

	point.	
1.5	<p>Co-option of Barbara Fuller as the professional services staff governor</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> following the publication of a News Alert to notify staff that a vacancy existed on the Board of Governors for a professional services staff governor, a number of staff had expressed an interest and had been invited to meet with the University Secretary and a panel of governors who had endorsed their candidacy following a University-wide ballot, Barbara Fuller had won by a clear majority and her co-option to the Board had subsequently been recommended by the Governance and Nominations Committee. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to co-opt Barbara Fuller onto the Board as the professional services staff governor. <p><i>Note: Barbara Fuller joined the meeting at this point</i></p>	
15/06/2	<u>Minutes</u>	
2.1	<p>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 19 May 2015 (Enclosure A)</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. 	
2.2	<p>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brixham Environmental Laboratories (Minute 15/04/2.2): a tabled update on negotiations with a prospective anchor tenant acquisition and proposals for collaborative research and development at the site Plymouth Science Park (PSP) (Minute 15/04.2.2): a second charge over the Phase 5 building had been agreed with both PSP and its bankers, HSBC. The Heart of the South West LEP had confirmed £3m grant funding, but under the terms of that grant the University would not be able to exercise the charge for 5 years from 1 April 2016. This was not a significant disadvantage since were the project to get into difficulties during that period, the initial response would always have been to work with Plymouth City Council to restructure PSP in order to secure its position. The Board agreed to proceed on this basis. The paper which the Board had seen on extracting value from the relationship had now been shared with PSP and with PCC, who were considering a similar approach. 	<p>R&I</p> <p>CFO/US</p>
15/06/3	<u>Presentations</u>	
3.1	<p>Update on the League Tables Committee</p> <p><i>Presentation by Professor Nikolaos Tzokas</i></p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the presentation aimed to provide an overview of the HE landscape, and in particular identify the range of league tables and the University's current position and future ambitions in the context of continuing challenge to UK HE's global brand league tables were a one-dimensional competition but were important in 	

	<p>the context of a service which was by its nature complex and which students could not directly inspect or experience in advance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as far back as 2011, HEFCE had identified that students wanted suitably qualified teachers who were effective communicators, to be supported in their studies, to enjoy their experience, to complete their course successfully and then to get a good job • in this context, league tables were an important factor in terms of student choice nationally and internationally • the University had lost its previous focus on league table performance and measures to improve its position, and its position in a number of league tables had deteriorated over the past few years. The League Table Performance Committee, now chaired by Professor Tzokas, had been re-invigorated to address this. The objective was to secure a place in the top 50 institutions in 3-5 years • league tables used a variety of input and output measures, differentially weighted and crucially interlinked: the presentation included a detailed analysis of those areas in which the University's performance had not matched that of its competitor set, and the improvements required to secure its ambition, which would form the basis for prioritising actions • in the majority of areas, the University had improved its performance, but had not matched the level of improvement in other institutions and had consequently lost ground • previous data returns had in some cases incorporated errors or used methodologies which did not maximise the University's performance. While it was clearly important that returns were completed in accordance with the agreed criteria, other institutions had been more successful in identifying approaches (eg in relation to employability) which presented a more favourable position • the message was not all negative. Plymouth's performance in the Times Higher Education's (THES) World Rankings was very impressive, as one of only 34 UK HEIs in the top 300. It was the top performer in the People and Planet analysis; had a good rating in the THES student experience survey; had maintained very positive REF outcomes; and was ranked highly in the Leiden rankings (which it could be argued were the only absolutely objective league table, based as they are on citations) • while it was important to improve the University's position in the UK league tables, it was also important to celebrate other successes and to ensure these were communicated to prospective students • the national Key Information Set (KIS) provide considerable comparative information to inform student choice and the presentation outlined some of that data. Given a risk of information overload, the value proposition (both emotional and rational) became increasingly important • the intention was to work with students in identifying the way forward, to use league table performance as a strategy to drive improvement, to change services and delivery where necessary, to make data collection a more professional exercise (and keep checking it) and to learn from others • the Committee would both monitor the position and intervene proactively to inform decisions which might impact on league table performance, using expertise from across the University to maximise its impact and facilitate both a more detailed analysis of the position and a wider understanding of key factors, and focusing on a professional approach to league table 	
--	--	--

	<p>performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to monitor not only improvements in the University’s performance but also the performance of other institutions with a similar profile in order to secure improvement in the University’s relative position • the initial focus would be in rectifying data errors and looking for quick wins: there was a time-lag, since league tables often reflected data from the previous year, hence the 3-5 year timescale, but it was important to move forward at a pace • there were some more deep-rooted issues. It was timely during the Assessment Board period to reflect on the number of external examiners’ comments which encouraged staff to use the full range of marks; if staff did not use the upper end of the mark scale, this would impact on student awards with consequences not only for league table performance but more importantly for individual students • the need better to understand overall student satisfaction scores, given that improvements in individual factors were not currently reflected in the overall scores. It was suggested that this might reflect non-academic factors influencing student satisfaction • the important role of UPSU in this context • employability was major factor in the league tables, and the University’s scores were improving following recent actions, a more managed approach to the reporting of spend on students and facilities could also offer quick wins. Coding of data at the outset, through the Finance system, could be key • ongoing work in relation to the strategy implementation programme had been informed by a review of league table metrics • a link to the relevant intranet site could be provided for any governor who wanted further detail • thanks to Professor Tzokas for taking on the project, which was clearly critical for the University <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to include UPSU representation on the Committee • Professor Tzokas to attend a Board meeting in the Autumn to provide an update. 	<p>NT US/NT</p>
<p>3.1</p>	<p>Update on incoming UPSU Executive Officers and their campaigns <i>Presentation by Sarah Bowman and Ruth Titmuss</i></p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the UPSU vision and mission remained the same: to make a positive impact on the lives of all members, through understanding, empowering and delivering on their needs; and to transform lives through experience • the values had been updated and focused on being fun, progressive, student led, empowering, democratic and sustainable • UPSU departments had been embedding values and ambitions in their local plans • key strategic goals associated with the ambitions would be launched formally on 30 June at the UPSU officers’ handover • the presentation identified the 6-9 goals associated with each ambition • highlights included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a focus on the review and development of existing academic 	

	<p>representation structures (where work was ongoing with the University)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the development of the sports strategy and additional resource for the further development of societies and activities ○ developing new ways of increasing engagement with traditionally 'hard to reach' groups such as mature students, postgraduates, international students and those studying off the main Plymouth campus ○ the provision of a vibrant and diverse social programme ○ the criticality of the student advice centre in relation to support and wellbeing ○ a focus on staff wellbeing ○ the need to demonstrate value for money across all activities ○ maximising opportunities for part time employment and building a partnership with the University to improve graduate employability ○ ensuring sustainability both in terms of social responsibility and organisational sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● all annual plans would be agreed and progress monitored by the UPSU Board of Trustees ● voter data for the recent UPSU officer elections demonstrated lower levels of engagement from partnership students and third and fourth years and UPSU would be working on encouraging participation from those groups. Nonetheless, 3279 voters was more than 10% of eligible students, compared to a sector norm of 5%, ● Ruth Titmuss had been elected President and Chair of the Trust Board. Her main priority was to work on national campaigns, but she also had a sustainability role, and was the lead on internal and external communications. Her key campaigns were employability, transparency, and, in relation to organisational sustainability, strengthening the UPSU Accommodation Office ● Matthew Dark had been elected as VP Sports and Deputy President. His key campaign – Give It A Go – focused on encouraging students to try different sports. His other main manifesto pledges were focused on improving communication between students and the SU, and working with the University on the range of sports partnerships which supported the SU sports clubs ● James Stoner had been elected as VP Activities. His main campaigns were the availability of App sign-ups; the development of a sponsorship directory; and the development of the media teams in using online platforms ● Steph Wearne had been elected as VP Education, and would be a member of the University's academic committees. She also took responsibility for the course/school rep system, where it had become increasingly apparent that a 'one size fits all' approach was unsustainable. She would also represent postgraduate students and lead on the SSTAR awards ● Davide Bertelli had been elected as VP International and Outreach. He would be responsible for international student support and partner institutions – representing the under-represented. His campaigns included a buddy scheme for international students, and the development of a North Hill Carnival ● Jess Small had been elected VP Welfare, and would be continuing a range 	
--	---	--

	<p>of welfare campaigns, developing the advice centre, and working with the University on an accessibility audit focused on both physical and mental health issues. She would also be working on implementing support packs for new students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • candidates for UPSU posts self-nominated and stood for specific roles: UPSU provided training and workshops for all candidates to highlight key issues. UPSU would put election materials online and email all registered students about the election but it was the responsibility of individual candidates to try to reach as many students as possible • a suggestion that UPSU could work with Schools in developing contact with hard to reach groups such as students on placement • UPSU used a variety of routes to feedback to the University: the Big10 survey would be repeated annually; feedback from course and school reps was fed back locally and those reps were trained so that they were confident in their role; UPSU officers met with members of the University Executive Group in a range of contexts; and there was UPSU and wider student representation on academic committees. 	
15/06/4	<u>Governance</u>	
4.1	<p>Update on the Governance Improvement Programme (Enclosure D)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • given continued progress with the workstreams associated with the Governance Improvement Programme, the Governance and Nominations Committee meeting in the morning had endorsed a recommendation that the Programme be formally be closed in the Autumn, and oversight of outstanding work transferred to the Committee • some concerns about the resources available to support ongoing work • good progress with the review of the Academic Board, on which Professor Mark Cleary was the Board's representative: the review group had agreed that there was a need to strengthen the role of the Board and clarify both its areas of responsibility and the matters which would form the basis of constructive debate with the University Executive Group • a proposal to rename Academic Board as Senate, in order to signal the change of approach • the need to ensure that the review did not forget the important issue of identifying the mechanisms by which Academic Board, howsoever designated, would provide assurance to the Board of Governors about matters of academic governance. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to close the Governance Improvement Programme in late September and transfer oversight of governance improvements to the Governance and Nominations Committee. 	US
4.2	<p>Draft Schedule of Delegation (Enclosure E)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • following discussion by both the Governance and Nominations Committee and the full Board in May, the Schedule of Delegation had been updated to incorporate comments • comments had also been received from UEG following its meeting on 10 June, including the potential to include links to eg the Financial Regulations 	

	<p>rather than repeat information, and the need to maintain the focus on key decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if the Board agreed the revised format, the intention was to incorporate comments and present a final draft to the July meeting • the Schedule would need regular review once it became operational • thanks to all those involved in the development of the Schedule. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the format of the draft Schedule of Delegation • members would submit comments on content to the University Secretary outwith the meeting, to be received by end-June. • The final version would be submitted to the Board in July 	<p>All</p> <p>US</p>
4.3	<p>Updated role profile for governors (Enclosure F)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been agreed that the University would use the services of regional search consultants to widen the search for new independent governors: under the procurement regulations, it was necessary to secure three quotes • once consultants had been appointed, the advertisement for new independent governors would be published • in this context, the current background information provided for interested candidates had been reviewed and simplified to provide a combined statement of primary responsibilities, role profile and Code of Conduct: this had been discussed and agreed by the Governance and Nominations Committee • a proposal to include a list of Frequently Asked Questions about the role of governors on the Governance website • the potential value of specifying the likely overall time commitment as being for the academic year 2015/16: the current pattern of monthly Board meetings was unusual in the HE context (although fairly typical for other large complex organisations) and placed a not inconsiderable workload on both governors and the executive and Board support, and there may be value in a review in the coming session. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the updated role profile • to include a list of Frequently Asked Questions on the governance website. 	<p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p> <p>US</p>
4.4	<p>Future role/portfolio of the University Secretary (Enclosure G)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the paper focussed on the profile and portfolio of the future University Secretary/Clerk to the Board role: a wider paper, covering also the role of an Academic Registrar, had been discussed by the Governance and Nominations Committee in the morning • the Committee was recommending appointing to a post combining a traditional University Secretary role with a broader governance and legal dimension • it had been suggested the responsibilities of the broader role might include oversight of Internal Audit and management of the internal audit contract : this was fully supported by the Audit Committee 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Committee had also suggested that the title of the role should be University Secretary and Head of Governance the post would be full time (1FTE). <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> governors would send any comments on the proposed role profile to the to the Chief Talent Officer by Friday 19 June the need to move forward rapidly with an appointment, given the forthcoming retirement of the current postholder. 	All
15/06/5	Strategy	
5.1	<p>Outcomes from the Strategy Implementation Programme (Enclosure H)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the brief update on the Strategy Implementation Programme outcomes had been discussed in detail at the Board/UEG Development Day on 9 June 	
5.2	<p>Tribal benchmarking data (Enclosure I)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the report compared the University's financial performance in historical cost terms against a range of other modern Universities for which recent data was available the report had been considered by both Finance and Employment Committees peer group comparators had been used with the aim of matching programmes as best as possible, but this had been restricted as no other modern University had a Medical School, nor as significant a focus on research activity, particularly in the science and engineering areas the overall picture was complex but confirmed the macro view that the University had been underperforming in relation to both the sector overall and the peer group in terms of financial surplus there was no direct comparison with league table data, since Tribal allocated costs based on self-determined analyses of how individuals spent their time across a range of activities the data appeared to show that the University had comparatively higher spend on senior staff/management grades but had fewer senior academic staff : this may reflect current structures and policies but merited further analysis the University's spend on non-pay was significantly higher than its competitors in a number of areas, but this included over £1m spent on the Digital Learning Environment, the costs of field trips (where other institutions passed costs on to students) and scholarships, and the impact of an unusually high number of voids (empty rooms) in halls of residence with costs consequently falling on the University professional services staff costs were generally lower than the norm activities reflected comparatively lower spend than the peer group the underspend compared to the peer group on general facilities costs related to the decision taken in the year in question to defer ongoing maintenance in the light of the overall budgetary position Finance was using the data to interrogate budget forecasts for 2015/16; in addition the structural issues raised were under review in HR. The report 	

	<p>was also feeding in to the SIP road map and portfolio review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> outcomes from the portfolio review would inform a review of professional services, although some of those conversations were already being initiated at the local level, it was recognised that an ongoing review of structures and processes was a fundamental part of business as usual it was intended to carry out a structured review of expenditure on student accommodation, looking at benchmarking across the sector, and the appropriateness of the current skills mix, with a view to ensuring that the University both met student requirements and provided value for money for the University's investments. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the underlying data sets could be made available to governors on request: given the complexity of the information, it was suggested that anyone interested in doing so arranged initially to go through it with the Interim Chief Financial Officer or Director of Finance the executive would report back to the Board (via Employment and Finance Committees as appropriate) in relation to the questions raised, their resolution, and the action and learning points arising. 	<p>All</p> <p>UEG</p>
5.3	<p>Outcomes from the Board/UEG Away Day</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the joint Board/Executive Development Day held on 9 June had been very helpful and the honesty and openness of debate about a number of issues and challenges was welcomed the test of success would be the actions which were now in train any further feedback should be sent to the Head of Strategy and Performance. 	All
15/06/6	<u>Finance</u>	
6.1	<p>Period 9 management accounts (Enclosure J)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the forecast operating surplus for the full year at period 9 was £3.8m compared to the original target of £1.8m: while this was insufficient to match future investment plans it was an improvement on the previous year savings had been achieved by careful management of spend in faculties and Directorates; the Interim Chief Financial Officer was discussing projected spend between now and the year-end with budget managers ongoing work on the campus masterplan would be factored in at the year-end, to identify the potential for balance sheet write-offs the impact of significant reductions in the BIS budget might not be as severe as initially feared but there had as yet been no formal announcement from HEFCE. Any reduction in the HEFCE 2015/16 budget would impact on the University's outturn for 2014/15, given that HEFCE's financial year started in April 2015 the disparity between results to date and forecast technically offered the opportunity for an additional £2m surplus: this was being carefully monitored. The position would of course be impacted by any increase in spend towards the year-end or any in-year cuts from HEFCE and it was anticipated that the forecast would not be significantly above forecast notwithstanding some concern that overly-cautious forecasting may lead 	<p>CFO</p> <p>CFO</p>

	<p>the Board to defer capital spend unnecessarily, there was a view that prudent provision was appropriate in the current external environment. It would be possible to review at the year-end the potential impact of prudent forecasting on infrastructure spend, and this would be taken into account in planning for future austerity.</p>	CFO
6.2	<p>HEFCE three year financial forecasts (Enclosure K)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the draft of the financial forecast for the years ending 31 July 2016, 31 July 2017 and 31 July 2018 which must be submitted to HEFCE by 31 July 2015. The final version would be presented to the Board in July for approval the criticality of the sensitivity analysis, given that relatively small movements in eg student recruitment could have a significant impact the pay bill was predicted to rise, both as a result of recruitment to some unfilled vacancies and a 2% increase in pension costs and a 3.5% increase in National Insurance contributions it would not be possible to continue to manage the financial situation through action at the margins, and in order to implement the portfolio review and review of the overall cost base, there would be need for provision for restructuring costs: a £4m restructuring fund was therefore incorporated a change in accounting standards in 2016 would impact on the treatment of restructuring costs the Board had not yet formally discussed its approach to risk appetite going forward, but if the University achieved forecast surpluses, it would potentially have the borrowing capacity for infrastructure investments the University was reviewing options for short term amelioration of the current limits on laboratory space, so as not to constrain student recruitment the aggregate capital expenditure demands would need to be reviewed to identify the levels of borrowing required against current borrowing capacity a link between the portfolio review and the developing estate strategy (including new build/refurbishment/maintenance) the potential to review the current focus on the provision of accommodation on-campus, given available sites elsewhere in the city: such developments might be both quicker to realise and more cost-effective the cash balances remained healthy, notwithstanding provision for capital expenditure the forecasts would come back to the Board in July for approval: the University was encouraged to undertake more work on managing downside sensitivities. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to ask the Finance Committee to look at the associated scenario planning and sensitivities to see whether it might be possible to drive up the surplus. 	<p>Chairman/US</p> <p>CFO</p> <p>Finance</p>
15/06/7	<p>Report from the Remuneration Committee (Enclosure L)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a report on discussions at the extended Remuneration Committee 	

	<p>believed that matters were now being bottomed out, particularly in relation to partner college relationships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an internal audit of student accommodation had been requested under the previous leadership and undertaken at a time at which a number of issues were unresolved. It was clear that lessons had been learned and progress made, and as a consequence the internal auditors were revisiting the issues before the year-end with a view to providing a level of assurance which could feed into the annual audit report • an internal audit of expenses had raised no issues which were out of line with the sector • some audit recommendations from previous years had deadlines in July/August: if these deadlines were not met the Committee would ask the responsible manager to attend an Autumn term meeting to give an explanation • a draft internal audit plan had been discussed and some changes proposed to align with University priorities • the Committee was confident that high risk items from the corporate risk register had been picked up in the audit plan • the list of contracts awarded between February 2015 and May 2015 without a formal competition had been noted • a report on value for money in relation to the Marine Building had confirmed that the project had delivered value (although those on the project board had not been made aware of the initial business case) • capital projects scheduled for future review included: Mast House, the Truro Residences, The House, and the Marine Station • similar value for money exercises would be carried out in relation to revenue expenditure, and it had been agreed that the first of these would focus on Research and Innovation. The Chief Marketing Officer would also be invited to give a presentation on securing value for money in relation to External Relations activities • the Committee had agreed that responsibility for the oversight of internal audit required senior executive focus and should form part of the responsibilities of a new University Secretary and Head of Governance • in that context, the Committee considered that it would be timely to review current internal audit arrangements. 	
8.3	<p>Minutes of the Finance Committee held on 19 May 2015 Noted. Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to ask Finance Committee to review the 2015/16 University budget in advance of its consideration by the Board. 	
8.4	<p>Minutes of the Governance and Nominations Committee held on 19 May 2015 Noted.</p>	
15/06/9	<p>Any other business</p>	
9.1	<p>Plymouth eBooks Project – Proposal to continue and extend Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the paper had come direct to the Board since the next Finance Committee was not until July and if a decision were taken to continue and extend the scheme it was important that it could be highlighted in ongoing student recruitment 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scheme provided new Plymouth students with personal eBook copies of core first year texts: it had been pioneered in 2011 and student feedback was overwhelmingly positive there was some evidence that it was a potential recruitment incentive, and it certainly levelled the playing field in terms of affordability and access to core texts (which had also had a positive impact on retention and performance during the initial pilot project) Plymouth was currently the sector leader, but other universities were now looking to develop similar schemes costs were already included in current spending forecasts: in fact the continued support for the scheme at the level of £582k from 2015/16 was marginally below the existing budget forecast the importance of ensuring that this spend was appropriately coded to impact on league table data there would be a small saving in terms of library costs, but the savings were largely for students who would otherwise have had to buy texts <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to approve the continuation of the scheme for a further three years, extending its scope to all new undergraduate students, with provision for review at the end of that period the associated expenditure of £582Kpa for 2015/16 and the three year life of the project. 	
9.2	<p>Thanks to outgoing UPSU representatives</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sarah Bowman and Richard Skipper had come to the end of their terms of office, and the Chair conveyed the Board's thanks for their valuable contributions in their two years as governors. He would arrange to talk to each of them about their experience on the Board, to explore the student perspective. 	US
15/06/13	<p><u>Date of next meeting</u> Tuesday 21 July 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; 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

