

## Plymouth University

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

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 29 September 2015.

|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
| Present: | James Brent (Chairman)<br>Professor Mark Cleary<br>Professor David Coslett<br>Matthew Dark<br>Barbara Fuller<br>Rong Huang<br>Steve Pearce | Dr Ranulf Scarbrough<br>Dr Mike Sheaff<br>Stephen Tillman<br>Ruth Titmuss<br>Henry Warren<br>Professor Mary Watkins<br>Denis Wilkins |
|----------|--|--|

Secretary: Jane Hopkinson, University Secretary

In attendance: David Alder, Chief Marketing Officer  
 David Beeby, Interim Chief Financial Officer  
 Professor Simon Payne, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
 Professor Richard Stephenson, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor  
 Vikki Matthews, Chief Talent Officer  
 John Wright, Chief Information Officer  
 Professor Nikolaos Tzokas (for item 3.2)  
 Margaret Metcalfe, Executive Administrator

|                |  | Action |
|----------------|--|--------|
| <b>15/08/1</b> | <b><u>Membership</u></b>   |        |
| 1.1            | <b>Apologies for absence</b><br><b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• apologies received from Board members: Nick Buckland and Margaret Schwarz.</li> </ul>   |        |
| 1.2            | <b>Notification of items of any other business</b><br><b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• none received.</li> </ul>   |        |
| 1.3            | <b>Declarations of interest</b><br><b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• declarations of interest as set out in the Appendix attached</li> <li>• Mike Sheaff noted a potential conflict in relation to the presentation on portfolio review, given his role as programme manager for an academic area which might be impacted, but given the recognition that his role as a governor was not representative of any staff group, and that the presentation would not include specific proposals, the Board saw no issue</li> <li>• no other potential conflicts of interest were identified in relation to matters to be discussed.</li> </ul> |        |
|                |  |        |

|                |   |       |
|----------------|---|-------|
| <b>15/08/2</b> | <b>Minutes</b>  |       |
| 2.1            | <p><b>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 21 July 2015 (Enclosure A)</b></p> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman</li> <li>no redactions were deemed necessary and the minutes could be published in full.</li> </ul>   | MM    |
| 2.2            | <p><b>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the report as presented</li> <li><b>Brixham Environmental Laboratories (Minute 15/07/2.2):</b> ongoing negotiations with a potential anchor tenant. Due diligence was in train.</li> </ul>   |       |
| 2.3            | <p><b>Minutes of special Board of Governors meeting held on 24 September</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the minutes would be circulated once approved by the Chairman: they would reflect that the decision to appoint Professor Petts as the next Vice-Chancellor had been unanimous.</li> </ul>  | US/MM |
|                |   |       |
| <b>15/08/3</b> | <b>Presentations</b>  |       |
| 3.1            | <p><b>Strategic Implementation Programme</b></p> <p><i>Presentation by Professor Richard Stephenson</i></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the objective of the Programme had been to transform Strategy 2020 into a series of measurable priorities and goals and to clarify the University's strategic direction</li> <li>this had led to the development of a rolling three-to-five year implementation roadmap, with an assessment framework against which decisions could be measured and the development of a more focused range of strategic KPIs against which progress could be measured</li> <li>it was hoped that the updated KPIs could form the basis of the performance report to the Board in November</li> <li>at the joint development day in June, the Board and the Executive had confirmed focus on five key areas of strategic importance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>aim to be a UK top 50 (World top 300) university in 3-5 years (underpinned by a greater emphasis on student satisfaction, employability, quality research and financial sustainability)</li> <li>optimise the portfolio through a sharper focus on the core business of teaching and high quality research, with appropriate adjustments to size and shape</li> <li>enhance the University's value proposition by investing in the offer to students</li> <li>execute the student recruitment strategy by transforming current student recruitment activity</li> <li>manage the University's cost base, so as to save to invest</li> </ul> </li> <li>the strategic framework would be developed and re-presented to the October Board, following further testing: the roadmap would continue to focus on two key areas – financial sustainability and enabling excellence, based on six key considerations to be addressed in any decision, but with</li> </ul> | UEG   |

|  |  |                             |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
|  | <p>sustainability and the University's role as an anchor institution fully embedded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the key considerations were: value; opportunity cost; risk; capacity to deliver; supporting evidence</li> <li>• a number of indicative targets were being developed, designed to maintain the trajectory which would secure the key objectives by 2020: in some cases these were already very clear, but others were still a work in progress</li> <li>• the Executive was now producing a more detailed roadmap identifying mission critical initiatives and investments with associated timelines, decision points and executive governance, with the intention of providing both assurance and visibility for the Board</li> <li>• initiatives included portfolio review; process transformation; saving to invest; student recruitment transformation; employability; sustainable research excellence; and a world class estate. Each had an individual Executive lead, and a timeline identifying key milestones to facilitate ongoing monitoring. The Executive lead was formally accountable for the initiative, although the Executive collectively owned the entire roadmap</li> <li>• the Strategic Framework, KPIs and roadmap would be discussed at the UEG away day (with a focus on portfolio review) on 30 September, the Senior Leadership Forum on 6 October, the Teaching, Learning &amp; Quality Committee on 12 October, Academic Board on 14 October, and an All Staff Briefing on 20 October prior to submission to the Board on 27 October</li> <li>• the intention that the Board receive a 'University Strategy Implementation Report' twice a year as well as in-year updates as required or requested.</li> <li>• the need to acknowledge and understand the latency period associated with some of the proposed changes</li> <li>• the Executive would bring forward a view of the macro picture once portfolio review was concluded and the estate strategy was more fully developed; this latter initiative was considering the options for the Faculties of Business and Health, which had been identified as key issues</li> <li>• some underlying assumptions were already clear: no significant growth overall; the need to re-establish and sustain a national and international reputation for teaching excellence; a more focused research portfolio; and growth in international activity</li> <li>• the portfolio review would identify areas for disinvestment which would support re-investment in strong growth areas delivering better returns. The University could not continue to do more of the same but must focus on doing more of what it was best at</li> <li>• the Board's wish to ensure that information about key priorities was presented as soon as possible, to enable decisions about priorities and consideration of opportunity costs. Currently Finance Committee was receiving business cases to support investment requests, but without the broader context it was difficult to judge whether a particular approval might subsequently impact on later proposals</li> <li>• the Audit Committee was now ensuring that the outcomes of capital projects were monitored against the objectives originally agreed</li> <li>• there was a need to develop an investment strategy, but not all of the answers would be clear at the outset: decisions must be based on the best available evidence at that particular point</li> <li>• the need to model the impact of planned changes on the University's league table position</li> </ul> | <p>UEG/US</p> <p>UEG/US</p> |
|--|--|-----------------------------|

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the potential significance of the incoming Teaching Excellence Framework: it would be important to ensure that University agreed metrics mapped directly onto the TEF</li> <li>• the importance of engaging employers to ensure that decisions maximised student opportunities for work-based learning and increased employability: this was an important area for faculties. The development of a graduate attributes framework was underway, and it was intended to establish an Employability Board, involving local employers, and to align the Careers Centre more closely with faculties</li> <li>• the criticality of high quality data on which to base decisions. The University was testing data thoroughly in order to be able to provide assurance about high level analysis but this was taking more time than originally anticipated since the identification of an issue in one area almost inevitably had impacts in other data fields and took considerable time to resolve. Considerable work was being undertaken in the context of the portfolio review</li> <li>• there were some unresolved issues in relation to intelligent data management, although work was underway. The need to establish a sustainable process which would ensure robust and high quality data was well understood</li> <li>• governors were happy to be involved in developments as and when that might be helpful, but the strategy implementation plan was not yet sufficiently developed to enable the Board to provide effective challenge. There was however a need to ensure the Board did have the opportunity to challenge both the proposed priorities and the University's capacity to deliver them</li> <li>• KPI targets must be both challenging and realistic. The Board suggested the University consider value-add as a meaningful indicator in relation to student progression</li> <li>• the Board would welcome more information about the mechanisms by which the Executive ensured ongoing horizon-scanning and the ways in which that information was used</li> <li>• the changes to the University's comparator set did not impact on the roadmap or the development of University KPIs, but did identify institutions who were performing well in areas in which the University was aspiring to improve its performance. The competitor set reflected institutions with whom the University was competing, but it should be recognised that in many cases competitive data at a discipline level was very different from the overall institutional position</li> <li>• once the position was clear, information would be disseminated amongst staff and students, so that they could see what was being done and understand the context.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• copies of the presentation would be circulated to governors</li> <li>• governors would provide feedback on the proposed KPIs by the end of the week.</li> </ul> | <p>UEG</p> <p>UEG</p> <p>UEG</p> <p>VC</p> <p>MM<br/>All</p> |
| 3.2 | <p><b>Portfolio review</b><br/><i>Presentation by Professor Simon Payne</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the review was ongoing and the purpose of the presentation was to</li> </ul>  |  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>provide an update for the Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the underlying drivers: the external political context; a strategic focus on quality, sustainability and employability; improved strategic use of key data; and transparent investment and disinvestment decisions</li> <li>• a series of meetings had been held with all faculties prior to the Summer vacation, to review the (substantial) data set available and discuss the quality and financial sustainability of the portfolio</li> <li>• a number of categories had been identified and some small programmes, and programmes which had not recruited for some time, had been discontinued at an early stage</li> <li>• further meetings had been held with each faculty in September to review progress and consider updated data sets: current data indicated that the initial targeting had been appropriate</li> <li>• a number of programmes/discipline areas had been identified for a detailed review, led by the relevant Executive Dean, working with Professor Payne</li> <li>• for the University overall, the average quartile position for teaching in the NSS had improved, as had the DLHE outcomes, although overall outcomes could mask specific issues in particular areas so it was important to carry out a more detailed analysis</li> <li>• detailed validation of initial subject level financial data had been carried out over the summer, in particular to seek assurance that costs, particularly staffing costs, were being allocated correctly, given the complexities of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental teaching. This was complex since financial data was not currently fully aligned with programmes. A detailed review of 5 programmes was now complete: this had led to significant movement in financial performance data</li> <li>• closing discipline areas would not of itself improve the University's financial position: it must be linked with a reduction in associated overheads. Transformation would also need to involve a close scrutiny of research spend and University structures</li> <li>• UEG would review progress to date, and the detailed review of the 5 areas completed thus far, at its away day on 30 September. The Board would receive a further update on 27 October, and detailed proposals would come forward by January 2016. The timing reflected the issues identified in relation to financial data and the need to ensure accurate data underpinning decisions</li> <li>• it was acknowledged that in some areas quality data would of itself argue for more rapid decision-making, but there was also a need to consider the overall picture in order to make an initial assessment of the potential impact on professional services</li> <li>• the need also to model the impact on the University's positioning in the league tables of withdrawing a range of programmes</li> <li>• it would be important to be able to demonstrate to the University at large that there had been a thorough understanding of context, a consistency of process based on fully tested data, and a consideration of all the implications before decisions were taken: the Executive was erring on the side of caution, given the University's recent history</li> <li>• staff would be kept informed with regular updates at Faculty and School level: the Executive recognised the risk of inconsistent approaches, but also acknowledged the criticality of effective communications given the</li> </ul> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>UEG</b></p> |
|--|--|---|

|     |  |           |
|-----|--|-----------|
|     | <p>need for ongoing staff engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need for effective communications with students, to ensure they received appropriate reassurance about the programmes on which they were enrolled</li> <li>• the first report on KPIs would be made at October Board meeting, but initial comments were invited by the end of this week</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• copies of the presentation would be circulated to governors.</li> </ul>  | <b>MM</b> |
| 3.3 | <p><b>Update from the League Tables Committee</b><br/> <i>Presentation by Professor Nikolaos Tzokas</i></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new league tables had recently been published, or would shortly be issued</li> <li>• the value of the Unistats website, which provided both overall ratings and a more detailed analysis of individual components, which were potentially the best predictor of rational choice, but it had to be acknowledged that outcomes could appear contradictory, including contradictions between different disciplines within a single institution</li> <li>• student choice was a complex matter which was difficult to predict, but it was possible to identify and fix perceived weaknesses and focus on student perceptions</li> <li>• improvements would inevitably take time</li> <li>• the University had improved its NSS scores, with an increasing number of programmes above the NSS average, but there was still room for improvement</li> <li>• in the Sunday Times ranking, the University had declined despite substantial improvements in teaching quality, student experience and research excellence: this reflected the University's relative performance on employability, entry standards, student:staff ratios, and spend per student. The League Tables Working Group was focused on addressing these issues, with a particular focus on the impact of the ways in which the University reported its data</li> <li>• the QS World University Rankings were important for recruiting international students. In these rankings the University was 651 out of 700, which was an improvement on last year, and was ranked 58<sup>th</sup> in the UK. This ranking used different SSR data, and the Working Group was investigating those discrepancies</li> <li>• in the THE Data Points the University ranked in the band of 301-350 this year out of 800 institutions worldwide</li> <li>• currently, the League Tables Working Group was: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ attempting to enhance the professional management of the DLHE survey</li> <li>○ rationalising the University's HESA returns in order to secure more accurate SSRs, using new guidelines to ensure that all those engaged in teaching were formally defined as teaching staff</li> <li>○ looking in more detail at the recording of UCAS points, to ensure that the University collected and included all qualifying information, not simply the points which had secured entry</li> <li>○ modelling cost centres vs SSRs to secure the best outcome for the University</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |           |

|                |   |  |
|----------------|---|--|
|                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the need to consider the impact of reporting of statutory data on league tables</li> <li>the importance of increasing the pace of change</li> <li>employability was a key issue, and the University was undertaking a number of initiatives in this area.</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>15/08/4</b> | <b><u>Finance</u></b>   |  |
| 4.1            | <p><b>Management accounts to July 2015 (Enclosure D)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the University was delivering a net surplus of just over £6m, but this included a £2.4m positive pension adjustment under FRS17, which would almost certainly reverse in the coming year given the current pension deficit</li> <li>the surplus took account of the write-off of assets valued at c£5m in the context of the new campus masterplan</li> <li>OFFA spend had been at a level significantly above that required by the OFFA agreement and had consequently been reduced: the impact, if any, on student spend as reported in the league tables would need to be monitored</li> <li>discussions with Greenwich School of Management about co-investment to drive-up the student experience had resulted in an agreement that the University contribute £250K to reflect a proportion of the additional costs of the expansion of the Library and other initiatives intended to enhance the student experience. GSM was intending in due course to seek degree awarding powers but the University was anticipating a continuing relationship at postgraduate level</li> <li>the University's cash position had improved.</li> </ul> |  |
| <b>15/08/5</b> | <b><u>Governance</u></b>  |  |
| 5.1            | <p><b>GGI report on the University's progress (Enclosure E)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the report had been reviewed by the Governance and Nominations Committee that morning</li> <li>the report identified that good progress had been made, but there was still some work to do: the Committee had proposed some drafting changes which it was felt would better reflect the real and commendable progress made and avoid some current confusions</li> <li>the Committee had also looked at a report assessing the University's compliance with the CUC HE Code of Governance, which would be submitted to the Board in October with updates agreed by the Committee.</li> </ul>   |  |
| 5.2            | <p><b>Updated Raising Concerns (whistleblowing policy) (Enclosure F)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the whistleblowing policy had been redrafted in a more user-friendly format and subsequently reviewed by the Plain English company</li> <li>the Chairman would provide a foreword</li> <li>the policy would be tested out with student and staff focus groups, and their feedback taken into account in subsequent revisions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p>   |  |

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
|         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the updated Raising Concerns (whistleblowing) policy.</li> </ul>   |  |
| 5.3     | <p><b>Formal process for Governors' appraisal (Enclosure G)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the work undertaken to date was commended: while there was an intention to adopt an enhanced appraisal process going forward, involving a 360 review, it was important that a governor appraisal process was introduced in the current calendar year</li> <li>the Vice-Chancellor would be asked to provide comment from the executive team to inform governor appraisals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to implement the process as proposed.</li> </ul>   |  |
| 15/08/6 | <p><b>University Report to the Board (Enclosure H)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Board continued to find the report useful</li> <li>an <b>update on senior appointments</b>: the appointment process for the Vice-Chancellor had been completed successfully. Shortlisting had taken place on 22 September for the role of University Secretary, and the assessment centre would be taking place on 7/8 October. The role requirements and specifications for the Academic Registrar were being finalised. The recruitment of a permanent Pro Vice-Chancellor Research had been put on hold pending discussion with the VC designate. Applications had been received for the substantive Director of Student Services post and it was anticipated that the assessment centre would take place in November</li> <li>a number of <b>major University projects and initiatives</b> were underway, including portfolio review, recruitment and admissions, and the student experience</li> <li>a suggestion that the University explore whether it could claim IP rights in relation to Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs)</li> <li>the University had been working to address the new requirements relating to <b>Student Contract and Consumer Rights</b> to ensure compliance</li> <li>some reorganisation and simplification of the University's <b>research</b> infrastructure was taking place: the incoming Vice-Chancellor would inevitably have thoughts on the University's research agenda</li> <li>work to support the achievement of the <b>People Strategy</b>: a detailed update was provided</li> <li>further to announcements by the Universities Minister on the inception of a <b>Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)</b>, Madeleine Atkins, HEFCE Chief Executive, had said that new arrangements for quality assurance and the TEF should form a "single overall system" to avoid "unnecessary bureaucracy and duplication". The National Union of Students (NUS) was formally opposed to the TEF, but the current NUS President, Megan Dunn, had focused on the need to ensure that the TEF supported a culture of continuous improvement rather than as a proxy for allowing some institutions to raise their fees.</li> <li><b>Annex II</b>, which was circulated to all staff, provided a summary of UEG activities for June-July 2015. The value of this approach to keeping staff</li> </ul> |  |

|                |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|
|                | <p>informed should be explored with staff governors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the previous week's <b>Graduation ceremonies</b> had provided a very visible demonstration of all members of the University working together to celebrate the achievements of over 5,000 graduates. The event had been very successful and much favourable feedback had been received from graduates and their families. Thanks were due to everyone who had been involved in the organization of, or participated in, the ceremonies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Agreed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Report should include regular updates on employability initiatives, the likely timescales within which impact might be expected and monitoring of outcomes.</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>15/08/7</b> | <p><b>Current position in relation to student recruitment (Enclosure I)</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the paper provided an update on the current position in relation to student recruitment for the 2015 enrolment. Since the update had been written, there had been some changes: undergraduate recruitment was currently 323 FTE below target (in the context of a target which had been increased by 158 FTE from the previous year); international recruitment was 144 over target; and postgraduate taught recruitment was down by 81</li> <li>notwithstanding more challenging institutional behaviours across the sector in the current external environment, the University had improved its position in Clearing while maintaining quality: offers had not been made below the agreed thresholds</li> <li>financial forecasts had taken account the initial unpredictability, and current figures were within budget forecast</li> <li>given the current climate this was a good result, and thanks were due to all those involved.</li> </ul> |  |
| <b>15/08/8</b> | <p><b><u>Committee minutes</u></b></p>   |  |
| 8.1            | <p><b>Oral report from the Governance and Nominations Committee meeting held on 29 September 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all points discussed had been covered during in the meeting.</li> </ul>  |  |
| 8.2            | <p><b>Oral report from Finance Committee meeting held on 29 July 2015</b></p> <p><b>Noted:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Committee had discussed the appointment of new directors to the boards of the University's subsidiary companies, and had highlighted the need to ensure that directors took account of the potential for appropriate strategic alignments, particularly scope for working with students to enhance employability</li> <li>the business case for £1m funding for the Davy 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor North refurbishment had been approved</li> <li>updates had been received on the Veysey project and disposal of the Rolle Exmouth site, noting that progress was being made</li> <li>an interesting opportunity relating to a development proposal focused around the railway station had been discussed and the University had</li> </ul>  |  |

|                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|
|                 | been encouraged to explore further.  |  |
| 8.3             | <b>Minutes of the Finance Committee held on 21 July 2015 (Enclosure R)</b><br><b>Noted.</b>  |  |
| 8.4             | <b>Minutes of the Governance and Nominations Committee held on 21 July 2015 (Enclosure S)</b><br><b>Noted.</b>   |  |
|                 |  |  |
| <b>15/08/9</b>  | <b><u>Any other business</u></b>   |  |
| 9.1             | <b>Raising awareness of drug related incidents</b><br><b>Noted:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• anecdotal evidence of concerns about drug use among students in the City</li> <li>• it was very difficult to monitor whether there were problems of drug abuse within the University student population, but the University and the Students' Union worked very closely at a strategic level with the local police, and also ran a number of initiatives to raise students' awareness of potential risks in addition to offering support to those who may have a problem</li> <li>• the most significant current issue related to the use of legal highs, and UPSU was proposing a campaign to raise awareness of the associated dangers</li> <li>• the University continued to do what it could to identify potential problems.</li> </ul> |  |
|                 |  |  |
| <b>15/08/10</b> | <b><u>Date of next meeting</u></b><br>Tuesday 27 October 2015 at 1430  |  |

**Appendix 2: 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<br/>Theatre Royal Plymouth</p> <p>PA Central Limited<br/>Shebbear College<br/>First Great Western<br/>Ditchen Farm<br/>The British Computer Society<br/>The Chartered Management Institute<br/>The Royal Society of Arts<br/>The Institute of Maths &amp; it's Applications<br/>The Royal institution<br/>The Institute of Directors<br/>The Wellcome Trust</p> <p>Cornwall Adult Education Service</p> <p>Careers SW<br/>Tempus Leisure Ltd<br/>National Trust</p> <p>SuperFast Cornwall - EDT<br/>Slough and Eton Business and Enterprise Academy<br/>Elected member of the Council for the Institute of Mathematics<br/>Cornwall College<br/>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<br>Karst<br>PCH CiC  | Advisor<br>Trustee<br>Board member  |
| Professor Mark Cleary | Management Development Institute of Singapore<br><br>University of Bradford<br><br>Commonwealth Scholarship Committee  | Honorary Senate Member<br><br>Emeritus Professor and<br>Member of Court<br><br>Selection Committee<br>Member  |
| Matthew Dark          | University of Plymouth Students' Union<br>UPSU Trustee Board   | Vice-President and<br>trustee   |
| Barbara Fuller        | None   |   |
| Rong Huang            | Association for Tourism in Higher Education<br>Tianjin University of Commerce<br>Quality Assurance Agency Enterprises  | Executive member<br>Guest Professor<br>Associate  |
| Steve Pearce          | Deputy Lieutenant of Devon<br>Drake Foundation<br>Devon and Cornwall Crimestopper<br>Hamoaze House   | Vice-Chairman<br>Member<br>Trustee  |
| Dr Ranulf Scarbrough  | BT Group PLC   | Employee  |
| Margaret Schwarz      | None   |   |
| Dr Mike Sheaff        | brother is employed by the University (Prof Rod Sheaff in<br>the School of Government, faculty of Business)<br>Stoke Damerel Community College (one son is an<br>employee)<br>B&Q (one son is an employee)<br>younger son has been selected by the Green Party to stand<br>for election to Plymouth City Council in Drake Ward (in<br>which the campus is located)   | Staff governor  |
| Stephen Tillman       | Altitude(Ascot) Limited<br>Altitude Real Estate LLP– name change to<br>ARE (Properties) LLP<br>Altitude Property Developments Limited<br>Altitude (Arncott) Limited<br>Argent Projects Nos 2 Partnerships<br>Argent Projects No.3 Partnerships<br>Miller Argent Holding Limited:<br>Miller Argent (South Wales) Limited<br>Miller Argent (Ffos-y-fran) Limited;<br>Miller Argent (Nominee No 1 Limited)<br>Ffos-y-fran (Commoners) Limited<br>SGR (Bicester 2) Limited<br>SGR (Farringdon) Limited<br>Altitude Real Estate Limited<br>ST 2015 Holdings Limited | Director<br>Partner<br><br>Director<br>Director & shareholder<br>Partner<br>Partner<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director |

|                        |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|
|                        | ARE (Binfield) Limited<br>SGR (Bicester 3) Limited<br>SGR (Bicester 4) Limited<br>ARE (Moss End Limited  | Director<br>Director<br>Director<br>Director   |
| Ruth Titmus            | University of Plymouth Students' Union<br>UPSU Trustee Board   | President and trustee<br>Chair   |
| Henry Warren           | Plymouth Science Park Advisory Board<br>Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust<br>Fluvial Innovations Limited  | Member<br>Non-executive director<br>Director   |
| Professor Mary Watkins | PenCLAHRC (NIHR Peninsula Collaboration for Leadership<br>in Applied Health Research and Care)<br>Plymouth University<br><br>South Western Ambulance Services NHS Foundation Trust<br><br>BUPA Medical Advisory Panel<br>Aster Housing<br>Hamoaze House - Plymouth<br>Acorn Academy Cornwall<br>Peninsula Medical Foundation | Chair<br><br>Emeritus Chair,<br>Healthcare Leadership<br>Non-Executive Director<br>and Senior Independent<br>Director (SID),<br>Member<br>Non-executive Director<br><br>Chair<br>Chair |
| Denis Wilkins          | Royal College of Surgeons – Faculty<br>Peninsula Medical Foundation<br>Confidential Reporting Programme in Surgery (CORESS)<br>Menheniot Old School Trust<br>PUPSMD Board<br>Son in Law Director at Ernst & Young  | Trustee<br>Trustee<br>Trustee<br>Member  |