

Plymouth University

Higher Education Corporation Board of Governors

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 27 October 2015.

Present: James Brent (Chairman)
Nick Buckland
Professor Mark Cleary
Professor David Coslett
Matthew Dark
Rong Huang
Steve Pearce
Dr Ranulf Scarbrough
Margaret Schwarz
Dr Mike Sheaff
Stephen Tillman
Ruth Titmuss
Henry Warren
Professor Mary Watkins
Denis Wilkins

Secretary: Jane Hopkinson, University Secretary

In attendance: David Alder, Chief Marketing Officer
Professor Simon Payne, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Professor Richard Stephenson, Interim Deputy Vice-Chancellor
John Wright, Chief Information Officer
Kirstie Godwin-Day, Senior Executive Officer, Strategy and Performance (*for item 4*)
Matthew Jackson, University Solicitor (*for item 8*)

		Action
15/09/1	<u>Membership</u>	
1.1	Apologies for absence Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none">apologies from Board members: Barbara Fuller UEG members: Vikki Matthews	
1.2	Items of any other business	
1.2.1	Health and Safety Executive Noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none">the University had received a prohibition notice from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) on 21 October 2015, relating to the lift in the Nancy Astor Buildingthe insurers had previously identified work which needed to be undertaken on the lift: this had been passed to the contractors to complete, but had not been undertaken in a timely manner. The University was investigating with the contractors and the University's Estates team to understand the exact chronology and the reasons for the apparent lack of monitoringcurrently the lift was out of action while work was in train. Other lifts had briefly been taken out of service to investigate safety, but no issues had been identified	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact on staff and student-facing services on the upper floors had been acknowledged, and the University was making modifications as necessary no criminal offence was associated with the prohibition notice provided the University complied, but there was potential for prosecution should HSE conclude that the University had failed to provide a safe place of work all lifts were serviced in accordance with an agreed schedule the need to ensure that the University's insurers had spoken to the contractors' insurers in case of subsequent legal action an update would be provided at the next Board meeting 	DVC (SP)
1.2.2	<p>University Secretary role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the appointment of a new University Secretary had been progressed with assistance from Perrett Laver. Regrettably, following interviews no appointment had been made and interim arrangements were now being explored to take the University through until Summer 2016 three potential options were being considered: an external or an internal interim appointment or splitting aspects of the role between internal colleagues. 	
1.3	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> declarations of interest as set out in the Appendix attached. Mike Sheaff's declaration of interest at the previous meeting remained valid, as did the Board's response potential conflicts to be raised if they became apparent in relation to matters to be discussed. 	
15/09/2	Minutes	
2.1	<p>Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on 29 September 2015 (Enclosure A)</p> <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> subject to amending: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> page 5, 4th bullet point: detailed proposals <u>by vice</u> in January 2016 page 6, 1st bullet point: regular updates at <u>Faculty and</u> School level and deleting page 5, 6th bullet point, the minutes were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. 	MM
2.2	<p>Necessary redactions</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> subject to the corrections above, the minutes could be published in full. 	
2.3	<p>Matters arising: (Enclosure B)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the report as presented Brixham Environmental Laboratories (BEL) (<i>Minute 15/07/2.2</i>): a request that the Board receive a full summary of developments at BEL, including a full list of tenants and an analysis of the position as against the original business case Management accounts to July 2015 (<i>Minute 15/08/4.1</i>): the income and 	DVC (SP)

	expenditure account, balance sheet and cash flow statement would all be circulated to the full Board after this meeting.	MM
15/09/3	<u>University Strategy</u>	
3.1	<p>Strategic Intelligence Report (Enclosure C)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the horizon scanning report had been compiled by the Strategy and Policy team, primarily for the Executive: it was however valuable in providing both assurance to the Board that this was happening and background on the current context an update would be provided a least twice yearly, supplemented by individual briefings and monthly summaries for the Executive the key issues currently were the potential impact of the Comprehensive Spending Review and the Teaching Excellence Framework proposals health and welfare was currently a part of key government and NHS agendas: the University's work in relation to student wellbeing was therefore important in potentially accessing funds in relation to young people's mental health. This was currently just under the radar, but had been noted as an increasingly important area: the University's policy on data sharing had recently been reviewed in this context, and additional funding had been made available to enable 24/7 provision of student-facing frontline services, following the reduction in Disabled Students' Allowance. UPSU noted that elsewhere in the sector similar services were being cut, and the University's position was therefore much appreciated the issues arising from the continued national focus on concentration of research and science funding would need to be addressed urgently following the appointment of an interim Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research). Following the publication of REF results, there had been efforts to streamline research architecture, but more work needed to be undertaken in the context of targeting research funding. postgraduate student numbers continued to be strong, and relationships had been built with Research Councils to ensure access to doctoral training funds. The University had advertised for c.60 studentships, and had received very high quality applications. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it would be helpful to distinguish pgr/pgt in this report the Director of Student Services would be invited to brief the Board on student health and wellbeing at a future meeting the DVC with responsibility for research would provide an update on the University's activities post REF at the January meeting, with a further report on key decisions after Easter, to enable the engagement of the incoming Vice-Chancellor. 	DoSS DVC (SP)
3.2	<p>University Strategic Plan (Enclosure D)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a focus on how Strategy 2020 would be prioritised and implemented two key documents: the Strategic Framework as a guide to decision making; and the Roadmap which identified, prioritised and sequenced mission critical initiatives and investments Annex 1 was welcomed as a valuable one-page summary of 'where we will 	

	<p>be in 2020': this could form an extended elevator pitch for governors and others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • widening participation, which was an historic strength of the University, did not come over strongly in the annex: the University was developing a new Fair Access approach, designed to ensure well-qualified applicants were not inadvertently deterred by the WP designation • the University did intend to maintain a focus on being a University of first choice, at least in certain areas • the need to ensure that the statements also encompassed students drawn from the world of work as well as those recruited directly from school or college • the potential to strengthen references to alumni • the anchor institution role was key given the University's regional location • a key stress on outputs and on the obligation to give students the best possible chance to reach their potential • questions remained about the balance between teaching and research, which had previously been an issue. There had been a subtle shift in the way research was now addressed, which should provide a useful basis for moving forward. The focus on research-informed teaching remained, although it may not be expressed as strongly as it might be • the need to ensure the focus was on student learning and not just teaching • STEMM subjects would continue to be a strength, but the University would also continue to invest in other areas, given appropriate quality and markets • the need to be clear, at least internally, what was/was not a priority which would be developed through the Strategic Framework and Roadmap • questions about the extent to which the objectives and timescales were realistic. The current focus appeared to be on the processes which would determine and measure objectives, but not how to deliver, for example, a jump of 36 places in league tables in three years. The University recognised that this was a challenging target, but noted progress over the past twelve months in a number of areas, through engaging with faculties, refocussing on core activities, and highlighting the significance of key measures • some colleagues noted that while Plymouth had the capacity to make dramatic improvements, so did competitor institutions: it might therefore be better to focus on significant improvements rather than specific target placings, recognising that quality was more important than league table positions per se. While not wishing to diminish aspirations, a failure to achieve top 50 could be demotivating or become a hostage to fortune • in some ways, subject league tables were more important • the message about putting students at the centre of all activity was very clear but must include the commitment to high quality research informed teaching across the board • in Plymouth's case, the strategy was also to maintain and develop areas of world class research, with exceptional outputs, focussed on the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. There were some questions about the extent to which this would be justified when measured against the Strategic Framework and Roadmap. It was clear that access to high quality research staff was a factor in student recruitment, and that the academy had a responsibility for the pursuit of knowledge, but the issue may not be what the University wanted to do but what it could afford to fund 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a commitment to maintain Annex 1 at no more than one page, while taking comments into account as far as possible • the Board had seen previous iterations of Annex II/III Strategic Framework/Roadmap, which had now also been disseminated to the Senior Leadership Forum (SLF) and Academic Board, and referenced in staff briefings • the Board was requested to endorse the KPIs, in terms of measures not measurements. The specific values required more work in order to create a more nuanced view of interdependencies and impacts • the rolling 3-5 year framework was not focussed solely on 2020, but was intended to identify appropriate metrics going forward, and create the lens through which it would be possible to review plans • the refocus on core business had helped to secure improvements in performance in the current year • the need for some stability in terms of size, but with some rebalancing across the portfolio • the University was mindful of the external development of the Teaching Excellence Framework, and was aiming to develop metrics which would also meet the requirements of the TEF • process transformation would be a significant activity going forward • there was not necessarily an equal weighting to each of the key decision-making lenses: the intention was to create a balanced overview • Page 6, 4.2, referencing the dashboard at a subject/programme level was clearly important, but there would also be a need to articulate the links between qualitative and quantitative data to ensure that there was an opportunity for reflection. The framework was intended to ensure that the consequences of decisions were clearly understood: business cases would be expected to include the qualitative narrative, and more, and more detailed, KPIs would be developed at the local level • the staff metric related to satisfaction, rather than engagement: there may be better indicators, given that the survey was only triennial • teaching KPIs were determined at the point of graduation, so there may be a need to incorporate broader data throughout a student's interactions with the University • there was no reference to pgt quality because the current relatively small numbers of students and relatively low response rate to PTES, raised questions about the reliability of data • research outputs should include income-based metrics • some measures (eg internships/work placements) would form part of an accompanying fleet of management indicators which would underpin the Board KPIs • it was recognised that this was a very complex and impressive picture. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to use provisional KPIs to create the baseline performance report in November 2015 • to find a date in December for a joint Board/Executive meeting to discuss in more depth in order to do justice to the high quality work which had been undertaken. 	
--	--	--

3.3	<p>Portfolio Review</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a presentation which provided an update on the review: copies would be circulated to the Board • drivers for the portfolio review • phased delivery had meant that c50 very small programmes or those not currently live had already been removed from the portfolio • 17 areas had been identified for detailed review under Phases 2 and 3: the focus was on developing options for changes to the portfolio; assessing potential implications for University structures; and aligning with levels of investment required in the context of the research strategy • recommendations would come forward over the next two months. Deans would make recommendations to the Portfolio Review Group, chaired by Professor Simon Payne. The Group would make recommendations to UEG and thence to Academic Board and the Board of Governors, in parallel with consultation with staff unions and key stakeholders • the first recommendations were likely to be presented to the Board on 24 November, after UEG and Academic Board meetings on 4 November, with a second round presented at the additional Board/UEG meeting in December • a further round of meetings with Deans was now virtually complete; SLF, the Joint Consultative Committee and Academic Board had all been briefed and the all staff briefing had also included information about the portfolio review. UPSU had been kept advised through Academic Board, but separate briefing would be scheduled in parallel with the decision timetable • any statutory redundancy consultation process would be initiated formally once the Board of Governors had endorsed proposals but staff unions would be advised after UEG on 4 November of the areas potentially affected in the first decision-phase and HR would be briefed to provide support • proposals for processes relating to the subsequent and associated professional services review and savings would come to UEG on 4 November; meetings would be held with professional services staff in November/December to review portfolio decisions, the delivery of immediate savings and longer term efficiencies, and potential changes to structures • an email from Deans advising staff of planned timelines was due to be issued shortly • the Chief Marketing Officer had been working on a communications plan, building on information already known about the process and ensuring that the criteria and rationale for decisions was clear. This would also encompass communications to current students and applicants • the review had taken into account the upward swing in demographics forecast after the initial downturn, and of differential upward swings across different regions: the potential for growth of postgraduate taught programmes, particularly in the Business School, could partially ameliorate the demographic downturn • for 2016/17, the university was anticipating fewer Home/EU students but an increase in international recruitment through improved conversion rates and a marginally less conservative approach to offers (the University's current visa refusal rate was 1.3%, as against the maximum 10% which would trigger UKVI intervention). A refreshed marketing strategy was 	MM
-----	--	----

	<p>designed to improve Home/EU applications going forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> going forward and learning from issues identified as part of the current review, work was underway on developing robust and integrated HR and financial data which would be easy to interrogate and monitor in the context of business as usual campus strategy exercise was currently capturing space utilisation, which would inform plans for the Estates Masterplan. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governors would receive a confidential briefing note on 4 November with a summary of recommendations. If any governors received approaches from staff, they should be referred to Professor Simon Payne. 	DVC (SP) All
15/09/4	Governance	
4.1	<p>Closing report from the Governance Improvement Programme (Enclosure E)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Governance Improvement Programme had largely succeeded in its objectives: outstanding actions would be taken forward as part of 'business as usual' for the Governance and Nominations Committee thanks to Kirstie Godwin-Day for an excellent job as Programme Manager: any additional comments should be sent to her by 6 November there would be a final report from the Good Governance Institute in Spring 2016 on actions taken against both the GGI report and the University's subsequent action plan. 	All US
4.2	<p>Assessment of progress against the CUC Code (Enclosure F)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this had been considered by the Governance and Nominations Committee in September and updated following actions agreed by that Committee the report was intended to be a live document, subject to annual review. 	US
4.3	<p>Annual report on student complaints (Enclosure G)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the format for future reports would be reviewed, but the full document had been presented on this first occasion to give the Board a clear picture of the information available and subject to discussion at Academic Board Committees data on complaints to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and their outcomes the increase in numbers of complaints was also reflected in the UPSU experience and was most likely to be related to the £9k fee the relatively high proportion of numbers of complaints from partner colleges was impacted by a 'class action' complaint from one cohort. 	
4.4	<p>Revised Instrument and Articles (Enclosure H)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the revised Instrument and Articles had been considered by Governance and Nominations Committee, who had made some suggested revisions 	

	<p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further comments from the Board to be sent to the University Secretary by 6 November: the final version would then be signed-off by the Governance and Nominations Committee before submission to the Privy Council. 	All
15/09/5	<u>Academic Board</u>	
5.1	<p>Senate terms of reference and composition (Enclosure I)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the revised terms of reference and composition had been considered and approved by Academic Board, after discussion on two occasions • the new Senate would come into force in the New Year, following Privy Council approval of the revised Instrument and Articles, but Academic Board was already operating in accordance with the principles of the new terms of reference • the overarching responsibilities of the Board of Governors were reflected upfront in the new terms of reference • thanks to Professor Kevin Jones for his work in Chairing the Academic Board Review Group. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the re-designation of Academic Board as Senate • the revised terms of reference as proposed • the revised composition and management of elections as proposed • the meeting schedule and procedural rules • to delegate authority to Senate to determine the bye laws governing its meeting procedures. 	US US Senate
5.2	<p>Minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 25 June 2015 (Enclosure J)</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
15/09/6	<p>Update on preparation for the QAA Higher Education Review (Enclosure K)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • work on the Self Evaluation Document was currently focussed on evidencing statements • the student submission was an independent document, but UPSU was in regular contact with the Pro Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning and the Head of the Quality Office • the final submission would be available in late December • a very granular approach from QAA. <p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to invite the Pro Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning to provide an update at the January meeting. 	MM PVC (T&L)
15/09/7	<p>Update on the University's response to the Government's PREVENT Strategy (Enclosure L)</p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an important update on actions undertaken under the PREVENT duty • contrary to some external reports, the PREVENT strategy was not aimed at any particular target or faith group but was seen as part of the University's 	

	<p>responsibilities in relation to its duty of care to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Board’s formal responsibility as Charity Trustees to be vigilant of and for itself • Professor Richard Stephenson was the University’s Executive lead on this • the potential impact on the monitoring and reporting of electronic communications required careful consideration, in order to maintain the principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech which underpinned the academy • the University was liaising with Plymouth City Council in the context of multi-agency meetings on the PREVENT agenda in the City • a more detailed presentation at a future meeting would be valuable. 	US
15/09/8	<p>Competition and Markets Authority guidance and the University’s response (Enclosure M) <i>Matthew Jackson, University Solicitor, attended for timed business</i></p> <p>Noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more detailed briefing on the involvement of the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), including guidelines issued in Spring 2015 • the implications of the new Consumer Rights Act • the requirement for a fair contract meant that universities could not require the assignment of IP rights; could not implement academic sanctions for non-academic debts; and must ensure that applicants received all the information necessary to make informed choices, with the terms of the student contract clear and transparent from the outset • detailed work, led by the University Solicitor, had brought together all those documents/statements which constituted part of the offer; provided a checklist for programme staff to ensure compliance and advice on the adoption of best practice; and assessed the legal., regulatory, reputational and financial risks involved • the key issue had been the flexibility to change programmes, where the views of the CMA and of the sector had been divergent. The University accepted that it did not have an unfettered right to change key aspects of a programme but was also aware that there were circumstances where change was unavoidable – and in some cases in the best interests of students • the University was following closely the approach taken by other institutions, including those who had published formal contract terms for some time, but regrettably there was no sector-wide approach and neither UUK nor the mission groups were taking this on board • CMA had reserved the right to undertake audits of HEIs, and would give notice of a proposed visit, although provided the University was both aware of and responding seriously to its new responsibilities, it should not be at risk. The Which magazine had just published a report reviewing the information provided across the sector in respect of Psychology programmes: the University had been faulted on two issues, a failure to publish fees (now addressed), and an alleged failure to publish staff qualifications, although these were available through the website • the new regulations required both an initial review of published information and ongoing monitoring of publications and of the website; a review of relevant institutional procedures; a means of monitoring delivery against published information; a review of processes for making changes to 	

	<p>programmes; and training and briefings for academic and professional services staff, overseas agents and all those whose statements might be implied terms of the contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implications in relation to relationships with partner colleges was an area which required further work • the Board of Governors was being briefed given governors' role as Charity Trustees: it was for the Board to determine what further information it might need to provide the levels of assurance it sought in this respect. 	
15/09/9	<u>Committee minutes</u>	
9.1	Minutes of the Finance Committee held on 29 September 2015 (Enclosure N) Noted.	
9.2	Minutes of the Governance and Nominations Committee held on 29 September 2015 (Enclosure O) Noted.	
15/09/10	<u>Date of next meeting</u> Tuesday 24 November 2015 at 1430	

Appendix: 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
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
Matthew Dark	University of Plymouth Students' Union UPSU Trustee Board	Vice-President and trustee
Barbara Fuller	None	
Rong Huang	Association for Tourism in Higher Education Tianjin University of Commerce Quality Assurance Agency Enterprises	Executive member Guest Professor Associate
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
Stephen Tillman	Altitude(Ascot) Limited Altitude Real Estate LLP– name change to ARE (Properties) LLP Altitude Property Developments Limited Altitude (Arcott) Limited Argent Projects Nos 2 Partnerships Argent Projects No.3 Partnerships Miller Argent Holding Limited: Miller Argent (South Wales) Limited Miller Argent (Ffos-y-fran) Limited; Miller Argent (Nominee No 1 Limited) Ffos-y-fran (Commoners) Limited SGR (Bicester 2) Limited SGR (Farringdon) Limited Altitude Real Estate Limited ST 2015 Holdings Limited	Director Partner Director Director & shareholder Partner Partner Director Director Director Director Director Director Director Director Director Director

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