Minutes of the meeting of 3 December 2018

18.31 Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 19 November 2018 and Action Log

.1 The minutes of the meeting of Monday 19 November of 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

.2 UEB members were requested to review the deadlines of any actions and advise the Secretary of any changes.

18.32 Chair’s Business

.1 The Vice-Chancellor had circulated an update to UEB members prior to the meeting.

.2 Campus Solutions passed had passed its final gateway and implementation of the system would begin over the next few weeks. Thanks were given to the PVC ESE and CDO for their continued work. The lessons learnt report on the project would be updated by KPMG and presented to the Senior Leaders’ Forum prior to its wider publication which would also include an executive summary and contextual support. Council and Senate would be informed of the planned communications.

.3 UEB considered the nature of its accountability and its relationships with Senate, Council and the Vice-Chancellor. It also considered the perception of its activity and decision making by the wider University community. It was acknowledged that there are various governance and accountability models to suit the complexities and context of different organisations. UEB AGREED that further consideration should be given to some of the questions raised during the discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4 To include a session on accountability at a future meeting.</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor/Secretary</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18.33 Organisational Effectiveness Review Implementation

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/32 presented by the Registrar.

.2 UEB NOTED:

.2.1 Good progress on the implementation of many of the Review’s recommendations and less progress on others as a result of the delay in full implementation of Campus Solutions. The feedback on progress which had been sought through a number of quality assurance activities.

.2.2 The significant work undertaken by the Directors of Student Services to achieve a more collaborative relationship between Student Services and Faculties and Schools.

.3 UEB AGREED:

.3.1 There should be an updated communications exercise to apprise staff of the progress of implementation of the Review’s recommendations.

.3.2 The Implementation Group should continue whilst a small UEB sub-group considered the mechanism that should replace it and oversee user, implementation and development activity following implementation of Campus Solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4 To implement an updated communications exercise to update staff on the implementation of the Review’s recommendations</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 The DVC, Registrar and CDO to consider the mechanism that should replace the Implementation Group.</td>
<td>DVC, Registrar, CDO</td>
<td>To start January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.34 DORA Proposal

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/34 presented by the PVC RKE, the Senior Research Librarian and the Research Strategy Manager.

.2 UEB NOTED:

.2.1 Research Committee had considered a proposal that the University signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), a code of best practice around the use of publication metrics, backed by UKRI and REF 2021, to which institutions could subscribe.

.2.2 Research Committee had considered that it was unable to approve the adoption of DORA as to do so would have implications outside the committee’s remit. Therefore, Research Committee made a RECOMMENDATION that UEB consider the adoption of DORA with a focus on its wider impact.

.2.3 UNNC was considering the adoption of DORA, but there were tensions between DORA and MYRA which would provide challenge for UNM in terms of adoption.

.2.4 Adoption of DORA did not preclude the use of research publication metrics but promoted the responsible and appropriate use of research publication metrics.

.2.5 Whilst overall the University’s use of research publication metrics was broadly in line with DORA’s recommendations, there was work to do in communicating the University’s approach effectively to staff and to support areas of the University where the use of research publication metrics had been more extensive.
.3 UEB APPROVED the adoption of DORA from 1 January 2019.

.4 UEB AGREED that:

.4.1 A working group on research publication metrics should be convened to consider the steps required to embed DORA’s recommendations and to develop an appropriate communication plan and guidance for staff on the responsible use of research publication metrics.

.4.2 The working group should be chaired by an academic and amongst its academic representation should include members of Senate and early career researchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5 To sign the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment.</td>
<td>PVC RKE</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6 To convene a working group to consider how to implement and embed the DORA’s recommendations.</td>
<td>PVC RKE</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.35 Professional Services Coherence

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/39 presented by the CFO and Registrar.

.2 UEB NOTED:

.2.1 the steps being taken across the University to improve the coherence of Professional Services including the creation of two governance groups; the Professional Services Steering Group and the Professional Services Executive Group and planned changes to and reviews of teams and activities.

.2.2 The Faculty Directors of Operations role would be key and role holders would sit on the Professional Services Steering Group.

.3 UEB RECOMMENDED that consideration should be given to including an explicit commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion in the terms of reference of the new groups.

.4 UEB NOTED:

.4.1 The purpose, objectives and scope of the planned review of Human Resources, in particular that HR system issues were out of scope as they are being considered as part of the HR and Finance strand of Digital Futures Programme. The review would be managed externally.

.4.2 Communications regarding the review would be managed carefully to ensure that any potential anxiety amongst staff was minimised.

.5 UEB RECOMMENDED that whilst HR policy and procedures themselves were excluded from the scope of the review, the review should capture instances of inefficiency which might be related to them.

18.36 Governance and Compliance Committee Proposal.

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/37 presented by the Registrar.

.2 UEB NOTED:
.2.1 There was an ongoing process to create a Governance and Compliance Division headed by a Director of Governance and Compliance which was in consultation with relevant members of staff.

.2.2 Compliance requirements were increasing in volume and breadth and to provide assurance to UEB and Council that all requirements were being attended to appropriately, it was proposed that an operational sub-committee of UEB was established.

.2.3 There was a greater breadth of activities to be included within the remit of the proposed committee than the Terms of Reference currently indicated.

.2.4 Additional areas of compliance including some that applied to UNNC and UNM should be included within the remit of the proposed committee.

.3 UEB AGREED:

.3.1 The purpose of the committee should be amended to remove the reference to the Registrar’s Department specifically and paragraph 5 should be removed as the activity was managed elsewhere.

.3.2 A scoping document should be prepared to identify a full spectrum of responsibility for the proposed committee and circulated along with revised terms of reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>To revise the Terms of Reference and circulate with a scoping document setting out as full as list as possible of the activities to be overseen by the committee.</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.37 Establishing the Nottingham Sichuan Innovation Centre Ltd in China

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/35 presented by the PVC GE.

.2 UEB NOTED:

.2.1 The proposal to establish a wholly owned subsidiary company in Chengdu, south west China, for the purpose of accessing locally available research grants, collaborative research, delivering CPD programmes and services for third parties. The forecasted financial returns and that the company would be owned by UNUK.

.2.2 Concerns raised about well-publicised and long running labour practice issues in Chengdu and the impact they might have on the project and the University.

.2.3 Considered the proposed constitution of the board of the subsidiary company and queried whether it had the capacity to oversee and manage a subsidiary company at distance.

.3 UEB AGREED:

.3.1 Negotiations with the Sichuan government should continue with a view to addressing the key issues identified by the legal report on establishing and operating a legal entity in China, the associated reputational, legal, financial and operational risks and an exit strategy.

.3.2 A report detailing the developments and outcome of the negotiations and a proposal for the next course of action should be presented to UEB for consideration at its meeting in March.
.3.3 Further consideration should be given to the constitution of the board of the subsidiary company.

.3.4 An Equality Impact Assessment should be conducted with regard to the proposed activities and management of the subsidiary company.

.3.5 Due diligence should be conducted regarding current labour practices in Chengdu and any potential reputational impact on the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4 To enter into continued negotiations with the Sichuan government</td>
<td>PVC GE</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 To present a report to the March UEB meeting detailing the development of negotiations and to:</td>
<td>PVC GE</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5.1 include the result of an Equality Impact Assessment on the proposed activities and management of the subsidiary company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5.2 report on due diligence regarding current labour practices in Chengdu and any potential reputational impact on the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5.3 address the key reputational, legal, financial and operational risk of the proposed project including an exit strategy and reconsideration of the constitution of the board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5.4 propose a course of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.38 Information Security Update

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/36 presented by the Chief Information Security Officer.

.2 UEB NOTED:

.2.1 Progress had been made in respect of phase one of the security programme during 2018, in particular the progress in respect of the IT security remediation work. Phase two would focus on embedding the security policies and further IT security remediation work. Funding for the remediation had been approved by the Digital Futures Programme Board.

.2.2 An independent review of the current security approach had been carried out, following a request from the Audit and Risk Committee, which confirmed the current approach and endorsed both the actions taken so far and the phase two strategy.

.2.3 Work continued to support units across the University to implement the Secure Data Handling Standards which covered both personal and commercial data but progress had been variable.

.2.4 The Chief Information Security Officer’s asked FVPCs and Directors of Professional Services to request regular updates to their respective Faculty or Professional Services Board from their Information Security Working Group member.

.2.5 Two thirds of staff had now completed the online information security module. Reminders would be sent out and department heads would be provided with a list of staff who still had to complete the module.

.2.6 The newly appointed Head of Information Compliance would conduct a review of the University’s GDPR position and prepare a plan to build on the progress made to date which would be presented to UEB in February.
18.39 First Impressions of UEB Committees

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/40.

.2 UEB NOTED:

.2.1 In most committees, the contribution from nominated members had been strong and members were engaged with the committee’s activities. A number of Chairs had met with the nominated members of their committees individually and it was felt that this had contributed to nominated members feeling comfortable to engage and contribute at meetings. In one or two of the Committees that were pre-existing, there was a perception that nominated members found it more challenging to contribute. It was suggested that Chairs of those committees met with the nominated members in order to encourage and develop their engagement.

.2.2 Attendance by student representatives had not been high. This would continue to be monitored and steps taken to understand cause.

.2.3 It was important to remind committee members that they attended meetings as a member of the Committee and not as a representative of their School, Faculty or Professional Service Department and of their responsibilities of confidentiality for sensitive items. Information would be more readily shared by committees moving forwards but it was the responsibility of the committee to manage that process rather than individual members.

.2.4 The importance of appropriate behaviour by UEB members as an example to others during committee meetings was stressed.

.2.5 There was further work underway to identify and develop the reporting model for committees with a joint reporting line to Senate and UEB.

.3 UEB AGREED:

.3.1 UEB members had an open invitation to attend any UEB sub-committee meetings as an observer and subject to the Chair’s approval should be permitted to attend meetings of the committees of Council as an observer.

.3.2 The format of the paper for reporting sub-committee activity to UEB.

18.40 Circulated Items

UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/18/38 from the Secretary. UEB NOTED the outcomes of the circulated papers and comments received.
18.41 Roundtable

The following items were reported by UEB members:

.1 The CEO of Boustead would be standing down at the end of the year. It was not yet clear whether he would be replaced on the UNM Board.

.2 The FPVC Engineering would be leading the work on the 30% contingency plan and challenged UEB to suggest ways of reducing its budget.

.3 An external advisory board was being convened in the Faculty of Arts with one of its focuses being on employability.

.4 Work continued with the transitional senior leadership team in Nottingham University Business School. The School would go to market for a new Dean and consideration would be given to other senior posts.

.5 The Defence and National Rehabilitation Centre was in the final stage of construction at Stanford Hall and the government had challenged local universities to develop educational and research provision at the site.

.6 Incident management teams convened to manage issues relating to Crops for the Future and activities at UNNC would be merged and provide a horizon scanning function for and more coordinated support to the Provosts at UNCC and UNM.

.7 It was International Day of Persons with Disabilities which would be marked with the Trent Building being lit purple. A review would be commissioned to focus on support for staff with disabilities as current support appeared to be disjointed and hard to navigate. A Task and Finish Group would also be set up to review staff networks.

.8 There would be soft launch of the new private medical insurance scheme available to staff.

.9 UCU had decided to re-ballot on the pay settlement. The ballot would be open between 14 January and 22 February.

.10 The 21st Century University strategy events had taken place, one per faculty, two for professional services and one at each of UNNC and UNM. 377 people had attended and provided over 3500 comments for consideration in the preparation of the report which would be produced in the form of a Green Paper early in the New Year.

.11 Implementation of RIS was ongoing but had been challenging and slower than expected as a result of poor data quality. The process was being managed carefully and staff asked to follow the process step by step to ensure the data was in place by the spring.