



## University Executive Board

### Minutes of the meeting of 3 August 2020

**Attending** Professor Andrew Long (DVC and Chair), Professor John Atherton (FPVC Medicine and Health Sciences), Professor Dame Jessica Corner (PVC RKE), Dr Paul Greatrix (Registrar), Professor Jeremy Gregory (FPVC Arts), Professor Graham Kendall (Provost UNM), Professor Sam Kingman (FPVC Engineering), Professor Todd Landman (FVPC Social Sciences), Professor Nick Miles (Provost UNNC), Professor Robert Mokaya (PVC GE), Margaret Monckton (CFO), Professor Kevin Shakesheff (FPVC Science), Professor Sarah Sharples (PVC EDI), Sarah Speight (PVC ESE)

**Attending** Rowena Hall (Secretary), Deb Booter (Faculty Operations Director, Arts), Pip Peakman (Director of Research and Innovation) for minutes 20.98 and 20.99, Haf Merrifield (Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change) for minute 20.99 ,

**Apologies** Professor Shearer West (Vice-Chancellor), David Hill (CDO), Jaspal Kaur (Director of Human Resources)

#### 20.93 Welcome, Declarations of Interest and Quoracy

- .1 The Chair welcomed Deb Booter, Faculty Operations Director, Arts to the meeting as an observer.
- .2 The Secretary confirmed that the meeting was quorate.
- .3 There were no declarations of interest made by members save for any interests that academic members of UEB might have as principal investigators on research projects fitting the eligibility criteria for UKRI Grant Cost Extensions. The Secretary would confirm details with members.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
4	To confirm the details of research projects where UEB members act as principal investigators.	Secretary	15 September 2020

#### 20.94 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 7 July 2020 and Action Tracker

- .1 The minutes of the meeting held on 1 June 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.
- .2 The following updates on actions were provided:
  - 20.5.8: Activity on the Student Accommodation Strategy had been delayed. It was AGREED that the due date for the action should be postponed until January 2021.
  - 20.37.6: As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the course of action of the project had altered. An update would be provided in September.



20.38.06: The action had been completed. The PVC RKE requested a slot on a forthcoming agenda to discussion the research environment statement.

20.69.5: The FPVC Arts would progress the action. It was AGREED that in the first instance, issues would be discussed as a DVC/FPVC meeting in September.

20.77.11 The action was complete.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.3	To schedule a discussion on the research environment statement at a forthcoming UEB meeting.	Secretary	31 August 2020
.4	To schedule a discussion focussed on devising principles for the development and allocation of PGR teaching opportunities at a DVC/FPVC meeting in September.	DVC/Secretary	31 August 2020

**20.95 Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**Research Strategy Review**

.1 The PVC RKE confirmed that the research strategy review had been discussed with the DVC and it was considered that it was not the right time for the review to be conducted. There would be a pause and it would be returned to when possible.

**20.96 Chair’s Business**

.1 The Chair reported that the COVID19 Recovery Board and Start of Session Programme Board had considered how 1m+ social distancing might be interpreted and implemented at the University and had agreed that the teaching timetabling should be prepared on that basis.

.2 Plans for a more general return to work were being developed and would link to the agile working policy also being developed. A message would need to be provided to staff before either of the plans were finalised in order to set out expectations.

**20.97 Promotions and Regrading 2020/21**

.1 UEB RECEIVED and NOTED paper (UEB/20/104) received from the PVC EDI and People which, following an earlier discussion at UEB, proposed the postponement of promotion cycle by five months.

.2 The Provosts of UNNC and UNM were invited to consider similar issues as set out in the paper when considering the timing of the promotion cycle and evaluating cases at UNNC and UNM.

.3 The criteria for promotion would not be altered but the process would allow the specific impacts of COVID-19 on a candidate to be highlighted. Candidates would also be encouraged to show where they had demonstrated leadership in the University’s response to the pandemic. The PVC EDI and People reiterated that there were EDI issues connected to the postponement, but there were more EDI issues connected with maintaining the current schedule.

.4 It was queried why there was a different date for the restart of the regarding process. The PVC EDI and People would liaise with the Director of Human Resources to ascertain whether the start date could align with the start of the promotion cycle.



- .5 The Chair recommended that communications on the revisions to the SET and SEM evaluation mechanisms remain separate to communications on the promotions cycle which would be delivered via the Promotions Committee.
- .6 Subject to the outstanding point in connection with the date of the restart of the regrading process, UEB AGREED the proposals set out in the paper to postpone the start of the promotion cycle.
- .7 It was further AGREED that the DVC and PVC EDI and People would develop draft communications for staff to advise them of the changes to the timetable, and that proposed changes to the promotions process would be submitted to Promotions Committee for sign off before the start of the cycle.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.8	To ascertain whether the date for the restart of the regrading process could be aligned with the start for of the promotion cycle.	PVC EDI and People, Director of Human Resources	31 August
.9	To issue communications for staff advising of the changes to the promotions and regrading cycle.	DVC, PVC EDI and People	31 August
.10	To submit proposed changes to the promotions process to the Promotions Committee for approval	PVC EDI	30 November

**20.98 UKRI Grant Cost Extensions**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED and NOTED paper UEB/20/105 from the PVC RKE and presented by the Director of Research and Innovation.
- .2 It was reported that the UK Research and Innovation had announced it would deploy £180 million of funding for organisations to sustain UKRI grant-funded research and fellowships affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. The University of Nottingham had received a £4.6m allocation with an option to repurpose a further £1.6m on existing grants. The allocation would be awarded and managed as a research grant, awarded centrally with PVC RKE as PI.
- .3 The University was required to submit a governance plan outlining the principles and approach for allocating funds to projects affected by COVID-19 to UKRI. UEB NOTED the proposed principles and approach as set out in the paper. A number of concerns were raised.
- .4 Some UEB members expressed concern that the process appeared overly bureaucratic. The PVC RKE confirmed that whilst the University had been given permission to make allocations as it saw fit within the parameters prescribed by UKRI, the process and allocation would be audited by UKRI, therefore a certain level of formality and process was unavoidable.
- .5 The size of the governance group was challenged. The PVC RKE reassured UEB members that whilst the group was large, it would be agile as many members met regularly as part of other meetings and it would be more efficient to include all APVCs for Research to achieve a discipline mix within the group rather than liaise with them separately outside the meeting.
- .6 UEB NOTED it was planned to write to eligible grant holders to inform them of the process and approach for the allocation of UKRI funds. UEB stressed the importance of ensuring that the communications were carefully drafted in order to manage expectations as it was likely that only a relatively small number of the 231 eligible grants would receive an allocation. PIs should be clear that repurposing of available funds should be the first step and that allocations



were only available where the completion of research objectives was not possible without additional funding.

- .7 UEB AGREED the principles for allocation of the UKRI Grant Extension Allocation fund, but made the following comments and recommendations:
  - .1 The process should be considered further to ensure that was not unnecessarily bureaucratic.
  - .2 Communications should be drafted with the upmost care to ensure that expectations of an allocation were managed.
  - .3 FPVCs should be used as a test group for feedback on draft communications for staff.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.8	To ensure that all communications to staff are reviewed by the communications team, DVC and FPVCs before publication to staff	PVC RKE	15 September

**20.99 Operating Model for Postgraduate Research Students**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED and NOTED paper UEB/20/102 from the PVC RKE which was presented by the Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change. This proposed formation of a working group to develop a proposal for the future operating model for the oversight and management of postgraduate research students.
- .2 The ongoing Getting in Shape project on the PGR Student Experience was noted. Formation of the proposed working group would be put on hold pending the outcome of this project.

**20.100 Any Other Business**

- .1 The Registrar referenced communications that had been sent to staff relating to car parking permits. The matter would be considered further at the COVID19 Recovery Board and Start of Session Programme Board.
- .2 The USS consultation response had been submitted. A copy would be circulated to members for information.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.3	To circulate a copy of the USS consultation response	CFO, Secretary	17 August