



## University Executive Board

### Minutes of the meeting of 4 May 2021

---

<b>Present</b>	Professor Shearer West (Vice-Chancellor), Professor John Atherton (FPVC Medicine and Health Sciences), Professor Dame Jessica Corner (PVC RKE), Dr Paul Greatrix (Registrar), Professor Jeremy Gregory (FPVC Arts), David Hill (CDO), Jaspal Kaur (Director of Human Resources), Professor Sam Kingman (FPVC Engineering), Professor Todd Landman (FPVC Social Sciences), Professor Andrew Long (DVC), Professor Nick Miles (Provost UNNC), Professor Robert Mokaya (PVC GE), Margaret Monckton (CFO), Professor Sarah Sharples (PVC EDI and People), Sarah Speight (PVC ESE), Professor Zoe Wilson (FPVC Science)
----------------	--

<b>Attending</b>	Rowena Hall (Secretary), Professor Louise Crewe (APVC ESE), Professor Steve Howdle (Head of School), David Ouchterlonie (Associate Director Global Engagement, Strategy Support) for minute 21.62, Professor Lucy Donaldson (APVC Graduate School and Researcher Career Development) for minute 21.63, Pip Peakman (Director of Research and Innovation) for minute 21.63, Jason Carter (Director of Governance and Assurance) for minute 21.64 and 21.65, Mike Early (Senior Risk Adviser) for minute 21.65.
------------------	---

---

#### **21.58 Welcome, Apologies, Quoracy and Declarations of Interest**

- .1 The Chair welcomed Professor Louise Crewe, APVC ESE and Professor Steve Howdle, Head of the School of Chemistry to the meeting as observers.
- .2 The Secretary confirmed that the meeting was quorate.
- .3 There were no declarations of interest.

#### **21.59 Minutes of the March and April 2021 Meetings and Action Log**

- .1 The minutes of the meetings held on 8 March and 7 April 2021 were confirmed as a true record.
- .2 The Action Tracker was NOTED.

#### **21.60 Chair's Business**

- 1. The Vice-Chancellor had circulated a report to UEB prior to the meeting which reflected on ongoing debate in connection with fees and funding.
- .2 UEB considered the various different models and approaches to funding which included fee reductions, differential fees, the debate between STEM v SHAPE disciplines, student number caps and minimum entry requirements.
- .3 UUK members would have different preferences, therefore it was unlikely that a common approach would be identified on all aspects. The University would be keen to ensure that



funding for foundation degrees was not affected as they played an important role in widening participation.

- .4 Given the uncertainties, it was not feasible to include fee impact modelling within the current MTFP.
- .5 It was acknowledged that reduced funding would lead to larger class sizes, poorer student experience and impacts on infrastructure and research.

**21.61 FleishmanHillard Fishburn Strategic Workshop Output**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/21/58) from the Registrar.
- .2 An external consultancy had been engaged to deliver a workshop to support the consideration of the geopolitical issues that might affect the University’s reputation risk. UEB DISCUSSED the outputs from the workshop and the recommendations made.
- .3 UEB CONSIDERED the response to each of the recommendation and AGREED the proposed actions. It was also AGREED that an update on the delivery of the workshop should be provided to the Audit and Risk Committee.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.4	To update the Audit and Risk Committee on the delivery of the strategic reputation workshop	Registrar	14 September 2021

**21.63 Global Engagement Strategic Delivery Plan**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/21/59) from the PVC GE supported by the Associate Director Global Engagement, Strategy Support.
- .2 The GE SDP focused on delivering the University’s strategic goal of “Cultivating a Global Mindset” for staff and students. UEB NOTED the six priorities of the GE SDP and that it had been designed to broadly align to other SDPs.
- .3 Following approval of the GE SDP, the plan would be communicated across the University and activity would commence to develop a detailed project plan to ensure its delivery and to identify KPIs. The Global Engagement Strategy Support Unit would initiate projects in the Action Plan, but operational delivery would lie in many cases with Faculties, Schools and Professional Services Departments.
- .4 UEB DISCUSSED the GE SDP and provided feedback:
  - .1 Development of the Action Plan and its delivery should be carried out in collaboration with the leads of other SDPs, in particular the Research and the Education and Student Experience SDPs, to ensure that the plans were clearly aligned and not operating in silos.
  - .2 Operationalisation of the plan was key to its success; therefore, it would be important to ensure that staff across the University were able to feed into the selection of the projects. This would support buy-in to the SDP.
  - .2 The SDP contained a significant breadth of ambition which should be reflected on.
  - .2 Further prominence should be given to virtual global mobility. Our approach needs to be altered so that travel is not the immediate response to increase mobility and collaboration. Paragraph 4.4 of the International Mobility priority might be raised higher up the list.



- .3 Further work was required to finalise the Teaching Partnerships review to identify the most valuable partnerships and ensure that they were managed appropriately.
  - .4 Consideration should be given to whether the plan should include messaging on workload.
  - .5 An alternative name for the Nottingham Global Skills Academy should be identified.
- .5 Subject to changes arising from the feedback provided, the Global Engagement Strategic Delivery Plan was APPROVED.

#### **21.64 Research Strategy One Year Plan**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/21/60) from the PVC RKE, the APVC Graduate School and Researcher Career Development, and the Director of Research and Innovation. The paper set out the plan for a one-year refresh of the research strategy prior to the finalisation of a new research strategy.
- .2 The five key research priorities were presented. UEB NOTED an investment request associated with the paper had been included in an investment prioritisation update to Planning and Resources Committee and was under consideration.
- .3 There was general consensus that current research performance issues should be better communicated across the University. It was suggested that the next set of Town Hall meetings might be used to provide clearer context on performance and a realistic depiction of the future research funding environment and its impact.
- .4 It was further suggested that communications should be clear that not all research funding ceased as the University responded to the financial challenges caused by the pandemic; only centrally funded research funding was suspended.
- .5 UEB NOTED the reallocation of existing resources rather than the allocation of additional resources would be required to fund the research strategy. It was expected that activity which was not delivering results would need to cease.
- .6 UEB considered that the One Year Plan should clearly communicate how it would link to the new strategy and bridge the gap before it was finalised.
- .7 It was NOTED that there had been a differential impact on individuals as a result of the pandemic. Early career researchers were likely to have been particularly affected. Consideration should be given to how they might be better supported.
- .8 UEB AGREED the Research Strategy One Year Plan subject to the feedback given.

#### **21.65 Risk Management Review**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/21/61) from the Director of Governance and Assurance.
- .2 It was reported that a high-level review of the current University risk management position had been undertaken. The Audit and Risk Committee had indicated that the risk management approach at the University could be improved. In particular, current reporting did not provide sufficient clear or meaningful reassurance.



- .3 The Director of Governance and Assurance affirmed that risks were being managed at the University, however a proper framework needed to be embedded within core operations and decision-making processes.
- .4 UEB NOTED the recommendations contained in the paper which included amongst others: a focus on three categories of risk: strategic, operational and legal and statutory compliance, the requirement that each Professional Services Department, Faculty and Strategic Delivery Plan establish and maintain a risk register, establishment of a small team to oversee the risk process including introducing a more senior role, the overall responsibility for the risk management approach moved from PPSC to the Governance and Assurance Division, and the modification of the terms of reference of the Assurance Committee to provide it with a mandate to oversee the approach to risk management.
- .5 As part of the recommendations, the Director of Governance and Assurance considered it vital that accountability for implementing the risk management requirement was made explicit in the roles of senior individuals.
- .5 The Vice-Chancellor was keen that staff be supported to understand how important proper risk management was to decision-making,
- .6 UEB was keen that similar approaches were adopted across all three campuses and supported the proposals to consider the issues further at the next UEB Away Day and to deliver a session to Senior Leaders.
- .7 UEB AGREED the recommendations contained in the paper and supported the proposal to present the approach and implementation roadmap to the Audit and Risk Committee.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.8	To communicate the risk management process to Senior Leaders.	Registrar, Director of Governance and Assurance	30 June 2021
.9	To present the approach to risk management and the implementation roadmap to the Audit and Risk Committee.	Registrar, Director of Governance and Assurance	14 September 2021

**21.66 University Level Risk Register Review**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/21/65) from the Senior Risk Adviser supported by the Director of Governance and Assurance and NOTED the updates to the University Risk Register.
- .2 A workshop at the next UEB Away Day would focus on risk. The Vice-Chancellor asked that attention be paid to the format of the session to ensure that attendees were engaged and workable outputs were delivered. There would be limited value in significant aggregation of issues leading to the statement of the risk losing its value or extended periods of time spent crafting the detailed wording of the risks.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.3	To provide an outline of the risk workshop to the Vice-Chancellor for approval	Registrar, Director of Governance and Assurance	14 May 2021

**21.67 Roundtable Discussion**



- .1 The Chief Financial Officer reported that early indications as part of LRF3 suggested that it would be possible to give consideration to reinstating the Nottingham Reward Scheme.
- .2 It was reported that units in some areas of the University were making unrealistic demands for resource, yet others were working within the confines of the adjusted budgets. Additional support for communications with staff was requested. The Chief Financial Officer confirmed that as activity grew, resource was being built back into budgets.
- .3 The third round of USS roadshows was due to begin supported by the University's pension advisors.
- .4 A quality assurance review of UNNC was in progress and the annual teaching and learning conference had taken place the previous month. A joint workshop had been held between the APVCs for ESE and RKE which had facilitated structured conversation about teaching and research priorities.
- .5 The 2021 Athena Swan and EDI Survey would be open between 10 May and 4 June. It was planned to present the headline results from the survey at the next UEB Away Day. The results would feed into the Athena Swan action plan and be used to refresh the EDI SDP in 2022.
- .6 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the last of the 10 strategic delivery plans to support the University strategy would be published imminently. Webpages would be produced which would include the University's strategy and summarise the strategic priorities arising from the Strategic Delivery Plans.