Welcome, Apologies, Quoracy and Declarations of Interest

1. The Chair welcomed Professor Van Tam (FPVC MHS) to his first meeting, and also Professor Paul Hegarty (at the request of Jeremy Gregory) and Kenon Man (Deputy Director of Marketing) both as observers.

2. The Senior Governance Manager confirmed the meeting was quorate.

Minutes of the 4 April 2022 Meeting and Action Log

1. The minutes of the meeting held on 4 April 2022 were confirmed as a true record.

2. The Action Tracker and the following updates on overdue actions were NOTED:

   1. Minute 22.12.7 Castle Meadow Update – A further meeting was planned for 4 May to progress this action along with a civic dinner on 13 May.

Chair’s Business

1. The Vice-Chancellor had circulated a report to UEB prior to the meeting.

2. UEB DISCUSSED the potential to take a stage-gated approach to the Nottingham University Business School quality business case. The potential for growth in the School was recognised; however, further consideration would need to be given to areas such as culture and EDI matters, research and student experience quality improvement, tri-campus focus, and to the pace at which activities could be progressed.

3. A focus on people was DISCUSSED and the prioritisation of related activities such as training, staff engagement, and support and return to campus. The Graduate Teaching
Assistant pilot was DISCUSSED and the positive impact this scheme had on postgraduate research students feeling valued by the University.

22.52 REF Results Briefing

.1 UEB RECEIVED a verbal update on the REF results from the PVC RKE.

.2 UEB NOTED the following:

.1 The initial results would be sent to institutions on 9 May and would be circulated to senior colleagues. These results would be under embargo until 12 May;

.2 Communications plans were being developed and this would include a longer external campaign. It was suggested that the external campaign could have a broader focus than REF 2021, with a particular focus on research impact;

.3 An internal REF review process would commence, and Faculties and Schools would be asked to develop action plans. It was expected that this review would be completed, and a report submitted to Research Committee, by October 2022.

22.53 2022/23 Medium Term Financial Plan Update

.1 UEB RECEIVED a verbal update from the Chief Financial Officer on the Medium Term Financial Plan 2022/23.

.2 UEB NOTED the following:

.1 The updated MTFP had been discussed by both Planning and Resources Committee and Finance Committee;

.2 Assumptions for the increasing cost of inflation and also increases to budgets had been built into the updated MTFP without breaching banking covenants;

.3 The MTFP had included a cost saving target of £20m which equated to 2.5% of turnover. It was NOTED that most organisations had an annual cost saving target of three percent.

22.54 Hugh Stewart Hall Refurbishment

.1 UEB RECEIVED and DISCUSSED a paper (UEB/22/65) from the FPVC Social Sciences, Catering, Conferencing and Hospitality Director, and Capital Projects Manager. The paper provided a summary of completed and in progress activity for the Hugh Stewart Hall refurbishment.

.2 UEB NOTED the following:

.1 It was proposed that the project commence in February 2023 and completed in time for student intake in September 2024;

.2 The proposal sought to refurbish all bedrooms, complete outstanding compliance and backlog maintenance works, and provide an amenity and welcome point as the single point of contact for catering, residence experiences, and halls of residence;

.4 The full project had been costed at £34.56m across four years.

.3 UEB DISCUSSED the following:

.1 The demolition of the Hugh Stewart Hall 1960s block and replacement with a new build had been considered. However, the financial cost and the environmental impact of demolition and new build would be higher than refurbishment;
.2 Accessibility of the hall and how it would be improved through refurbishment to include better accessibility to the dining room and six accessible bedrooms;

.4 UEB suggested that future iterations should include commentary on the consideration of the demolition of the 1960s and a new build, and where student input had been sought as well as an overview of where the project was prioritised in terms of the overarching programme, Project Stay. UEB NOTED that the business case would be revised before being considered by the Planning and Resources Committee.

22.55 Improvements to the Student Record System and Associated Processes and Practices

.1 UEB RECEIVED and DISCUSSED a paper (UEB/22/58) from the Deputy Registrar and Product Director that summarised a business case for further investment of £13.5m over the following three years to enable the Education Administration Continuous Improvement Team (EACIT) to deliver improvement projects centred around Campus Solutions.

.2 The Chair confirmed that the purpose of the item was for discussion and comment, rather than approval.

.3 UEB DISCUSSED the following:

.1 The inclusion of a more detailed assessment of benefits of the projects would be welcomed in future iterations of the business case;

.2 Engagement with academic colleagues had taken place throughout the project to date and this approach had included staff and students who were based in multiple settings (such as those based in health care). It was NOTED that as the system was developed, there may be points where some areas were too complex for the system, and bespoke arrangements would need to be established;

.3 The business case had focused on the digital aspects of changes required; however, the simplification of processes was recognised as a key component in making this project work. Assurance was sought on how this activity would be progressed across all areas. It was NOTED that the business case had included lean practitioners who would assist with identifying lean ways of operating.

.4 UEB NOTED that the business case would be revised to include the following suggestions before being submitted to Planning and Resources Committee: a series of vignettes to illustrate improvements in staff and student experience; and a clear statement on how simplification and standardisation of processes would be progressed.

22.56 Institute for Policy and Engagement Review

.1 UEB RECEIVED a paper (UEB/22/60) from the from the Institute Board and Knowledge Exchange Committee presented by the Director of the Institute for Policy and Engagement which set out the outcome of the review of the Institute for Policy and Engagement from the Institute Board and Knowledge Exchange Committee.

.2 UEB NOTED the following proposal:

.1 That the Institute continue beyond 2022, with a stronger alignment to University priorities, alongside continuing to support all Faculties to develop the next round of policy and public engagement REF impact case studies;

.2 Core funding had already been included in the External Relations business plan therefore, the recommendation would not create an additional call on resources. Future levels of core funding would be agreed as part of the business planning process;

.3 The Institute would look to grow external funding from 25% to 33% of total budget alongside continued internal funding for core functions.
.3 UEB requested a strategy paper for the Institute with more ambitious KPIs, and underpinning elements which would help to achieve the KPIs and activities set out in the Strategic Delivery Plans. This paper should also include how the Institute would support the establishment of relations with policy makers, as well as a commitment to target as much external funding as possible, and an overarching timeline for all activities. This strategy paper would be submitted to a future meeting before the proposal would be considered further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4 A strategy paper for the Institute would be developed and submitted to a future meeting before the proposal would be considered further.</td>
<td>Director of the Institute for Policy and Engagement</td>
<td>July 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.57 Consultation on the Design of the UK’s Future Research Assessment Programme (FRAP)

.1 UEB RECEIVED and DISCUSSED a paper (UEB/22/59) from the FPVC RKE and APVC RKE which set out the University’s draft response for UEB approval.

.2 UEB provided the following feedback:

.1 The suggested change from an environment statement to environment metrics would lose the nuance current environment statements provided; however, such a change would reduce the workload involved in the preparation of such statements;

.2 It was suggested to remove the reference to income as an example of alternative measures that would replace research active staff full time equivalent (FTE).

.3 UEB APPROVED the University’s response to the consultation on the design of future Research assessment programme subject to the above comments.

22.58 Gender Pay Gap

.1 UEB RECEIVED a paper (UEB/22/67) from the PVC EDI and People which set out a proposed actions for improving the University’s gender pay gap.

.2 UEB DISCUSSED the following:

.1 Improvements as a result of Senior Pay banding changes would take some time to impact the pay gap;

.2 Cases for higher starting salaries or retention payments were already considered carefully; however these cases had to be balanced with the current recruitment environment and applicants and staff using such requests to negotiate higher salaries elsewhere;

.3 More work would need to be undertaken to ensure appropriate and attractive wording of adverts, as well as long- and short-listing activities.

.3 UEB NOTED that better understanding of recruitment issues in each area was needed and granular level data would support this understanding. Nuanced examples were discussed and these included attracting more male candidates into applying for lower level roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4 Standardised granular level data would be provided to Faculties and Professional Services.</td>
<td>Director of HR</td>
<td>July 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22.59 Response to the DfE Consultation on Higher Education Reform and Lifelong Loan Entitlement

.1 UEB RECEIVED a paper (UEB/22/70) from the PVC ESE which set out the proposed response to the Department for Education (DfE) Consultation on higher Education Reform and Lifelong Loan Entitlement.

.2 UEB DISCUSSED the following:

.1 Student number controls and minimum entry requirements were not considered a proportionate measure in the reduction of the small volume of lower quality provision. Whilst such a measure would not significantly impact the University, it would impact the broader widening participation agenda within the sector;

.2 It would be important to include emphasis of the need to use the existing higher education quality framework;

.3 Consideration would be given to the inclusion of a position statement at the start of the response however this would depend on the submission system and the structure of the form.

.3 UEB AGREED that the consultation be revised in light of the discussion and submitted to the DfE.

22.60 Access and Participation Plan Update

.1 UEB RECEIVED and DISCUSSED a paper (UEB/22/61) from the PVC ESE which provided an update on the Access and Participation Plan (APP) and expected changes to regulations.

.2 UEB DISCUSSED the following:

.1 The consequences of not achieving targets related to underrepresented groups in higher education were unknown. However, it was NOTED that all institutions were competing for the same students and it was understood that many institutions would not achieve their targets in this area;

.2 Surveys were sent to applicants to seek information on why some applicants declined offers from the University in order to identify critical points where applicants decided to either go to a different institution or not to go into higher education. However, it was unclear whether such data included socio economic backgrounds of applicants;

.3 A range of areas would support the delivery of APP targets and these included apprenticeships, and acceptance of T-level qualifications.

.3 UEB NOTED the update on the APP and expected changes to regulations.

22.61 Roundtable Discussion

.1 The Registrar REPORTED that Senate Elections were due to open in the next few weeks.

.2 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor REPORTED that it had been agreed that the Castle Meadow Campus would be developed in two phases with the first phase to redevelop a building as a landing point on the campus.

.3 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor REPORTED that the asymptomatic testing services would be closed from the end of June and this change would be communicated through Campus News. It was NOTED that the service could be restarted in the future if needed.

.4 The PVC EDI and People NOTED that Disability Recognition Month would take place locally in the University. This event was in addition to the national recognition month in November. A variety of activities would be publicised on Campus News.