22.79 Welcome, Apologies, Quoracy and Declarations of Interest

.1 The Chair welcomed Professor Olympia Bekou, Head of the School of Law, and Professor Paul Wilson, Head of the School of Biosciences, to the meeting as observers.

.2 The Secretary confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

.3 There were no declarations of interest.

22.80 Minutes of the 6 June 2022 Meeting and Action Log

.1 The minutes of the meetings held on 6 June 2022 were confirmed as a true record.

.2 The Action Tracker was NOTED.

22.81 Chair’s Business

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

.2 UEB were advised that following the announcement of the University’s award of £29.1 million by UKRI to establish the UK’s most powerful MRI scanner as a national facility, the University would assist the EPSRC in the development of the full business case for the facility. Work was underway to consider further research funding bids which would align with the facility.

.3 The PVC RKE provided an overview of the detail of the Government’s ‘Plan B’ alternative to Horizon Europe. It was AGREED that the University would need a plan for its approach to
managing ‘Plan B’ in advance of a final decision being made about Horizon association. Initial discussions would take place outside the meeting.

.4 UEB also discussed local and national pay negotiations, a recent letter from the Minister of Higher and Further Education setting out her views on Advance HE charter marks and UUK’s statement on returning to pre-pandemic award levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>To initiate the development of a University plan to manage and respond to the ‘Plan B’ alternative to Horizon Europe.</td>
<td>PVC RKE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.82 Scholarships, Bursaries and Fees – Re-setting our Approach

.1 UEB RECEIVED a paper (UEB/22/93) from the PVC ESE which summarised the high-level findings from a review of the effectiveness of the University’s approach to making financial awards to students. The paper set out the benefits of re-setting the University’s approach and proposed next steps.

.2 Benchmarking revealed that the University was at the higher end of the level of financial awards by universities. It was NOTED that the review had concluded that there was limited evidence of the effectiveness of many of the awards made by the University and of any return on investment.

.3 It was proposed to deliver a project over the next year to design a target operating model for financial awards with clarity of ownership and governance and which sets out a clear strategic intent. This would provide transparency on spend, deliver evidence of return on investment and would support the delivery of targets on size and shape. It would align with the work undertaken by the APVC Researcher Academy on PGR size and shape to support the research strategy.

.4 There was strong support for the proposed project and a consensus that given the University’s significant spend on financial awards, it was imperative that the awards made contributed to the delivery of University strategy. It was reiterated that the project was not about centralisation of decisions on financial awards, but ensuring that there was a cohesive strategic approach to decision-making.

.4 UEB NOTED that there was likely to be some nervousness about the project in parts of the University as it proposed a significant change in approach. Communications would require careful management to ensure that rationale and proposed benefit of the project were clearly articulated.

.5 UEB AGREED the proposed approach for a ‘re-set’ of the University’s scholarships, fees and bursaries strategy with a view to implementation of the new operating model in September 2023. It was NOTED that additional support from consultants would be required to deliver the project, but that this would be funded from existing budgets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>To ensure that regular updates on the progress of the project are scheduled on the Professional Services Committee’s forward plan</td>
<td>CMCO/Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>To ensure that all relevant stakeholders are engaged with as part of the project.</td>
<td>CMCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>To submit final version of the target operating model to UEB for approval</td>
<td>CMCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political and Public Affairs Priorities 2022/23

.1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/22/96) presented by the Director of Communications and Advocacy.

.2 The proposed core priority activities for political advocacy and policy influence for 2022/23 had been developed following discussion at the last UEB Away Day and aligned to four key areas of focus. It was confirmed that the core priority activities were future proofed in the event of a change in government.

.3 A number of suggestions to amplify the priority activities were made:

  .1 Work should continue to develop individual visits to campus for key government officials and local MPs, and to ensure that the University participated in major ministerial tours.

  .2 Opportunities for alternative routes of influence should be explored.

  .3 There should be no delay in activity related to UNM.

  .4 Plans should be developed to build better relationships with alumni in Asia.

  .5 There should be clarity in the delivery plan between groundwork activity with government departments and the development of clear and strong relationships with individuals within government.

.4 Subject to the comments for further development of the approach, UEB AGREED the University’s core priorities for political advocacy and policy influence for 2022/23, notably the key areas of focus and the proposed priorities and activities as set out in the paper.

.5 UEB NOTED that the next steps were to design a delivery plan to implement the activities and an appropriate reporting mechanism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6 To deliver a report on progress to UEB</td>
<td>CMCO/Director of Communications and Advocacy</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institute for Policy and Engagement Forward Strategy

.1 The FPVC Arts and PVC GE declared their membership of the Institute’s Advisory Board

.2 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/22/97) from the Chief Marketing and Communications Officer. The outputs of a review of the Institute for Policy and Engagement (the ‘Institute’) against its objectives had been previously presented to UEB by the Director of the Institute. The paper reflected the feedback received during that discussion and set out an ambitious step-change in the approach of the Institute with tight alignment to University strategy and delivery on KPIs and particular focus on the Research and Knowledge Exchange Strategic Delivery Plans.

.3 The activity of the Institute would focus on three areas:

  .1 Helping secure the University’s research funding and reputational priorities.

  .2 Creating the next cadre of impact and engagement leaders.
Using Castle Meadow as the catalyst for a new approach to public and civic engagement.

The CMCO cited the successful work of the Institute to date, but acknowledged that the Institute would have greater impact if there were closer integration with the activities of External Relations.

The Provost of UNNC queried the statement within the paper that the Institute would be UK focussed. It was confirmed that where the strategic focus had a connection to UNNC or UNM, then the Institute would work with the overseas campus, but that it would not be able to provide a universal service across the University. It had not been possible to develop a full understanding of the different political and operational contexts and build the networks necessary for meaningful impact and engagement from the UK.

There were some questions around how the Institute would best support researchers focussed on international work given the limitations on its capacity, as there was a lack of emphasis on that activity in the proposed forward strategy.

There were reservations about the proposal to develop a separate project team to deliver the Castle Meadow/Digital Nottingham element of the forward strategy. It was suggested that further thought should be given to the plans.

The Director of the Institute was asked to leave the room whilst UEB considered the Institute’s proposed forward strategy further.

UEB identified a number of areas which were not covered sufficiently within the paper:

- a detailed delivery plan including timetable for implementation;
- clear KPIs and measures of success;
- detail on how the Institute would be funded, although it was reported verbally that budget within the Research Strategy and HEIF allocation had been identified to fund activity; and
- a methodology for determining the income generated by the Institute.

UEB AGREED the proposed forward strategy for the Institute.

UEB clarified that the forward strategy should remained aligned with University Strategy and the work being led by the Director of Communications and Advocacy on the University’s political and public affairs priorities.

UEB further AGREED that:

- A detailed delivery plan including KPIs should be submitted to UEB [for information] following consideration by the Institute’s Advisory Board.
- An annual progress report on the activity of the Institute against its KPIs should be delivered to UEB.
- Further consideration should be paid to the relationship between the Institute and UNCC and UNM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To submit a delivery plan including KPIs to UEB for information following approval by Research Committee.</td>
<td>CMCO, Director of the Institute of Policy and Engagement</td>
<td>November 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22.85 Partnering to Establish the East Midlands Maths School

1. UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/22/98) from the PVC ESE which recommended that the submitted a formal proposal to the Department for Education to establish the University of Nottingham Maths School in partnership with the East Midlands Education Trust.

2. It was NOTED that feedback provided on previous iterations of the business case had been incorporated, including more detail on risks and benefits, exit strategy and leavers' destinations. Indicative revenue costs and workload estimates for support activities had been calculated and would be considered further during the next stage of the project.

3. The PVC ESE reported that the relevant Schools had confirmed that the project would not create additional workload and therefore no additional resource requests were expected, but where appropriate, realignment of existing activity would take place. External Relations would provide support as the project would feature as an important part of its APP activities.

4. Whilst acknowledging that the project was not focused on recruitment to the University, but rather the raising of attainment in the East Midlands, some UEB members were keen to see more assertive targets for recruitment.

5. UEB AGREED that a formal proposal should be submitted to the Department for Education to establish the University of Nottingham Maths School in partnership with the East Midlands Education Trust. UEB further AGREED that the associate targets for recruitment should be more ambitious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To provide regular progress updates to UEB</td>
<td>PVC ESE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.86 Agile Working Project Update

1. UEB RECEIVED and NOTED an update paper (UEB/22/94) from the Registrar which was presented by Dr Nalayini Thambar.

2. UEB NOTED that work to refine and evolve professional services hubs was ongoing following their rapid establishment. The hubs needed to reflect how staff worked and provide the different types of space required.

3. The complexity and long-term nature of the establishing agile working was acknowledged.

22.87 Access and Participation Plan

1. UEB RECEIVED a bi-annual report from the PVC ESE on the University’s progress against its Access and Participation Plan (APP) (UEB/22/95).

2. UEB’s attention was directed to the information on the two targets that had been missed when the 20/21 data was confirmed and the plans for the year ahead to address those targets.

3. UEB was concerned that the University’s contextual admissions policy was not being followed by all Schools. It was UEB’s view that the policy should be followed by all Schools. If a
School considered it had reason not to follow the policy, it should request permission from the Planning and Resources Committee to deviate.

.4 UEB NOTED that the APP required variation. A summary and addendum would be submitted to the Office for Students for review in July 2022. A draft version would be circulated to UEB for approval before submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5 To consider inviting the Office for Students Director of APP to contribute to a UEB Away Day in the coming year.</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor, Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6 To circulate the draft summary and addendum to the APP to UEB for approval</td>
<td>PVC ESE</td>
<td>July 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.88 Roundtable Discussion

UEB was provided with updates and details of developments in members’ portfolios as appropriate:

.1 Detailed discussions and communication with the senior leadership team at Nottingham University Business School continued.

.2 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that all the moderation meetings held as part of the introduction of the professorial pay banding scheme had been completed. FPVCs had already spoken with any staff who had been recommended to move to a lower band. Any appeals related to the application of the criteria would be heard before the Deputy Vice-Chancellor’s tenure ended. Staff who moved to a lower pay band would have their current pay protected for four years which should allow sufficient time for them to meet the necessary criteria to move up the banding scheme. EDI data had been updated and shared with UCU following the completion of the moderation meetings. There had been increases in the representation of staff with protected characteristics in the top bands of the scheme. As it moved into normal operation, it would be known as the professorial progression scheme.

.3 The FPVC MHS had met with the incoming Chief Executive of Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust (NUH). It was expected that the relationship between NUH and the University would develop significantly over the coming months.

.4 An overview of the Nursing and Midwifery Council review at NUH was provided. Potential implications for the University and its students were considered.

.5 The University’s application for a Turing award had been successful. The level of the award was still to be determined.

.7 NSS results were due the next day. Following publication and subsequent analysis, a paper would be submitted to UEB in the autumn proposing a change in the University’s approach to NSS.

.8 A paper would be brought to the next meeting by the FPVC Science on the outputs of an external review of student experience at Sutton Bonington.

.9 The PVC EDI reported on the ongoing debate connected to Advance HE’s charter marks.

.10 The Vice-Chancellor reminded members that the meeting had been the last UEB meeting for Professor Long in his role as the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Professor Long was warmly thanked for his many years of contribution to the University of Nottingham and best wishes were passed on for his new role.
It was reported that Professor Dame Jessica Corner had been appointed as the executive chair of Research England, subject to a pre-appointment hearing by the House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee. The news would be announced publicly the next day.