19.73 Welcome Declarations of Interest and Quoracy

.1 The Chair welcomed the Director of Careers and Employability, Dr Nalayini Thambar and Claire Lawrence, Associate Professor, Psychology to the meeting as observers.

.2 Members were asked to declare any interests they had relating to the items on the agenda. No declarations of interest were made.

.3 The Secretary confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

19.74 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 7 May 2019 and Action Log

.1 The minutes of the meeting of 7 May 2019 were agreed as an accurate record. The FPVC Arts confirmed that the launch date of the photographic portrait exhibition had been rescheduled to 9 July.

.2 Updates were provided to the Action Log and NOTED by UEB.

.3 UEB considered the programme of visiting Schools and Professional Services Departments undertaken by the Vice-Chancellor in autumn 2017 and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in 2018-19 academic year. UEB AGREED that a similar styled programme should be undertaken by a small groups of UEB each year.
Develop a programme of annual visits for small UEB groups to Schools and Departments of Professional Services.

Secretary, Executive Support

September

19.75 Chair’s Business

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

.2 UEB NOTED that the Augar Review Report had been published and that its fee recommendations were within the University’s scenario planning. A useful precis of, and commentary on, the report was available from Wonkhe. UEB considered the lobbying approach from both UUK and the Russell Group and NOTED that the KPMG report had formed the foundation of the recommendations.

.3 UEB considered the correct approach to be taken for the publication of the KPMG Project Transform Lessons Learnt Report. UEB NOTED that the full cost of the project would be published as part of the report and considered it was important that the figure provided was contextualised.

.4 The University had received an enforcement notice from the Health and Safety Executive in connection with asbestos located in the School of Medicine. A full remediation plan had been included in the Vice-Chancellor’s response to the notice, and a team was working to implement the plan. The enforcement notice and the Vice-Chancellor’s response would be circulated to UEB for information.

.5 Concerns about the system and processes used to facilitate PGR recruitment were raised and focused on the complexity of the process from an applicant’s perspective and the difficulties in tracking real time application turnaround times. The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that UEB were aware of the concerns and work was in train to look at the issues over the course of the next year.

ACTION

OWNER

DUE

.6 To circulate the Health and Safety Executive’s enforcement notice and the Vice-Chancellor’s response.

Secretary

July

19.76 University Strategy

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/67 from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and presented by the Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change.

.2 UEB NOTED that the paper reflected the outputs of the Green Paper consultation phase and further NOTED the timeline for consideration and development of the next phase of the strategy at a UEB Away Day, at Senate and at Council. A draft strategy would be presented to UEB in July, following which it would be shared with the University community for consultation.

.3 UEB were invited to consider and comment on possible headline choices which might underpin the new strategy. UEB’s considerations included:

- clear statements about the University’s mission and values;
- references in the mission and values to impact, ambition, trust, integrity and being global;
- overarching areas for goals: sustainability, lifelong learning, employment, the community, the University’s international dimension and the idea of global citizens;
- the concept of breaking down barriers internally and/or across the world: using research and education, by improving access to University facilities and through inter-disciplinary activities;
- the University’s impact and the difference it and its students can make; and
the importance of enablers to achieving goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To prepare a draft of headings for the strategy for consideration by UEB prior to wider consultation.</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.77 Business Plan

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/73 presented by the Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change.

.2 UEB NOTED the Business Plan for 2019/21 which had been developed as part of a full business planning cycle operated by Planning and Resources Committee and was to be considered as the activity plan alongside the Budget for 2019/20. The summary of the activity contained within the Business Plan had been considered at Planning and Resources Committee in May.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To confirm whether the Business Plan should include 2020/21.</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.78 Medium Term Financial Plan: 2019/20-2023/24

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/74 from the CFO and presented by the Financial Controller.

.2 UEB NOTED the planning assumptions contained in the MTFP. The Augar Review Report recommended a fee reduction to £7500. It was considered prudent, given external uncertainties and the lack of clarity about the implementation and timing of the Augar recommendations and additional elements of the report (e.g. the cessation of funding for Foundation Degrees), that the MTFP continued to assume a fee reduction to £6500. UEB further NOTED the combined revenue and capital investment figures of £443M over the five years from 2019/20 and the importance of delivering the ‘Getting in Shape’ programme to delivery of the MTFP.

.3 Planning and Resources Committee had agreed the MTFP and recommended it for approval by Finance Committee. UEB provided feedback on the layout and content of the presentation for inclusion prior to its submission to Finance Committee.

.4 UEB ENDORSED the RECOMMENDATION made by Planning and Resources Committee to Finance Committee, to approve the MTFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION:</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To revise the MTFP presentation in light of the feedback provided by UEB</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Prior to submission to Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.79 Final Budget 2019/20

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/75 from the CFO and presented by the Financial Controller.

.2 UEB NOTED that there had been engagement with FPVCs regarding a new budgeting process for Faculties. Further engagement and opportunity to consider the mechanism and
how it might work would be available at the next meeting of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and FPVCs.

3 UEB also NOTED that whilst the income targets for Research Awards had been re-phased, the targets were still ambitious.

4 UEB ENDORSED the RECOMMENDATION made by Planning and Resources Committee to Finance Committee, to approve the Budget 2019/20.

19.80 Enterprise Level Risk Review

1 UEB RECEIVED and NOTED paper UEB/19/68 from the Registrar presented by the Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change.

2 UEB considered whether there were any other enterprise level risks that should be managed within the organisational risk register. UEB NOTED risks around knowledge exchange activities but considered that they should be managed at Knowledge Exchange Committee level. Estate focussed risks were featured appropriately as part of other enterprise level risks and did not require a separate risk.

3 UEB NOTED that Education and Student Experience Committee would consider risks around student experience, health and wellbeing at a workshop at its next meeting. As part of that work, the committee would consider what an enterprise level risk might look like for student experience. UEB AGREED that the outputs of the workshop should be reported back to UEB.

4 UEB NOTED the proposal to record risk appetite for each entry on the enterprise level risk register. A four point scale to indicate appetite was recommended.

5 UEB AGREED that:

- Project Transform should no longer be managed as a separate risk at enterprise level following closure of the programme. It should be renamed Campus Solutions and managed at Education and Student Experience Committee and Digital Strategy Committee level.
- Health and safety should be included as a separate risk at enterprise level.
- The risk appetite for each enterprise level risk should be included on the risk register according to the four point scale proposed. The level of appetite should be considered with the relevant risk owner and sub-committee and be reported back to UEB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.6 The outputs of the risk workshop held at Education and Student Experience Committee would be reported to UEB.</td>
<td>PVC ESE</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7 Risk appetite should be considered for each enterprise level risk by the risk owner and relevant sub-committee and be reported to UEB.</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.81 Digital Core

1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/58 from the CFO and Director of Human Resources presented by the Financial Controller and Head of Specialist Services.

2 UEB NOTED that there was a project under way to consider the method and approach for the replacement of the finance, HR and procurement IT systems. The age of both systems was noted—c. 20 years old—in relation to the significant growth of the University since they were first launched. There were currently in excess of 100 systems in use to support those functions and which together facilitated millions of individual transactions annually. Some of
those systems were highly customised and relied on a single staff point for ongoing maintenance. Many required manual work-arounds to enable the University to meet statutory and compliance reporting requirements and most did not offer a sufficient level of self service. It was not anticipated that that the solution would be a single new system.

.3 UEB NOTED that it was intended that a full business case for the replacement of the systems would been submitted to the appropriate decision-making bodies during 2019/20.

.4 Notwithstanding that a planned programme of engagement for the project had been developed and that quality assurance would form part of the project from the start, UEB RECOMMENDED that further consideration was given to the lessons learnt from Project Transform.

19.82 Plan for RIS Implementation Phase Closure

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/70 from the FPVC Science.

.2 UEB NOTED that four work packages were live in the UK and being managed by the RIS Operations Board. The remaining functionalities were due to go live in the next three to six months. Therefore, it was anticipated that the implementation stage of the project would be due to close from September.

.3 UEB considered the project closure criteria including bringing the REF module online, which was anticipated to take place in July following the final clarifications to the REF requirements, and integration with the University website or agreed alternative model.

.4 UEB NOTED that the UK implementation of RIS had been prioritised but with the original intention that a single RIS system should be rolled out across UK, UNNC and UNM, provided that super-user access could be limited to local data only. It had not been possible to restrict super user access in such a way; therefore, a separate version of RIS would need to be implemented in each of the UK, UNNC and UNM with data stored in a ring-fenced location specific to each campus. UEB considered the proposal that a new Programme Board was convened to consider and manage the implementation of RIS at UNNC and UNM.

.5 UEB APPROVED:

- the criteria for the project closure; and
- the creation of a new Programme Board to consider and manage implementation of the RIS at UNNC and UNM.

19.83 Financial Performance year to date

.1 UEB RECEIVED and NOTED paper UEB/19/76 from the CFO.

19.84 UEB Sub-Committee Update

.1 UEB RECEIVED and NOTED paper UEB/19/71 from the Secretary.

19.85 Circulated Items

.1 UEB RECEIVED paper UEB/19/72 from the Secretary. UEB NOTED the outcomes of the circulated papers and comments received.

19.86 Roundtable
The publication of the TEF subject level results had been delayed until July.

Initial discussions were in progress with a college in Pontefract to establish a Maths School. An expression of interest would be required if the University wanted to pursue the opportunity. Further details would be brought to UEB as the discussions developed and as appropriate for approval.

2020 would see the 50th anniversary of the Medical School and the 30th anniversary of the School of Nursing. Plans were underway to celebrate those milestones.

Management Board at UNNC had reviewed its governance structures at its Away Day in May. Communications would be sent to colleagues soon to advise them of the work and offer the opportunity to join Management Board sub-committees.

Disruption to the email systems experienced in the previous week had now been fully resolved. Lessons would be learnt about ensuring timely internal communications to apprise colleagues as far as possible about the severity of issues.

The first of the ‘Getting in Shape’ workshops had been held and received positive engagement.

REF readiness review meetings had been completed and had made good progress. An overview of this activity would be considered by the REF Steering Committee with an opportunity for UEB to review after the summer.

A further response was requested from the University by UUK to options for USS including a third option which, whilst it remained under the level of Rule 76, included debt monitoring and prevented future withdrawal. The University agreed to support the third option and Council endorsed the position.

A project had been commissioned to look at the ‘One University Three Campuses’ model and how strategy and delivery should be deliver across the three campuses – where strategy should be set and followed at a global level, where strategy should be consistent but applied locally and what should subject to local decision making. The results of the work would be shared with UEB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>The outputs of the review of the One University Three Campuses model would be shared with UEB.</td>
<td>DVC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>