



BOARD DEVELOPMENT DAY

Thursday 26th May 2022

LANGFORD CAMPUS, Room 1.05, Churchill Building

MINUTES

Present: Mr J Boyer (Chair), Professor H Brady (Vice-Chancellor), Ms O Adesanya, Dr M Bhabuta, Ms G Bowen, Mrs K Bright, Ms J Cecil, Dr S Clarke, Professor I Craddock, Ms L Fletcher, Dr J Khawaja, Mr Andrew Poolman (Treasurer), Mr F Quek, Professor C Relton, Mr S Robertson, Mr M Saddiq, Professor J Squires (Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) Provost), and Mr K Sithamparapillai

In attendance: Professor E Welch (Incoming Vice-Chancellor), Hannah Quinn (Head of Governance), Michele Barbour (Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor for Enterprise and Innovation, part-meeting), Barra Mac Ruairi (Chief Property Officer, part-meeting), Robert Kerse (Chief Operating Officer), Rich Oldfield (Chief Executive, NCC, part-meeting), Lucinda Parr (Registrar and University Secretary)

Apologies: Professor A Carr, Mr N Joicey, Dr A Raffel, Professor P Taylor

1 WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1 The Chair welcomed members to Langford Campus, and particularly welcomed Prof Evelyn Welch, Incoming Vice-Chancellor.

2 BRISTOL INNOVATIONS

2.1 The Vice-Chancellor introduced the item. Michele Barbour and Rich Oldfield also joined the meeting for this item.

2.2 The following points were NOTED:

2.2.1 The importance of responding to the innovation agenda and the importance of innovation for city and regional development.

2.2.2 The consultations undertaken which included presentations to Board and Court, extensive internal consultation and papers to University Research Committee and University Executive Board.

2.2.3 The external drivers for this development including an increasing government focus on the transition to commerce and an uplift in funding for Innovate UK. The University needed to respond to these changes and were well placed to do so and to benefit from it.

2.2.4 That the recent outstanding REF results were also relevant and could serve as a differentiator for Bristol, leveraging this to attract new partners and investors.

2.2.5 That there was a huge breadth and diversity of existing activity in this area in every Faculty and School, however, to co-ordinate this requires the right framework and support which will resonate with academics and provide the conditions for success, grounded in the foundations of research excellence.

2.2.6 The integration of three elements – push, pull and publicise. Pushing included improving and extending the current offer but without reinvention. The pull element would respond to external drivers with the potential to establish new structures, for example special purpose vehicles or partnerships. Publicising would create a coherent brand for our innovation and enterprise undertakings.

2.2.7 The process of consulting and engaging the academic community, accommodating cultural variations across disciplines and ensuring the approach was balanced and not at the expense of other initiatives. Whilst there had been

reluctance to move at the pace and budget originally designed, there was a willingness to consider alternative delivery methods, noting the importance of due diligence and process.

- 2.2.8 The revised proposal further to consultation which retained many aspects of the original proposal but accelerated more slowly in the first phase. That the initial use of existing structures allowed for swift progress and an opportunity to consider new future structures. That the first phase would still be decisive and bold, but also measured and rigorous with a focus on speaking and listening to academics. Announcements to internal and external stakeholders were planned for late June.
- 2.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
 - 2.3.1 That while there was some engagement with private equity investors, there was an opportunity to improve and to work in a more strategic manner, creating a proper interface and mechanism for investors, and connecting the pipeline of great research to available capital.
 - 2.3.2 The need to take advantage of this moment of alignment with government priorities and our strengths. The need to be purposeful and to engage with the business community to understand their requirements.
 - 2.3.3 The balance between moving at pace and retaining academic engagement. That whilst the proposal may not be as bold as first imagined, there was a risk of moving too quickly and losing traction with stakeholders. The importance of positioning BI as a way to expand the impact of research, whilst retaining the ability to ramp up in phase 2.
 - 2.3.4 The importance of capitalising on this moment of synergy between REF successes and new opportunities and augmenting our reputation. Ambitions to secure an innovation accelerator for Bristol.
 - 2.3.5 How training of local workforces would be addressed. The team had considered how they contribute to delivery of the local industrial strategy and how to position BI as a delivery mechanism for national policies.
 - 2.3.6 That the BI brand would build on the University brand, speaking to quality, values and due diligence as the foundations of what is delivered, but should be appropriately distinctive and exciting.
 - 2.3.7 That the budget reflected the short-term position and phase two budget planning would follow.
 - 2.3.8 Synergies with the Business School and opportunities to integrate
 - 2.3.9 That culture change would be required, to include upskilling and development of students, academics and researchers. Work had been initiated with the Staff Development Team to identify what was needed. The Bristol Grid had been developed as a skills matrix but a robust way of agreeing prioritisation was required.
 - 2.3.10 The criticality of universities to their local ecosystem and the exemplars already established including Ziylo and the NCC.

3. NET ZERO

- 3.1 The Chair introduced the Chief Property Officer who joined the meeting for this item, supported by a presentation. The Chief Property Officer presented a series of short films and described the context of our Net Zero commitments.
- 3.2 The Board were asked to provide feedback on some of the challenges of achieving our commitments. The following points were DISCUSSED
 - 3.2.1 The impact of an ageing estate and heritage buildings
 - 3.2.2 The tension between power or facilities required and research excellence, for example the need to use carbon to carry out research on climate change
 - 3.2.3 Issues with hot water provision, insulation of buildings and the relative use of renewable energy
 - 3.2.4 The different Scopes with the commitment where Scope 1 related to emissions caused directly, Scope 2 related to indirect emissions and Scope 3 to all emissions across the supply chain.

- 3.2.5 The validity of offsetting, which accounted for 5% of the plan
- 3.2.6 How to manage end of life buildings and how they could be replaced. 33% of the 365 University buildings were built pre-1914.
- 3.2.7 That the three pillars of the Strategy all included sustainability considerations.
- 3.2.8 Change of use during the pandemic had supported improvements in Scopes 1 & 2, but not scope 3.
- 3.2.9 Those buildings with the largest carbon consumption were mainly in STEM subjects which required higher energy.
- 3.2.10 That many other Russell Group institutions were struggling with same challenge.
- 3.2.11 That it would be important to manage the tensions within the research space and consider how research behaviours could be shifted, by providing information and training to researchers.
- 3.2.12 Whether grant applications could be assessed for sustainability implications to understand the lifecycle impact of the project
- 3.2.13 The need to manage research assets, for example refrigeration, and optimise efficiencies.
- 3.2.14 Particular challenges of individual buildings and choices required in these areas.
- 3.2.15 Plans to work with student body fora and staff colleagues to improve impact

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Friday 27th May 2022

**TERRACE ROOM, WELLSRING MICRO-CAMPUS, 43 DUCIE RD, BARTON HILL, BS5
0AX**

MINUTES

Present: Mr J Boyer (Chair), Professor H Brady (Vice-Chancellor), Professor E Welch (Incoming Vice-Chancellor), Ms O Adesanya, Dr M Bhabuta, Ms G Bowen, Mrs K Bright, Ms J Cecil, Dr S Clarke, Professor I Craddock, Ms L Fletcher, Dr J Khawaja, Mr A Poolman (Treasurer – remotely) Mr F Quek, Professor C Relton, Mr S Robertson, Mr M Saddiq, Professor J Squires (Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) Provost), and Mr K Sithamparapillai

In attendance: Professor E Welch (Incoming Vice-Chancellor), Hannah Quinn (Head of Governance), Professor Ian Bond (for item 9), Steve Chadwick (for item 6), Ed Fay (for item 8), Jane Hallett (for item 7), Fiona Hyland (for item 12), Paddy Ireland (for item 7), Robert Kerse (Chief Operating Officer), Barra Mac Ruairi (for item 8), Lucinda Parr (Registrar and University Secretary), Tim Peters (for item 7), Jess Sharratt (for item 12), Tom Sperlinger (for item 10), Phil Taylor (for item 7), Jane Bridgwater (for item 5)

Apologies: Professor A Carr

1 WELCOMES, APOLOGIES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1 The Chair welcomed members, and noted apologies.

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

2.1 Ian Craddock, Jane Khawaja, Kirsty Bright, Caroline Relton and Sarah Clarke raised a conflict with the COO report. It was agreed they would not vote on the recommendation in relation to the pay award as it would financially benefit them directly. It was also noted that the Registrar & University Secretary and the COO were also conflicted, although they were non-voting members.

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 The minutes of the previous meetings of the Board of Trustees on 1st April 2022 were APPROVED as a fair and accurate record.

4 ACTIONS & MATTERS ARISING

4.1 Completed items would be removed from the Action Register

4.2 The Board sought an update on the branding programme

ACTION: Director of External Relations

5 VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT AND QUESTIONS

5.1 The Board discussed the judgement of Ralton JJ in Bristol Country Court and considered its implications. The discussion was led by the Registrar & University Secretary and key points are recorded below. Jane Bridgwater, Deputy University Secretary and Director of Legal Services joined the meeting to provide legal advice to Trustees. The Board does not waive legal privilege on that advice.

5.2 [REDACTED: LEGALLY PRIVILEGED]

5.3 [REDACTED: LEGALLY PRIVILEGED]

- 5.3.6 The Board conveyed their warmest support and thanks to staff who have been working to their utmost to support students.
- 5.3.7 The communication between the Executive and the Board in relation to current legal cases. The Chair and the Registrar and University Secretary confirmed improvements would be made in this area.

5.4 The Vice-Chancellor provided a regional and sectoral update. The following points were NOTED:

- 5.4.1 The impact on the sector from ongoing political uncertainty.
- 5.4.2 That Nicola Dandridge had stepped down as CEO of the Office for Students and had been appointed as a Professor of Practice in the School of Education.
- 5.4.3 That the ongoing issues with Horizon Europe association and the Northern Ireland protocol which were becoming a recruitment risk for academics.
- 5.4.4 The result of the recent local referendum which would abolish the directly elected Mayor position, despite a very poor turnout of 29%. The University would need to engage differently with the City and align our civic engagement work with key decision makers. Additional effort would be required to establish and maintain relationships.
- 5.4.5 That the Chief Executive of the Western Gateway was stepping down, but would be joining the NCC.
- 5.4.6 That there would be no further Industrial Action in the short term.
- 5.4.7 That the outstanding REF results had provided a morale boost for colleagues and were an endorsement of the quality of our research. The results had showed the potential to reach global top 50 and the need to increase volume.
- 5.4.8 That Michael Gove had been invited to Bristol to spend time at TQ as part of the levelling up agenda.
- 5.4.9 The comparative fundraising success which had seen Bristol move from 15th to seventh in the sector. A recent legacy bequest had made £7.7m available to fund six PhD students annually.
- 5.4.10 The appointment of Karla Pollman as Vice-Chancellor at Tübingen University

5.5 The following points were DISCUSSED:

- 5.5.1 Significant concern at the mayoral situation and the potential impact on the City. A need to engage more closely with the WECA mayor and to consider how the University could support local officials to meet their priorities – for example in the area of sustainability. The Executive confirmed that work had started to consider the transition to more proactively engaging with councillors and working directly with other institutions. This would require time and effort but could also allow the University to shape a potentially more positive interaction.
- 5.5.2 The outstanding REF results and the link between those and the aim to be top 50. There was a need to stay focussed on changes which would impact the strategy and to consider how to increase the volume of quality research. The REF results had confirmed the quality of our research, but it would require investment to increase scale. There would be careful analysis of quality by volume in each unit of assessment (UoA) with the aim to create critical mass in more areas. Further discussion would take place under item BT/21-22/057.

6 STRATEGY PROGRESS UPDATE (reference BT/21-22/056)

6.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item. Steve Chadwick also spoke to the item.

6.2 The following points were NOTED

- 6.2.1 Work completed on Strategy implementation to date, and planned for the rest of the year. Plans to launch the strategy externally with Professor Welch in the Autumn.
 - 6.2.2 Progress on the sub strategies, which were ready to launch
 - 6.2.3 Reports in relation to Goal 1 and 2 and the format of the report template on which feedback was sought. The different levels of maturity of the data underpinning the SPIs, although Goals 1 and 2 utilised widely benchmarked data
- 6.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 6.3.1 That the report was clear and helpful, and there were some recommendations for improvement, including standardising the use of RAG ratings and additional information about mitigations where progress was not as desired.
 - 6.3.2 The need to align risks at programme level with the KURR and add definitions of risk.
 - 6.3.3 Whether the SPIs and KPIs could be prioritised in terms of impact on top 50 and top 10 aspirations and linked to the metrics for league tables. That Goal 1 was relevant for top 50 and Goal 2 was relevant for top 10. Both top 50 and top 10 aspirations were of equal importance.
 - 6.3.4 The helpful addition of a narrative from Goal owners to provide context.
 - 6.3.5 That three years of benchmark and performance data was presented. This was helpful to enable targets to be set, but once targets had been set, the target and current year data would be presented. Academic colleagues could support with multi-level modelling of data.
 - 6.3.6 The volume of SPIs and the potential to add a measure of the percentage of black professors. It was noted that this figure would be too narrow to serve as an SPI, and it might be preferable to consider reporting on the talent pipeline
 - 6.3.7 That any lack of performance should be proactively addressed with the Board, including inviting Goal owners to address the Board.
7. **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK** (reference **BT/21-22/057**)
- 7.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item. Jane Hallett, Paddy Ireland and Tim Peters also spoke to the item.
- 7.2 The following issues were NOTED:
- 7.2.1 The outstanding REF results, which were a significant achievement across the full range of disciplines and a product of an outstanding institutional effort over the past seven years. That Bristol had moved up from 11th (in 2014) to 5th in the THES institutional league table, overtaking Oxford and LSE.
 - 7.2.2 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 7.2.3 At Unit of Assessment (UoA) level, the results were also good, with 18 of the 28 UoAs ranked in the top 10 and 11 in the top 5. Only four UoAs were outside the top 20 and four had dropped in the rankings since 2014.
 - 7.2.4 That while output performance had been strong across the institution, performance in impact and environment was less consistent. Work was required to improve these submissions to construct a better narrative and ensure all required elements were present. The Business and Management UoAs were impacted by their growth in relation to both Impact and Environment.
 - 7.2.5 The financial implications of the results were not yet known and changes were likely to the allocation methodology.
- 7.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED
- 7.3.1 If financial allocations were calculated under the current model, the “golden triangle” institutions stood to lose £20m.
 - 7.3.2 The support and contribution of professional services colleagues in RED
 - 7.3.3 The opportunity to communicate these messages to our research and community partners and thank them for their engagement

7.3.4 The job-share APVC model undertaken by Tim Peters and Paddy Ireland, which had been highly successful. The need to ensure additional support for the PVC Research in relation to the REF.

8. **NEW UNIVERSITY LIBRARY** (reference **PRESENTATION**)

8.1 The DVC & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item. Ed Fay and Barra Mac Ruairi also spoke to the item.

8.2 The following issues were NOTED:

8.2.1 That the New University Library was central to the strategic ambitions of the institution and a world class University needed a world class library.

8.2.2 That wellbeing, relaxation, inclusivity and accessibility were at the heart of the design principles. That the design was inspirational and adaptable, building in future proofing and sustainable design.

8.2.3 The impact of the library on our top 10 and top 50 aspirations and the alignment with the global civic agenda. The ground floor would be open to the public, house special collections, the theatre collection showcase and support work with partners.

8.2.4 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**

8.2.5 That an OFS survey in relation to the pandemic had shown many students had a lack of access to quiet study space, reliable internet or devices and had highlighted a growing digital and societal inequity. Lesson learned from the pandemic had been applied to the design principles and continuing change in in usage has been anticipated.

8.2.6 The opportunity and duty to showcase our world class assets and range of special collections. An audience roadmap was being delivered through work with differentiated groups including young Bristolians and creative and cultural industries across the City. The Centre for Cultural Collections would be housed in the NUL, providing a series of ways to engage with the University and to tell new stories.

8.2.7 That the design of the Campus Heart would connect Senate House and the NUL, closing the road to traffic and creating a civic square. Planning consent had been granted and this was being preserved through the commencement of minor works.

8.2.8 The potential timeline for the NUL, and the need to continue to engage with stakeholders, particularly Bristol Grammar School who had concerns in relation to drop off and pick up of students. Discussion on sequencing would return to the Board in September.

8.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED

8.3.1 That the design team were engaged in networks and informed by good practice around the world, including how to work with partners and collections.

8.3.2 That there were 13 departmental libraries, and while some rationalisation could be considered, belonging was also important – libraries tended to be at the heart of local spaces, and it would be important to consider student feedback.

8.3.3 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**. Planning consent had been granted for this scheme and was conditioned on quality.

8.3.4 The institutional responsibility to the City, and the role of the NUL in meeting our civic mission. The Civic University Agreement would place increasing expectations on universities to support their cities.

9. **ENGINEERING RESTRUCTURE** (reference **BT/21-22/058**)

9.1 RECEIVED the paper. The DVC & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item. Ian Bond also spoke to the item.

9.2 The following issues were NOTED:

9.2.1 That further approval of the School names would return to Senate and the Board.

- 9.2.2 That the Faculty was at the end of the first phase of a major growth plan and had doubled in size since 2011. The drivers for change were around internal management and staff management, responding to change and growth and providing better support and development for staff. That four Schools was the optimum option in relation to viability and size.
 - 9.2.3 Alongside the change in structure, processes were being reviewed to reduce complexity, and ensure more effective decision making.
 - 9.2.4 The organisational element of “department” would be removed, supporting staff development by creating additional leadership roles at a smaller scale and improving student support.
- 9.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED
- 9.3.1 How the groupings of subjects to Schools had been determined, noting that research groups were free to operate outside of school structure. There were many options for how these were allocated, and some subjects could be considered to fit in multiple Schools.
 - 9.3.2 The importance of marketing considerations in considering School names, and search engine optimisation. The Dean noted that students were expected to search for their chosen programme rather than the School. Identification with programmes would not change.
 - 9.3.3 That the concept of department was a legacy structure and most Faculties had moved fully to a School structure. Significant restructuring of other Faculties was not anticipated.
 - 9.3.4 That no detriment or disruption for students was anticipated as the Faculty was accustomed to teaching across multiple departments, and many of the changes would be behind the scenes.
 - 9.3.5 That the additional costs included new Heads of Schools and ancillary leadership roles.
- 9.4 APPROVED the creation of four Schools, from the current two Schools that exist within the Faculty of Engineering, further to endorsement by Academic Portfolio Board, University Executive Board and Senate.

10. ACCESS & PARTICIPATION PLAN (reference BT/21-22/059)

- 10.1 RECEIVED the paper. The DVC & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item. Lucy Collins, Doug Jennings & Tom Sperlinger also spoke to the item.
- 10.2 The following issues were NOTED:
- 10.2.1 The changes in relation to the Access & Participation Plan required by the Office for Students.
 - 10.2.2 The profound shift in the composition of the student body over the past 10 years, which had been due to a whole institution approach to develop sector leading initiatives, to be bold, take risks and embrace diversity in our student body.
 - 10.2.3 The imposition of enhanced monitoring by the OFS which had required additional investment and change.
 - 10.2.4 That the trajectory was good across all measures and the University was more diverse than it had ever been. While state school intake was important, it did not always correlate to disadvantage. The OFS measure of POLAR intake (postcode of local areas) where Bristol had been amongst the five worst institutions five years ago and was now exceeding targets.
 - 10.2.5 The positive outcomes of contextual offers with 93% of students being awarded a 2:1 or 1st class degree.
 - 10.2.6 The creation of more flexible pathways into our programmes through foundation degrees.
 - 10.2.7 Additional work required to meet the mature student target and the local student intake was not increasing rapidly enough. There were opportunities to work with e.g., local Muslim or Somali communities.

- 10.2.8 Plans to create flexible UG programmes at scale, to make a meaningful difference to local communities and engaging with growth industries in Bristol to address a lack of diverse talent pipeline.
 - 10.2.9 That a focus group of students who were not going into HE had been commissioned to consider the creation of an interdisciplinary, flexible offering for large groups of students. This could start with credit bearing short courses and build up to a potential 4-year degree programme, designed in collaboration with recruiters and with learning in community, at home and on campus.
- 10.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED
- 10.3.1 What lessons could be learned from UWE. Programmes at UWE had been designed with flexibility built in and had always been more vocational with lower entry requirements.
 - 10.3.2 The cost-of-living challenges for students and the importance of well targeted financial support required and accommodation costs.
 - 10.3.3 The opportunity to apply lessons learned at HUG level to PG and overseas applicants. Work had commenced with the International Office to develop this, and initiatives and packages had been created PG level.
 - 10.3.4 That while contextual offers were made to Black UG students at a similar rate, less Black students were applying. The request to disaggregate data to show progress in recruitment of Black students.
 - 10.3.5 The challenges of flexibility and micro credentialling which would be trialled as part of the flexible delivery approach.
 - 10.3.6 Expectations for universities to contribute to pre-16 attainment raising. The University already sponsored the Venturers Trust, provided CPD for teachers and undertook active research work with Schools via the School of Education. There were plans to harness existing outreach activity in the research community to meet targets.

11. BUDGET (reference BT/21-22/060)

- 11.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer (Robert Kerse) introduced the item.
- 11.2 The following issues were NOTED:
 - 11.2.1 The questions which had been submitted in advance of the Board and the responses which had been circulated to the Board.
 - 11.2.2 That the budget was within the parameters of the long-term financial plan with some additional headroom to acknowledge the volatile environment.
 - 11.2.3 The risk of travel from China being disrupted and provisions for students to stay in the UK over the summer to enable them to continue.
 - 11.2.4 That any overshoot in student numbers risked staff morale and engagement.
 - 11.2.5 That the Executive were comfortable with the mitigations in place and the budget contingency was likely to be spent on mitigation measures.
 - 11.2.6 During the pandemic, significant contingency positions had been built into the budget but going forward this had been reduced.
 - 11.2.7 The requirement to set a budget with significant headroom to comply with loan and borrowing covenants. Any surpluses would be reinvested
 - 11.2.8 That the Budget had been recommended by Finance & Infrastructure Committee.
- 11.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED
 - 11.3.1 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 11.3.2 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 11.3.3 The discussion at FIC of the scale of the challenge. The Board was asked to support difficult choices and budget discipline. Transparency would also be important against key criteria so that the Board could monitor how this was taken through the institution.

- 11.3.4 The absence of the merit pay scheme for professional services staff, while academic progression had been reinstated had not been popular with staff.
- 11.4 APPROVED the 2022/23 Budget and proposed minor changes to the Capital Programme & Business Plan.
- 12. TEMPLE QUARTER UPDATE REPORT (reference BT/21-22/061)**
- 12.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer (Robert Kerse) introduced the item.
- 12.2 NOTED the Temple Quarter programme report.
- 13. REPORT FROM COO (reference BT/21-22/062)**
- 13.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer (Robert Kerse) introduced the item.
- 13.2 The following points were NOTED:
- 13.2.1 That there was no further mandate for Industrial Action this academic year, but further challenges were likely in future.
- 13.2.2 That it was important to fairly reward staff, and to give something back from this year's surplus in recognition of the very significant efforts made by colleagues. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
- 13.2.3 That further to advice from the Board, and considering the surplus, additional payments were proposed for staff. Other institutions were reacting similarly, however the Bristol proposal also covered regular variable hours staff, including Hourly Paid Teachers.
- 13.2.3 That inflation-linked requirements were becoming more prevalent in new construction contracts resulting in unfixed prices.
- 13.2.4 A useful meeting in relation to Cybersecurity, the notes of which would be circulated to the Board.
- ACTION: Governance Team
- 13.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 13.3.1 The financial performance for the nine months ended 30 April 2022 and the forecast financial outcome for 2021/22, including whether management was taking appropriate action to address areas of underperformance.
- 13.3.2 The impact of labour market inflation and the pressures to pay more to confirm the right people into roles. The University operated the Hay Job Evaluation Scheme and had a market review had been undertaken in relation to some areas where there is greater challenge in attracting and retaining the best staff to establish appropriate supplements.
- 13.3.3 That in relation to the Dean of Arts position, an acting Dean was sought internally, and a search firm would conduct an external process for the permanent appointment to start in approx. 6 – 9 months. A strong field was anticipated
- 13.3.4 That Odgers Berndtson had been engaged to support the Head of Business School recruitment with an interview date of 12 October. There were multiple other HEIs also recruiting for similar positions.
- 13.3.5 The likely challenges of delivering capital projects in this market.
- 13.3.6 Whether the amount of £1000 was the right sum and an appropriate use of Charitable funds. The Board considered it to be in the University's best interests to make the proposed payment as the tight labour market increases the risk of staff turnover and we are experiencing challenges recruiting to a number of roles. A meaningful sign of appreciation to existing staff would go some way to reducing the risk of higher rates of staff turnover. Staff turnover had a significant direct cost associated with recruitment and the time that it takes for new staff to become fully effective in role. It also posed a risk to the wellbeing of remaining staff if we are unable to recruit permanent replacement staff on a timely basis.

Increased staff turnover also presented a medium risk to the achievement of our institutional goals if we do not have the skills and capacity we need.

- 13.4 APPROVED the payment of an unconsolidated bonus of £1,000 to all staff, grades A – M3, on permanent and fixed-term contracts who were in employment on 1 January 2022 to be paid in July 2022.
- 13.5 APPROVED a payment of £250 to Hourly Paid Teachers with authority to delegated to the Deputy Vice Chancellor & Provost and Chief Operating Officer to jointly agree the parameters for who receives the payment.
- 14. CHAIR'S REPORT (reference BT/21-22/063)**
- 14.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Board, Jack Boyer, introduced the item.
- 14.2 NOTED the report.
- 14.3 NOTED the decisions taken between meetings.
- 15. REPORT FROM DVC & PROVOST (reference BT/21-22/064)**
- 15.1 RECEIVED the paper. The DVC & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item.
- 15.2 NOTED the report of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost.
- 15.3 The following items were DISCUSSED
- 15.3.1 The proposals for consultation on renaming and the report on the Transatlantic Slave Trade, co-authored by Professor Otele. The proposals would stagger renaming and consider Colston, Goldney and the Merchant Venturers first. The University crest and logo would be considered as part of the branding programme. That Professor Otele was leaving the institution for a role at SOAS.
- 15.3.2 A collaborative project planned with the University of Cape Town focussing on reparations.
- 15.3.3 Concern at the pace of progress made in renaming and the impact on the perception of our commitments in this area. The need for a consistent message and timeframe as well as a commitment to feed back to people consulted. Examples of the progress of local Schools.
- 15.3.4 That in terms of process, advice would be sought from the Board on the outcome of the consultation and recommendations before any decision was taken by UEB.
- 15.3.5 The opportunity to build on less impressive REF results in management.
- 15.3.6 The increase in international hardship funding which was not focussed solely on Ukraine but recognised hardship globally.
- 16. REPORT FROM REGISTRAR & UNIVERSITY SECRETARY (reference BT/21-22/065)**
- 16.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Registrar & University Secretary (Lucinda Parr) introduced the item.
- 16.2 The following points were NOTED:
- 16.2.1 That the Business Operations Recovery Group had completed impact mapping in relation to Industrial Action. There had been a small number of complaints
- 16.2.2 The Student Experience Programme were making agile improvements to the student journey and had rolled out a global booking system saving time and improving the student experience
- 16.2.3 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]** This was difficult to predict as many factors were still unclear including visas, lockdowns and the potential removal of visa dispensations by the Home Office. Scenario planning had commenced.

- 16.2.4 Consideration of online provision for students from China was ongoing with risks either way.
- 16.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 16.3.1 That there were no plans to accommodate students outside of Bristol as in previous years. That the risk of overshoot was managed at UG level and more likely to occur with PGT students who did not have the same need for University residences.
- 16.3.2 The delay in finalisation of the Board Effectiveness Review and follow up meetings scheduled with the provider
- 16.3.3 The Board sought top level results from the “Your Priorities 2022” survey
ACTION: Registrar & University Secretary
- 17. REPORT FROM EDI OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (reference BT/21-22/066)**
- 17.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the EDI Oversight Committee, Jessica Cecil, introduced the item.
- 17.2 DISCUSSED the report of the EDI Oversight Committee.
- 17.3 APPROVED the proposal to change the name of the Committee to the “Equity, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Oversight Committee”, and to make this change to Ordinance 4.
- 18. REPORT FROM REMUNERATION COMMITTEE (reference BT/21-22/067)**
- 18.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Remuneration Committee, Mohammed Saddiq, introduced the item.
- 18.2 NOTED the report of the meeting.
- 18.3 NOTED the decision outside of the meeting
- 19. REPORT FROM FINANCE & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE (reference BT/21-22/068)**
- 19.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Finance & Infrastructure Committee, Andreas Raffel, introduced the item.
- 19.2 NOTED the report of the Finance and Infrastructure Committee meeting held on the 21 April 2022.
- 19.3 NOTED that the Committee RECOMMENDED the 2022/23 Budget & Business Plan to the Board of Trustees for approval, subject to further consideration of the pay award, the budget opportunities and risks presented in the report, the investment priorities for the Strategy Fund, moving towards orange for the cash flow [REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests] (paper BT/21-22/060).
- 20. REPORT FROM PENSIONS TASK & FINISH GROUP (reference BT/21-22/069)**
- 20.1 RECEIVED the paper.
- 20.2 NOTED the report of the Pensions Task and Finish Group held on the 28 April 2022.
- 21. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 21.1 None
- 22. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETINGS: 8 July 2022.**