



MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FRIDAY 2 FEBRUARY 2024
BURGES SALMON, 1 GLASS WHARF, BRISTOL BS2 0ZX
MINUTES

Present: Ms O Adesanya, Mr M Allan, Mr S Boyd, Mr J Boyer (Chair), Ms G Bowen, Professor A Carr, Ms J Cecil, Professor I Craddock, Professor N Edwards, Ms J Huggins, Mr N Joicey, Mr N Keveth, Dr J Khawaja, Ms X Levantis, Mr F Quek, Mr S Robertson, Professor J Squires (Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost), Miss H Thornton, Professor E Welch (Vice-Chancellor), Professor Dame M Welham.

In attendance: Mrs Jane Bridgwater (Deputy University Secretary and Director of Legal Services) – items 14 and 15, Mrs Claire Buchanan (Chief People Officer) – item 13, Dr Sophie Collet (Director of Strategy, Information and Operations) – item 8, Miss Ellie Cook (Portfolio Marketing Manager) – item 8, Mr Michael Flay (Head of Governance), Ms Lucie Lambert (Governance Apprentice), Mr Andrew Monk (Executive Director of Global Engagement) – item 12, Ms Lucy Penrose (Deputy Head of Governance), Lucinda Parr (Chief Operating Officer, Registrar and University Secretary), Mr Kris Roberts (VWV) – items 14 and 15, Professor Philip Taylor (Pro Vice-Chancellor Research and Enterprise) – Item 8, Mr Peter Vermeulen (Chief Financial Officer).

1. WELCOMES, APOLOGIES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1 There were no apologies.

1.2 The Board **NOTED** that today was Ms Linda Fletcher's final Board meeting as an independent trustee, although it had been agreed that she would remain as an 'Additional Member' of the new Infrastructure & Planning Committee which would come into being during Spring 2024, subject to Nominations Committee and Board approval. The Board thanked Ms Fletcher for the time that she had dedicated to the Board of Trustees and for her extremely valuable contributions over the many recent years.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 There were none.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 Subject to some minor amendments which had been sent to the Governance team in advance of the meeting today, the Board **APPROVED** the minutes of the 16th November 2024 meeting of the Board of Trustees as a true and accurate record (*on file*).

4. ACTIONS & MATTERS ARISING

4.1 RECEIVED and **NOTED:** the Board action register (*on file*).

4.2 It was specifically noted that the Head of Governance would continue to review the Board forward plan to ensure that adequate provision was being made for a fair balance of education and teaching, student experience, research, and other operational and strategic items for future Board meetings.

4.3 It was noted that student experience represented the 'golden thread' throughout all of the Board's discussions during the year, however, it was agreed that the COO, Registrar & University Secretary would additionally provide a more detailed update to the Board in the near future on the progress around the delivery of the Education and Student Experience Programme.

- 4.4 It was agreed that the discussion about the NSS results in September 2024 would be provided adequate amount of time on the agenda.
- 4.5 All completed actions would be removed from the register after today's meeting.
- 5. CHAIR'S REPORT (ref BT/23-24/028) (on file)).**
- 5.1 RECEIVED and **NOTED**: a report from the Chair of the Board covering new appointments to the Board of Trustees and/or its committees, and a summary of any significant meetings or events attended by the Chair since the previous meeting.
- 5.2 **NOTED**: Interviews had recently been held to appoint new 'Additional' members of the Audit and Risk Committee. Three candidates were interviewed on 26th January, and the appointments were currently being progressed through the Nominations Committee in February, with Board approval being sought on 22nd March 2024.
- 5.3 DISSEMINATION EMBARGOED:**
- 5.3.1 It was noted that interviews had now concluded for the appointment of the University's new Pro Vice-Chancellor Global Engagement (to replace Prof Agnes Nairn). The University had advertised internally and externally using the external search firm 'Odgers Berndtson', and there had been a very diverse and international field of candidates for both the longlist and shortlist. Internal and external focus groups, including students, had provided extremely positive feedback to the Appointments panel, which included Ms Jessica Cecil, independent trustee.
- 5.3.2 The Board was informed that the preferred candidate was Professor Michele Acuto, Professor of Global Urban Politics and Director, Melbourne Centre for Cities at the University of Melbourne. Professor Acuto had expertise in diplomacy and international law, with a special interest in urban planning. He had also been engaged in research projects here at the University.
- 5.3.3 Having reviewed Professor Acuto's CV, covering letter and overall credentials, the Board **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED** the appointment of Professor Michele Acuto as the University's new Pro Vice-Chancellor for Global Engagement. An announcement on the appointment would be made once arrangements had been formalised with the University of Melbourne.
- 6. EXECUTIVE GROUP REPORT AND QUESTIONS (ref BT/23-24/029) (on file)).**
- 6.1 RECEIVED and **CONSIDERED**: the report of the Executive.
- 6.2 The Vice-Chancellor introduced her report, and verbal updates were **NOTED**:
- 6.2.1 Professor Phil Taylor, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research & Enterprise, would be leaving the University at the end of July to join the University of Bath as their new Vice-Chancellor from 1st August 2024. A transition plan had already been implemented, and any conflicts of interests were being carefully managed by the Executive.
- 6.2.2 The new University logo had been signed off by the University Executive Board at its recent meeting, and a digital strategy for the logo replacement was currently being developed. The deadline for final sign off by the Vice-Chancellor was early February (aligned with the publication timeline for the University Prospectus). In terms of implementation and communication with the wider University, this would likely take place after Graduation at the end of February. It was noted that there had been no opposition by staff or students to the new logo, but there was however keen interest in the actions that the University would be taking as part of the Reparative Futures Programme.
- 6.2.3 The Board congratulated the University on achieving a joint top number of Collaborative Doctoral Training Awards in the UK.
- 6.2.4 The Board also congratulated the University for having been very recently jointly awarded a major grant in immersive arts together with UWE and the Watershed and a number of other industrial partners.

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

6.3 The following was **DISCUSSED**:

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

6.3.2 The recent UEB discussion around the University's TEF Gold ambition and the approach being taken. A TEF Gold action plan was currently being developed in parallel to the REF preparation programme. Commitment to achieving TEF Gold remained strong and the support and encouragement of UEB had been well received.

6.3.3 The extremely high cost for students of build to rent accommodation in Bristol, particularly compared with other major cities in the UK.

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

It was **NOTED** that a proposal about how to boost accommodation volume in Bristol would be discussed at the Finance & Infrastructure Committee imminently and it would then be considered by the Board of Trustees.

6.3.4 How the University might be able to do more in terms of providing students with appropriate employment opportunities given the extreme cost of living crisis and high rents in Bristol.

6.3.5 It was suggested that going forward the Executive Report could better reflect the cross-cutting themes of the strategy e.g. sustainability, EEDI.

ACTION: Head of Governance

Andrew Monk joined the meeting

6.4 The Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor addressed the recent Sunday Times Article on international student recruitment. The following was **NOTED**:

6.4.1 Aspects of the article were sensationalised and misleading. The story failed to distinguish between entry requirements for International Foundation Years and full degrees. International Foundation Years were designed to prepare students to apply for full degree programmes -they did not guarantee entry to them. They were designed for students who came from different education systems where, in many cases, students might have completed 12 rather than 13 years of education.

6.4.2 The University agreed with the stance taken by UUK, which was that the entry requirements for international and domestic students to full degree programmes should be equivalent, and it was essential that the integrity of entry routes be protected. However, entry routes for international students reflected the diverse countries and education backgrounds that these students came from, and some of those international students would require bridging courses to enable them to progress to UK degrees.

6.4.3 Clearly, whilst there were elements of genuine concern reflected in the article i.e. the use of rogue agents, the parity of the foundation programme with the final year of A-level and the finances of all UK HE institutions (which were now being completely dependent on attracting a sufficient quantity of highly qualified international students), this matter had become an extremely politicised issue, and was also very much linked to issues and rhetoric around migration.

- 6.4.4 The Vice-Chancellor had met this week with the SU Sabbatical Officers who informed her that the article had become a real source of distress for UoB international students who were feeling that they were being told they were not good enough to be studying here, that they had bought their way into the system, and that the UK did not want them to stay here after they had graduated. It was absolutely essential that the University protected its students so that they knew how much the University valued what they brought to the university and the wider City. This was the Vice-Chancellor's number one priority.
- 6.4.5 Given that the Board of Trustees was ultimately responsible for the quality of the university's degree outcomes and of its broader provision, the DVC & Provost and the Executive Director of Global Engagement provided assurances around the University's quality assurance processes, progression rates, tariffs for progression and how the University dealt with rogue agents.

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

- The University did use overseas agents to assist with overseas student recruitment, all of whom are signed up to a recognised quality assurance framework, and who follow an agents' good practice guide.
- The University had a very transparent admissions policy, published on the external public-facing website, which clearly articulated the entry requirements for the IFP and what was required for progression on to the main degree programme. The achievement required at the end of the foundation programme was also calibrated in relation to the University's own entry requirements. The higher the tariff for the University's programme, the higher the progression quality was required – this was so that students would be more likely to succeed. The University also reviewed tariffs and progression requirements on an annual basis.
- The University had a similar foundation programme for Home students, which allowed for the recruitment of an individual with non-standard academic qualifications e.g. non A-level, and provide them with a transition year to ensure that they had the academic skills, knowledge and capacity to gain access to the University's main degree programmes (this included programmes across all schools and faculties). 1

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

- The University was extremely rigorous in terms of progression routes
- REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

- All University admissions requirements and processes were owned by the University of Bristol, and nothing was outsourced. Entry into the University was not automatic, as implied by the Sunday Times Article.
- The University currently had agreements with 107 different agents across the world – this represented a small number compared with other universities, and the number was small deliberately because the University was working with each of the agents individually to ensure quality and to ensure their alignment with the values of the university. The University assigned an individual in the recruitment team to manage the relationship with the agents, and to also provide training to their staff.
- The University and now ceased working with the agents who were videoed in the Sunday Times Article – those agents had demonstrated that they were not working to the standards that the University required of them.

6.5 The following was **DISCUSSED**:

6.5.1 The importance of keeping a watchful eye on the impact that these sorts of articles might also have on home students (not just overseas students)

6.5.2 The importance of ensuring that the integrity and standards that the University applied to its students was consistent.

6.5.3 The fact that this narrative would continue to run for some time, [REDACTED] **REDACTED: Section 43** and how whilst this was a sectoral issue, there were players in the sector for whom this issue was a far more significant concern.

6.5.4 The importance of working together with UUK and the Russell Group Universities in their strategy to manage the reputational impact on the HE sector as a whole. A cohesive approach would be essential going forward, particularly given the root of the problem which was a fundamental flaw in HE funding – the sector must stand together on this issue.

6.5.5 The fact that the University also carefully monitored attainment and progression of students on the home foundation programmes, and that those students who went through the WP foundation programmes did very well and had high levels of attainment.

6.5.6 The issue of the calibration of the different routes of entry was critical in this debate – this did not come across in the Sunday Times article. The Board was assured that the inference that the HE sector was attempting to fast-track students who were of lower quality, was absolutely not the case at the University of Bristol. Indeed, it was clear that the University set the progression standards for all degree standards, and subject specialist programme directors reviewed each individual application and applied the same standards across the piece.

6.5.7 **REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)**

[REDACTED] It was noted that at the March Board development day (21st March) and subsequent formal Board meeting (22nd March), there would be a discussion specifically around international student experience.

6.5.8 The strength and reliability of the accreditation process for external agents [REDACTED]

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

6.5.9 **REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)**

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

- 6.5.10 Managing the messaging and correcting inaccuracies was essential and it was noted that the PVC Education was working together with the SU International Student Sabbatical Officer on the key messages that needed to be put across to international students about the value they brought to the university, as well as the provision of some practical support.
- 6.5.11 The diversity of entry and different routes and experiences referred to during this discussion today really represented a positive narrative, it was hoped that this should provide an opportunity for the sector to now have an open discussion with the UK Government about the motivation to recruit international students and the broader HE funding model.

Andrew Monk left the meeting

7. KEY UNIVERSITY RISKS (ref BT/23-24/030) (on file).

7.1 RECEIVED and **CONSIDERED**: the University's risk profile and the controls in place to manage the Key University Risks.

7.2 The COO, Registrar and University Secretary introduced the report, and the following was **NOTED**:

7.2.1

7.2.2 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.3 The Executive provided the Board with an update on Isambard AI project progress.

REDACTED:Section 43

Isambard AIRR

7.3.1 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.3.2 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.3.3 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.3.4 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.3.5 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.3.6 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.4 The Chair of the Audit & Risk Committee (ARC) provided feedback on the discussions that were had on the KURR at the recent ARC meeting.

7.5 The following was **NOTED**:

7.5.1 ARC could assure the Board of Trustees of its confidence in the risk scoring as presented.

7.5.2 Internal Audit would be undertaking a programme assurance process for Isambard AI, prior to the departure of the PVC Research & Enterprise. (See section 6.2.1 above)

7.5.3 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.5.4 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.6 The following was **DISCUSSED**:

7.6.1 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.6.2 The impact of high student rents on student mental health and wellbeing

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

7.6.3 The importance of Trusted Research

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

Phil Taylor, Sophie Collett & Ellie Cook joined the meeting

8. REF 2029 PREPARATIONS & CONTEXTUALIZATION OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REF AND RANKINGS (ref **BT/23-24/031**) and PowerPoint slides (*on file*).

8.1 RECEIVED and **CONSIDERED**: an update on REF 2029, including sector policy developments, REF Programme activity and initial activities in preparation for the University's REF 2029 submission.

8.2 The PVC Research & Enterprise introduced the paper and the Director of Strategy, Information and Operations and the Portfolio Marketing Manager delivered some PowerPoint slides.

8.3 The following was **DISCUSSED**:

8.3.1 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

8.3.2

8.3.3 The recently announced pilot for People, Culture and the Environment and the advantages of UoB taking part in that pilot.

8.3.4 The new REF governance structure and its capacity to flex as and when needs allowed, for example in the creation of more professional services capacity to support the governance structures in specific Faculties such as SSL and Arts.

8.3.5 As more information emerged, the importance of sharing benchmarking data with the Board of where UoB stood in comparison with its peers.

8.3.6 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

Innovations would be attending a future Board meeting, and this was on the Board forward plan.

- 8.3.7 The creation of the APVC for Research and Culture very early on represented a strong step forward in preparing the University for the research, culture and environment submission, which it was noted was critical to research sustainability in the long term.
- 8.3.8 The ambition to become a Top 50 University strongly correlated with the University's research reputation and recognition. It was also increasingly important because it was an indicator of quality, which drove international student recruitment, and recruitment more broadly. The University was currently ranked 55 in the QS which was extremely encouraging for its ambitions in relation to student recruitment going forward. The Board emphasised the importance of continuing to robustly embed the various constituent metrics into strategic thinking own thinking by using the Top 50 indicators as w ay of drawing out the key metrics that drive the University's performance. This would be a topic for discussion at the Board Development day in March 2024.

8.3.9 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

8.3.10 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

Phil Taylor, Sophie Collett & Ellie Cook left the meeting

9. FINANCE REPORT (ref BT/23-24/032) (on file)).

9.1 RECEIVED and **CONSIDERED**: a summary of the most important financial matters as at January 2024.

9.2 The Chief Financial Officer introduced the report and the following was **NOTED**:

9.2.1 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.2.2 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.2.3 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.2.4

- REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

- REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.2.5

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.3 The following was **DISCUSSED**:

9.3.1

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.3.2

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.3.3

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

9.3.4

REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

10. UNIVERSITY SECRETARY'S REPORT (ref **BT/23-24/033**) (*on file*).

10.1 **RECEIVED** and **APPROVED**: a series of items for approval requested by the University Secretary.

10.2 The University Secretary introduced the report.

10.3 **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**: the proposed amendments to Ordinance 6 (2.1.6(b)) to provide Senate with express delegated authority to rescind an Emeritus title (Senate already had delegated powers in relation to awarding Emeritus Titles).

10.4 **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**: the associated or consequential amendments to the Board and Senate delegation schedules, subject to some minor modifications highlighted by Ms Linda Fletcher, Independent Trustee, in advance of today's meeting, and subject to approval of the new Emeritus Academic Regulations by Senate at its meeting on 5th February 2024.

10.5 **APPROVED, BY SPECIAL RESOLUTION**: the following proposed amendments to Court statutes 7.4 and 6.3, which had been previously endorsed by the Board in September 2023, and were subsequently approved by University Court at its meeting on 1st December 2023:

Statute 7 (7.4)

7.4 The Secretary shall send notice of every meeting of Court not less than thirty five days before the day fixed for such meeting. Any member of Court wishing to bring forward any business at a meeting shall give the Secretary written notice of it not less than twenty days before the day appointed for the meeting. ~~provided that such business shall not be included on the agenda unless no fewer than nine other members of Court have indicated their support either by signing the notice or writing to the Secretary indicating their support for the business to be discussed. This shall not apply to~~

~~business brought forward by the Board of Trustees.~~ Not less than seven days before any meeting of Court the Secretary shall send every member of Court a statement of all business, and no business shall be considered at the meeting except that included in the statement. For the purposes of this Statute, any notice or written communication to the Secretary may be given by email.

Statute 6 (6.3)

6.3.1 The Attendees of Court will be invited to Court with the purpose of informing members of Court as required. Attendees of Court will be as follows:

- (a) twenty individuals elected by and from members of Staff;
- (b) the Full-time Officers;
- (c) the Board of Trustees;
- (d) the Vice-Chancellor;
- (e) the Pro Vice-Chancellors;
- (f) the Registrar & University Secretary;
- (g) ~~the Chief Operating Officer & Finance Director;~~ the Chief Financial Officer; and
- (h) ~~the Deans of Faculty;~~
- (i) ~~the University Librarian;~~
- (j) ~~the Bursar; and~~
- (k) the Secretary & Clerk to Court.

10.6 The amendments as per the above (for the avoidance of doubt) were as follows:

- additions to the wording in underlined text; and
- deleted wording in ~~strikethrough text~~.

10.7 **NOTED:** the changes to the Statutes would be implemented once Privy Council had approved them at the appropriate juncture in 2024.

11. REPORT FROM AUDIT & RISK COMMITTEE (ref **BT/23-24/034**) (on file)).

11.1 RECEIVED and **NOTED:** the report from the Audit & Risk Committee.

Andrew Monk joined the meeting

12. ANNUAL REPORT: PHILANTHROPIC INCOME 22/23 & PHILANTHROPIC PLANS FOR 2023/24 (ref **BT/23-24/035**) (on file)).

12.1 RECEIVED and **CONSIDERED:** a report from the Executive Director of Global Engagement which considered the impact of philanthropy at Bristol University, the performance relative to the Russell Group and previous years, the value for money performance of Philanthropy at Bristol University, the philanthropic priorities for 2023/24 and the University's total philanthropic income for 2022/23.

12.2 The following was **DISCUSSED:**

12.2.1 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

12.2.2 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

12.2.3 REDACTED: Section 43 (commercial interests)

12.3 The Board thanked the Executive Director of Global Engagement for his excellent and insightful report.

*Andrew Monk left the meeting
Claire Buchanan joined the meeting*

13. GENDER AND ETHNICITY ANNUAL PAY GAP REPORT (reference **BT/23-34/036**) (on file)).

13.1 RECEIVED and **CONSIDERED**: the Gender and Ethnicity Pay Gap report which represented a statutory reporting requirement.

13.2 The Chief People Officer introduced the report, and the following was **NOTED**:

13.2.1 There was currently no statutory requirement for an Ethnicity Pay Gap report but there was government guidance that aligned to the Gender Pay Gap guidance. The University had chosen to take a proactive approach to voluntarily report its disaggregated ethnicity pay gaps to continue to build stronger relationships with its workforce through openness and transparency.

13.2.2 The report focused on government prescribed data as of 31st March 2023. As such there was a time lag between initiatives taken and their effect on data. In October 2024 the University would provide an internal diversity monitoring report for staff which would include data on representation, OD data analysis of GPG and EGP data based on positions (spine points and allowances where appropriate) and the Impact of key HR processes on such data. This report would become the Annual People Analytics Report, providing insight into gaps and barriers to inform targeted action that would ultimately help to reduce pay gaps.

13.2.3 The percentage of females in the organisation had increased from 56% in 2022 to 58% in 2023.

13.2.4 The University continued to make progress in reducing its gender pay gap and had seen a reduction in both the median and mean pay gaps. The median gender pay gap of 10.6% in men's favor had reduced by 5.6% since the first report in 2017. The mean gender pay gap in men's favor of 14.4% had also reduced by 6.7% compared to 2017.

13.2.5 Since last year, the median gender pay had decreased by 0.4% to 10.6%. This remained below the national average of 14.3% but above the HE (Higher Education) median of 10% (ONS (Office for National Statistics) provisional figures for 2023).

13.3 The following was **DISCUSSED**:

13.3.1 The importance of ensuring that there were key milestones and intervals at which the University was monitoring how well it was doing in its ethnicity data.

13.3.2 The various initiatives currently underway such as the gender action plan and the anti-racism action plan, plus the female leadership initiative '100 Black Women Professors Programme', which had just had its first cohort.

13.3.3 The opportunities in this space for ensuring that recruitment programmes were diverse and to think about other positive actions that could be taken. There was also an opportunity to diversify the workforce at the senior level with the PVC R and I and Chief People Officer posts being advertised.

13.3.4 A suggestion to improve the collation of disability data and whether there was scope for more disability representation in the intersectionality reporting. It was noted that HR would review the disability data in October 2024, and would consider whether it might be feasible to incorporate it going forward. The issue currently was around getting staff to report a disability or not, in the first instance.

13.3.5 The possibility of including the Annual report on Promotions as part of this report going forward, and the importance of having a systems thinking approach to this area.

13.3.6 How the Board could continue to challenge the Executive on their actions to shift the dial especially with regards ethnicity.

13.4 The Board thanked the Chief People Officer for her report.

Claire Buchanan left the meeting

The Executive members of the Board left the room for the next item

14.a STUDENT MATTERS: Complaint Review (ref BT/23-24/037) (on file)).

14.1 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.2 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.3 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.4 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)
REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.5 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.6 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.7 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.8 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.9 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.10 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.11 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.12 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.13 REDACTED: Section 42 (legal professional privilege)

14.b STUDENT MATTERS: Annual Report on SU Legal Compliance (ref BT/23-24/038) (on file)).

14.14 **RECEIVED and CONSIDERED:** the 2022/23 Education Act Code of Practice, which had been reviewed and updated to reflect both SU and University responsibilities and how those responsibilities were carried out during the 2022/23 academic year.

14.15 The following was **NOTED:**

14.15.1 The Education Act 1994, Section 22 (Requirements to be observed in relation to Students' Unions) required universities to issue a code of practice, setting out the manner in which the requirements of section 22(1) and (2) of the Education Act, relating to the organisation and activities of the Students' Union, are to be put into effect.

14.15.2 This Code of Practice was created by the Students' Union in 2014 to fulfil a requirement and need around the Education Act 1994 responsibilities.

14.15.3 Each year this Code of Practice: Education Act 1994 Responsibilities was reviewed and updated by Bristol SU Directors, Bristol SU Executive and Governance Manager, The Head of Governance at the University and the SU's University Legal Contact (who is a member of the Bristol SU Trustee Board).

14.15.4 This document must be approved by both the Bristol SU Trustee Board and the University of Bristol Board of Trustees on an annual basis. The SU Trustee Board would be approving after consideration and approval by the UoB Board of Trustees.

14.16 **APPROVED:** the 2022/23 Education Act Code of Practice for onward approval by the SU Board of Trustees.

15. FREEDOM OF SPEECH WORKSHOP (ref PowerPoint Presentation) (on file)).

15.1 The members of the Board undertook a workshop on their responsibilities as trustees in Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom, led by the University's General Counsel and a Senior Partner at the Law Firm VWV.

15.2 The Chair of the Board declared a conflict of interest with regards to his role on the DfE Board, which had the responsibility of drafting the national freedom of speech legislation.

16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

16.1 There was a suggestion from one of the academic staff trustees that perhaps the Board should have a future discussion about organisational culture and values, particularly given the significant amount of organisational change currently underway at the University.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 22 March 2024 (Development Day: 21 March 2024)