



MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Thursday 27 May 2021

Meeting held via Zoom

MINUTES

Present: Mr J Boyer (Chair), Professor H Brady (Vice-Chancellor), Dr M Bhabuta (part-meeting), Ms G Bowen, Professor A Carr, Ms J Cecil, Professor S Ellwood, Ms L Fletcher, Mr N Joicey, Dr J Khawaja, Ms Ore Odubiyi, Mr J Palmer, Mr A Poolman (Treasurer), Dr A Raffel, Mr M Saddiq, Mr S Robertson, Professor J Squires (Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC) and Provost), Professor K Syrett.

Secretary: Lucinda Parr

In attendance: Sarah Clarke (part-meeting), Kiran Sithamparapillai (part-meeting), Robert Kerse, Hannah Quinn (Clerk and Head of Governance).

Apologies: None

1 WELCOMES, APOLOGIES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members, noting that this was an additional Board meeting to enable discussion of strategic items.
- 1.2 The Board APPROVED the nomination of Sarah Clarke as a Student Trustee on the Board of Trustees for a one-year term from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022 on the recommendation of Nominations Committee.
- 1.3 The Board APPROVED the nomination of Kiran Sithamparapillai as a Student Trustee on the Board of Trustees for a one-year term from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022 on the recommendation of Nominations Committee.

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

- 2.1 No new declarations

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 3.1 The minutes of the Development Day on 25 March 2021 were APPROVED as a fair and accurate record.
- 3.2 The minutes of the Board meeting of 26 March 2021 were APPROVED as a fair and accurate record, subject to minor changes.

4 ACTIONS & MATTERS ARISING

- 4.1 Noted the action register and that completed actions would be removed from the register.

5 VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT AND QUESTIONS

- 5.1 The following points were NOTED:
 - 5.1.1 Recent developments in funding policy in relation to tuition fees and research funding. Higher Education funding policy would be reviewed as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review in the autumn and could include

- consideration of the Augar recommendations. The University was influencing the debate and modelling emerging scenarios.
- 5.1.2 Pressure on the Treasury in relation to research and innovation funding policy. That more than £1bn would be required to fund full association with Horizon Europe and the source of funds for next year was unclear, with the decision to be made in the context of the CSR.
 - 5.1.3 That the University had met the recent cut in Overseas Development Assistance funding with internal funds, which had been well received.
 - 5.1.4 The announcement of plans for additional freedom of speech legislation. Concerns had been raised as to the need for this legislation, and the potential for universities to be exposed to additional expense and bureaucratic burden.
 - 5.1.5 Recent local elections which had seen Marvin Rees re-elected as Mayor of Bristol but with a Council composed equally of Green and Labour members. The Vice-Chancellor had engaged with the Mayor and conversations were ongoing to align plans. Opportunities to work with the Green Party particularly around the development of the Civic University Agreement. The Vice-Chancellor had also spoken to the new Labour WECA Mayor who was well briefed on Temple Quarter.
 - 5.1.6 The development of the Applied Digital Accelerator, the first proposal at scale from the Western Gateway partnership. A workshop had taken place with regional political, research and industry leaders to develop the proposal further and Bristol academics were leading in many areas.
 - 5.1.7 Disappointment at the Government's plans for a delayed return to campus.
 - 5.1.8 A recent difficult operational issue with the University's virtual learning environment which had impacted the assessment of 2,500 students largely in Engineering. The Registrar and the Chief Information Officer had led the response, working with students and Faculties and the supplier as well as additional mitigation in scheduling of assessment. An interim report had been compiled and a full report would follow.
 - 5.1.9 The volume of planning activity around A Level results and admissions and academic planning for next year, with no government guidance. Advice was being taken from the Scientific Advisory Group (SAG) and Public Health England (PHE).
 - 5.1.10 The recent re-opening of Senate House and the positive reception from students to the new facilities. All Trustees were welcomed to visit.
 - 5.1.11 The recent launch of the Pfizer Centre of Excellence for Epidemiology of Vaccine-preventable Diseases, attended by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. Other research events, including an event with GCHQ to mark a £20m investment in the Heilbronn Institute and a visit to Unit DY.
 - 5.1.12 That there had been good quality, granular engagement on the development of the University Strategy from leaders across institution. Key points from discussion had included an acceptance of the constraints of the funding model, opportunities to develop partnerships at scale, the importance of our cultural and civic mission. There was a better understanding of the role of Temple Quarter to deliver on the strategy and its funding model.
 - 5.1.13 That Erik Lithander, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Global Engagement had accepted a position as Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Strategic Engagement at the University of Auckland. The Vice-Chancellor commended Erik for his work on the International Foundation Programme, partnerships and internationalisation. He would leave at the end of August 2021.

5.2 The following points were DISCUSSED:

- 5.2.1 The University's political engagement strategy with regional representatives, and the need to also engage with local Conservative MPs. The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that an engagement programme was in place however efforts were being intensified. [REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests].
- 5.2.2 The recent Blackboard disruption and the potential to run a suite of products to ensure back ups were in place. The Registrar confirmed that expected

- testing had taken place and that software issues were front of mind for future development of blended learning.
- 5.2.3 The opportunity to engage with the Green Party locally where we have issues in common, and the need to anticipate their potential to become the main party in Bristol. The potential impact of local politics on allocation of government funding. The Vice-Chancellor noted that the institution needed to be prepared to stand alone financially, and not rely on capital investment.
- 5.2.4 The importance of working in partnership with other institutions to access levelling up funds, and examples of partnership with other institutions.
- 5.2.4 How the University could maximise post-Covid research funding and the use of particular research vehicles including the HVMC and NCC, which would be covered further in paper 063.

6 STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP (reference BT/20-21/059)

- 6.1 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost introduced the item. The Pro Vice-Chancellor Global Engagement (Erik Lithander), the Pro Vice-Chancellor Education (Tansy Jessop), the Chief People Officer (Clare Buchanan), the Dean Faculty of Social Sciences & Law (Simon Tormey) the Director of Strategy, Planning and Change (Steve Chadwick), and Senior Project Manager (Clare Parekh) also attended, supported by a presentation.
- 6.2 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost introduced the Strategy White Paper, noting that the presentation would focus on key areas of education, blended working and the Business school, and look at consultation and timelines. The following points were NOTED:
 - 6.2.1 That the green paper questions had been widely consulted on and feedback had been used to inform the drafting of the White paper.
 - 6.2.2 That the overarching aim was to strengthen the University's reputation and regain a global top 50 position, whilst reflecting key institutional values of being progressive, collegial and civic. That the values were subject to further consultation
 - 6.2.3 That each pillar, theme and enabler would also have a sub-strategy with targets and measurable deliverables and an implementation plan. These would be presented in a digital format which was intended to be interactive and accessible with video clips, definitions, case studies and vignettes.
- 6.3 The Chair expressed congratulations on behalf of the Board to Erik Lithander, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Global Engagement on his new role, and thanked him for his contributions.
- 6.4 The following points were DISCUSSED:
 - 6.4.1 The potential to consider the use of ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance) in place of Sustainability to reflect the trend in corporate organisations. A preference for the use of inclusive language in the drafting.
 - 6.4.2 The need to embed EDI in all of the pillars, and to capture interdependencies between the themes, ensuring no gaps. The importance of drawing out the relationship between EDI and the aspiration to being a global top 50 institution.
 - 6.4.3 The opportunity to be explicit about Bristol's unique selling points, and the difference that the strategy will make to the institution and to stakeholders.
 - 6.4.4 How students would be consulted on the values, and whether they would resonate with students. The DVC & Provost confirmed consultation was being planned and noted the challenges of the time of year.
 - 6.4.5 The potential to be world leading, but working locally and the need to define Global Civic. Noted the alignment of the Global Civic agenda with the values of being bold & Bristolian, and the desire to work with our communities to co-create and find answers to global questions.

6.5 The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education addressed the Board. The following points were NOTED:

- 6.5.1 That the Education & Students sub-strategy would set out what made Bristol distinctive, with an inclusive and accessible, research rich education and distinctive physical and digital learning environments. It was about transforming education from a transmission model to one of active participation, fostering knowledge generation and fulfilling some of the ambitions of research-rich education.
- 6.5.2 That the pandemic had led to a step change in provision, with more active learning and student participation online and had provided the opportunity for marginal voices to be heard. There had been greater innovation, creativity, personalisation and flexibility and a more intentional curriculum.
- 6.5.3 That there was still work to do on student digital equity and the tools, platforms and in creating a sense of belonging and community alongside managing student expectations for the return to in-person teaching.
- 6.5.4 That four options had been considered, taken from a recent JISC study and interpreted through a Bristol lens. The first was a return to in person on campus education which risked losing the initial gains and our competitive advantage.
- 6.5.5 The second option was supplemental – supplementing in person education with some digital content. This option risked dissipation of energy, and a lack of distinctiveness.
- 6.5.6 The third option was transformational – a deliberate redesign of the curriculum which would provide a competitive edge and lead to an innovative offer but would require hard work. The risk was that it could occur as overwhelming to staff if they were not effectively engaged.
- 6.5.7 The final option was to move to online only education. This was not felt appropriate for the majority of programmes as the City was an attraction for students, there was remaining demand for a residential model of education, and a need to accommodate practical and applied subjects.

6.6 The following points were DISCUSSED:

- 6.6.1 The importance of finding the correct blend of online and in person learning and the need for a reliable virtual learning environment with flexibility to be able to pivot as technology develops. It was confirmed that the blend would tilt more to in person teaching but that different disciplines would have different needs.
- 6.6.2 The need to consult fully with the student body and to consider differential student experiences and building in accessibility and flexibility for different groups. It was confirmed that consultation was underway.
- 6.6.3 The potential loss of structure in not being on campus and the need to create belonging. The risk to student experience and attainment when belonging was not present, which had been reflected in recent student surveys.
- 6.6.4 The inevitability of a blended experience and the opportunity to pioneer teaching methods which could also support wellbeing and community building.
- 6.6.5 What learning could be drawn from competitor institutions leading in the area. The Pro Vice-Chancellor confirmed that most Russel Group institutions were pursuing blended learning, however the experts were in the US and Australia.

6.7 The Chief People Officer addressed the Board. The following points were NOTED:

- 6.7.1 That blended working was one element of the proposed People sub-strategy, however was a challenge which required addressing in the short term.
- 6.7.2 The pandemic had proven that staff could be productive without being on campus and that there was a clear desire for a different kind of working arrangement.
- 6.7.3 Consultation undertaken with staff and Trade Unions. Two pulse surveys which had been run in August 2020 and March 2021 which showed that staff would like to work up to three days per week on campus.

- 6.7.4 That blended working was being introduced as a whole institution trial from September 2021 and would be reviewed in March 2022 to look at evidence, and monitor the policy impacts.
 - 6.7.5 That a comprehensive plan was in development to cover changes to campus, space, IT and equipment.
 - 6.7.6 The intention to run a continuous equality impact assessment, considering EDI considerations, and how we can support staff who are not able to work from home.
 - 6.7.7 The potential benefits of the policy in providing flexibility, maintaining a thriving campus and community of colleagues whilst supporting staff mental health and wellbeing, work-life balance and workload.
- 6.8 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 6.8.1 How the blended working pilot linked with teaching timetables and whether plans for education were leading plans for working arrangements, or vice-versa. The Chief People Officer confirmed the importance of understanding the impact on all groups of staff, not just in relation to teaching.
 - 6.8.2 The sample sizes in response to the pulse surveys, particularly among academic staff. It was confirmed that response rates were always lower among academics but further work was underway to elicit their responses.
 - 6.8.3 The need to encourage collegiate and nurturing relationships between staff and students.
 - 6.8.4 The level of manager discretion and whether there should be more direction centrally.
- 6.9 The DVC & Provost and the Dean of Social Sciences & Law addressed the Board. The following points were NOTED:
- 6.9.1 That plans would build on and be an evolution of existing success and strength within the disciplines. This would be a distinctive Bristol business school with a global civic agenda.
 - 6.9.2 Research which showed that no other subject area commands such a global market share, mitigating risk and enhancing the ability to recruit students on unregulated fees.
 - 6.9.3 The previous decision to disband the School of Economics, Finance & Management into three separate Schools and the resulting transactional costs. That most institutions had retained a single academic unit for business education.
 - 6.9.4 The role of the emerging business School as an anchor tenant for the CM1 building at Temple Quarter, along with Engineering research activities, in accordance with the original vision, which would drive students and finances, and provide a state-of-the-art built environment, as well as opportunities to develop executive education close to rail links.
 - 6.9.5 That the Business School would be world leading but Bristolian and retain a focus on research. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 6.9.6 The intention to develop in a measured way, firstly, to deliver on current targets and in a second phase, to develop other opportunities **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
- 6.9.7 The opportunity to increase student revenue income and use the surplus for reinvestment in the School and University.
- 6.10 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 6.10.1 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 6.10.2 The suitability of the plans for CM1 to a Business School. The Dean confirmed that it provides a modern, flexible building, in a key location, co-located with partners with a platform to work with the City.
 - 6.10.3 How science and technology elements of business would be incorporated, building on local economic strengths. The Dean noted interdisciplinary

opportunities to work with engineering, data sciences, and digital and creative industries.

- 6.10.4 The potential to attract and build new strengths and expertise within the area and how the offer would be distinctive.
- 6.10.6 The potential to contribute to the diversification of recruitment through differential fees for different markets and the need to consider the diversification of home and overseas recruitment.

6.11 The DVC & Provost thanked the Board for their engagement and encouraged further comments by email.

7 NAMING UPDATE (reference BT/20-21/060)

7.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost introduced the item. The Director of External Relations (Alicia O' Grady) and Professor in History of Slavery (Olivette Otele) were in attendance for this item.

7.2 The following points were NOTED:

- 7.2.1 The University's commitment to be critical and reflective about our past and not to hide our history. The commitment to review whether to rename our key buildings, made in Summer 2020 and the establishment of the Anti-Racism Steering Group with a Naming workstream led by Olivette and Alicia.
- 7.2.2 Research being undertaken on the University's links to the transatlantic slave trade which had two different trajectories, firstly in relation to the funders, their names and donations. Secondly work to understand the longer history and relationship of the University with people of African descent, including Afro Caribbean students who studied in Bristol from 1900 onwards. The research was being supported by Valuola Ojeme and Lillian Waddington, two minority ethnic undergraduate students.
- 7.2.3 That at the end of the 19th century, there was a network of people in Bristol who primarily invested in education and who tended to move in the same social circles. There was an existing transactional relationship with the Society of Merchant Venturers, with a list of around 30 recurring names, including the Fry family.
- 7.2.4 There was a tradition of setting up scholarships for particular student groups and some of addresses of donors are in India and the Caribbean but without a direct link to plantations.
- 7.2.5 As well as the expected names, who were the focus of renaming (Fry, Goldney, Wills), there was also a wider eco system of people who supported the University through more modest ongoing donations.
- 7.2.6 That it was important to address reparative justice and to acknowledge the legacies of the past which are present and visible – economic inequality, health and exclusion among others.
- 7.2.7 The role of the Wills family who continued to trade tobacco after the abolition of slavery, through sharecropping practices which would be considered slavery under the definition of modern slavery.
- 7.2.8 Our commitment to our communities and our students to consider how we communicate and interact with communities, and co-produce knowledge.
- 7.2.9 Consideration of the experience of other institutions, city councils and local Schools which had been informative and helpful.
- 7.2.10 That a full assessment had taken place of all of the University's assets including plaques and named chairs etc.
- 7.2.11 The importance of a consultative conversation with wider stakeholders.

7.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:

- 7.3.1 Positive discussion of this issue at the EDI Oversight Committee and the opportunity for Bristol to take a leadership role in this area.
- 7.3.2 The importance of framing consultation of such an emotive and complex topic, and the desire to understand who the consultees would be. It was confirmed that this was not a binary discussion and would be framed as a conversation.

- 7.3.3 The recent discussion at Court of this issue, and the range of views presented.
 - 7.3.4 The importance of a clear communications plan and careful consideration of framing of the outcomes.
 - 7.3.5 Experiences in relation to Colston Girls School and the importance of student and community consultation and engagement. Similar developments at other Universities, including the Rhodes campaign at Oxford University.
 - 7.3.6 That the research being undertaken would provide the framework and groundwork for the consultation. The research would inform the renaming but would go further and a report would be available in due course.
 - 7.3.7 The political context for this conversation which is becoming more controversial, and recent developments at the National Trust and Oxford University. That Bristol had an opportunity to provide leadership in a national conversation.
 - 7.3.8 Recent receipt of UKRI research funding for a project looking at links to the slave trade across the City, which would be co-created with community groups and partners.
 - 7.3.9 [REDACTED: Information for future publication.]**
 - 7.3.10 That decision making was framed by the Policy and guidelines for the naming of University buildings, centres, posts and awards.
- 7.4 The Board thanked The Director of External Relations and the Professor in the History of Slavery for their leadership in this area, supported the direction of travel and sought a future update on progress.

8 2021/22 BUDGET AND BUSINESS PLAN (reference BT/20-21/061)

- 8.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer introduced the item.
- 8.2 The following points were NOTED:
 - 8.2.1 The draft business plan and budget for 2021/22 proposed a baseline position to sustain education and research over the coming academic and financial year whilst making a selected number of strategic investments to support medium-term success. There is also a contingency sum to manage the ongoing pandemic based on operating experience during 2020/21
 - 8.2.2 That risks remained in relation to rent strikes and student debt and that the budget reflected a worsening position for both pension schemes.
 - 8.2.3 That the financial forecasts would return to the Board prior to submission to the OFS in early 2022.
- 8.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
 - 8.3.1 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 8.3.2 Trustees were satisfied with the amount of contingency and commended the stress testing elements, but challenged whether there was adequate management capability to oversee the planned growth. The COO confirmed that investments had been made in middle and senior management over the past 5 years.
 - 8.3.3 That the lead indicators were positive in terms of the future pipeline of students, the research order book and job applications; however downside scenarios were provided in the paper, considering reduction in research income and a change to UG fee income.
 - 8.3.4 That it would most likely be possible to extend the revolving credit facility and advice taken earlier in the year had provided assurance in this area, **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 8.3.5 The level of internal support for proceeding with Temple Quarter. The Vice-Chancellor had consulted and engaged with Deans who were supportive of the academic future vision and the opportunities for developing innovation, co-creation and partnerships. Additional time had been allocated to ensure a common understanding of the financial implications and the impact of not proceeding.

- 8.3.6 The business plan and forecast student numbers. The COO clarified that the business plan would return to the Board in November as part of the strategy refresh work.
 - 8.3.7 The feedback from potential occupants of Temple Quarter. It was noted that the approval of the Sheds development had enthused colleagues however challenges remained around the desire for individual academic offices.
 - 8.3.8 [REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]
 - 8.3.9 That the Board would consider proposed timelines for the New University Library at its July meeting, with an aim to work towards a 2027 opening. The balance between earlier opening and accruing debt would be discussed by FIC and the Board.
- 8.4 APPROVED the proposed 2021/22 Budget & Capital Programme; noting that business case approval would be required for any major projects.
- 8.5 ENDORSED the financial forecasts as a working version. They will be subject to approval in advance of each financial year in the form of the annual budget.
- 8.6 APPROVED that the Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice Chancellor & Provost be able to re-distribute the £10m contingency held for potential tuition fee shortfalls to our strategy delivery in the event that student enrolments do not result in a call on some or all of this contingency in autumn 2021.

9 TEMPLE QUARTER NEXT STEPS (reference BT/20-21/062)

- 9.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer introduced the item. The Programme Director, Nicola Key, joined the meeting.
- 9.2 REVIEWED the programme update, noting that Section 4 covered the anticipated engagement from Trustees over time.
- 9.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
 - 9.3.1 [REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]
 - 9.3.2 The work to manage partners' expectations of any delay to opening, and resultant impact on other projects and the academic endeavour.
 - 9.3.3 Plans in relation to the Coal & Retort Sheds, which would be brought back to the Board in July, would also mitigate impact on research funding and would allow earlier work with partners.
 - 9.3.4 The link to the full business case provided with the papers and the risks highlighted in relation to the international student pipeline, fee income and residential accommodation. The COO confirmed a £20m contingency and additional philanthropic contributions being sought to manage the net cost. Home UG students would not be a significant population at Temple Quarter, so there would be less impact from the Augar recommendations. Market analysis in relation to the development of the Business School, suggested that the potential for international student recruitment was strong.

10 ENTERPRISE & INNOVATION (reference BT/20-21/063)

- 10.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) and Registrar & University Secretary (Lucinda Parr) introduced the item. The Pro Vice-Chancellor Research (Phil Taylor), the Executive Director, Research and Enterprise (Jon Hunt) and Chief Executive of the NCC (Rich Oldfield) also attended.
- 10.2 CONSIDERED and COMMENTED on the proposals to strengthen innovation. The following points were NOTED:
 - 10.2.1 That the intention to strengthen innovation had been introduced to the Board as part of emerging research strategy presented at the Development Day in March 2021.

- 10.2.2 That research is undertaken in pursuit of positive impact and this proposal helps us to effectively collaborate and to push knowledge out into society. The proposal also responds to the external funding landscape, with recent cuts in ODA funding, to UKRI funding and due to the impact of Brexit alongside increases in funding in innovation and government interest in translational research to drive growth.
- 10.2.3 The likelihood that funds will not be given directly to universities, but, as in the case of Digital Nation, will be given to industry, catapults or other intermediary organisations, such as translation research vehicles (TRV).
- 10.2.4 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests].**
- 10.2.5 That criteria would be developed to create a high bar to set up a TRV, alongside metrics for success.
- 10.2.6 That the innovation landscape in Bristol was fragmented and this was an opportunity to pull together activity and scale it up as well as an opportunity to help deliver government strategies and raise the reputation of the University and the region in areas such as build back better and route to net zero.
Thanks were noted to Rich Oldfield for his collaboration and leadership.
- 10.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 10.3.1 The mechanism for interface between academics and TRVs which would need to provide an easy flow and enable staff to engage. The balance of revenue split between the discipline and the TRV.
- 10.3.2 The opportunity to develop vehicles for different sectors, or different types of investors. The importance of developing relationships with investors whilst incentivising academics.
- 10.3.3 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
- 10.3.4 The opportunity to address sustainability issues and green growth through this model.
- 10.3.5 That this model had been developed following assessment of other HEIs and industry practice, taking advantage of lessons learned, particularly in relation to governance. Various elements had been taken from evolving best practice in the landscape, whilst considering what would work for Bristol.
- 10.3.6 How EDI would be positioned within the research ecosystem to contribute to a diverse research pipeline. The Pro Vice-Chancellor confirmed that this was a key consideration and started with getting the research culture right so that diverse voices and researchers are nurtured and enabled to thrive. There was an opportunity to learn from SETSquared and other partnerships with targeted initiatives in the start up and spin out sector. The opportunity to build EDI into success criteria for TRVs.
- 10.3.7 The importance of seeking impact, not just commercially, through work with the NHS, in relation to health and wellbeing, and skills development
- 10.3.8 Potential for collaboration with other HEIs, as seen from the Digital Nation work in partnership with Newcastle.
- 10.3.9 Options for the University to invest its own money into TRVs. The Evergreen fund, held in RED, for example was a way of storing a share of proceeds from share sales that was reinvested in initiatives. That SETSquared had formed a company and recruited a fund manager to seek to raise a £100m fund to invest in spinouts.

11 REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE (reference BT/20-21/064)

11.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Board of Trustees (Jack Boyer) introduced the item.

11.2 APPROVED the nomination of Caroline Relton as an Academic Trustee on the Board of Trustees effective from 1 August 2021 (see para ref 2.1.5) on the recommendation of Nominations Committee.

11.3 APPROVED the nomination of Ian Craddock as an Academic Trustee on the Board of Trustees effective from 1 June 2021 (see para ref 2.1.6) on the recommendation of Nominations Committee.

11.4 APPROVED the recommendation that a vacancy for Professional Services Trustee is held on the Board of Trustees from 19 March 2021 to 31 May 2021 to cover the period between Kate Ashley leaving the University and appointment of new trustee from 7 June 2021. (see para ref 2.1.8).

11.5 NOTED that the Board of Trustees will be asked to approve a recommendation from the Nominations Committee via email after interviews for a new Professional Services Trustee on 28 May 2021 (see para ref 2.1.8).

11.6 APPROVED the recommendation Trustees that Professional Services Trustees Jane Khawaja's membership on the Board of Trustees is renewed for a second 3-year term from 1 August 2021 to 31 July 2024 (see para ref 2.1.13).

11.7 NOTED the Update on Governance Apprenticeship Scheme (see para ref 3.1)

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 It was noted that Madhu Bhabuta had contacted the CUC in relation to queries raised at the March 2021 meeting. The CUC had confirmed they would make changes to the Code and these changes would be reflected in the Ordinances.

ACTION: Head of Governance

12.2 In relation to the Risk Register, Trustees sought an update in relation to Industrial Action. The DVC & Provost confirmed that the formal dispute with UCU locally in relation to in person teaching had not been formally resolved, but was in abeyance.

12.3 The Chair NOTED thanks from the Board to Ore Odubiyi, at her last meeting of the Board. Ore had served one year as a student trustee on the Board, whilst completing her fourth year reading Medicine. Whilst serving on the Board, as well as being based in local hospitals, Ore continued her work with BME Medics, a student society that she established in 2019 which champions the improvement of diversity and inclusion within healthcare. The Board wished Ore well in her future career.

12.4 The Chair NOTED thanks from the Board to Jason Palmer, at his last meeting of the Board. Jason had served two years as a student trustee on the Board, whilst continuing as the elected Equality, Liberation & Access Officer at Bristol SU. During his tenure, Jason had provided advice and insight to the Board on the student perspective and the relationship between the University and Bristol SU and had been a co-lead on the Governance workstream of the Anti-Racism Steering Group. The Board wished Jason well in his future career.

12.5 The Chair NOTED thanks from the Board to Sheila Ellwood, at her last meeting of the Board. Sheila joined the University as Professor of Financial Reporting in 2006 and in her academic career had led several large studies in financial management and governance in government and public services. Sheila joined the Board and the Finance and Infrastructure Committee in August 2018 and during her tenure, she provided particular focus on legal and financial matters and valuable insight to FIC. Sheila is retiring from the University and therefore leaving the Board of Trustees, effective from 31 May 2021. The Board wished Sheila well in her retirement.

13 Date of Next Meeting: 9 July 2021.