

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Friday 23 September 2022

Burges Salmon

MINUTES

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

In attendance: Hannah Quinn (Head of Governance), Helen Cole (Senior Governance Officer), Craig Butts (Professor of Structural and Mechanistic Chemistry – Item 9), Pat Capps (Professor of International Law – Item 9), Hilary Carey (Professor of Imperial & Religious History – Item 9), Esther Dermott (Professor of Sociology and Social Policy – Item 9), Tansy Jessop (Pro Vice-Chancellor Education – Item 6), Andrew Monk (Executive Director of Development & Alumni Relations – Item 8), Emma Raven (Professor, School of Chemistry – Item 9), Siobhan Shilton (Professor of French Studies and the Visual Arts – Item 9), Jeremy Tavare (Dean of Faculty of Life Sciences – Item 6).

Apologies: Mr N Joicey, Dr A Raffel

1 WELCOMES, APOLOGIES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members, and noted apologies.
- 1.2 The Board congratulated:
 - 1.2.1 Mohammed Saddiq on his appointment to the role of Lord Lieutenant for Somerset
 - 1.2.2 Nick Joicey, on his recent promotion
 - 1.2.3 Sarah Clarke, on the birth of baby Alexander
 - 1.2.4 Robert Kerse, on his appointment to a new role at Imperial College.

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

- 2.1 None were received.

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 3.1 The minutes of the previous meeting of the Board of Trustees on 8 July 2022 were APPROVED as a fair and accurate record.

4 ACTIONS & MATTERS ARISING

- 4.1 There was an outstanding action in relation to branding. A briefing would be shared with the Board and the Registrar would then provide updates via her report, with a substantive update in the new year

ACTION: Registrar & University Secretary

- 4.2 An update on Bristol Innovations would also return to the Board in the Spring
ACTION: Head of Governance

5 VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT AND QUESTIONS

- 5.1 The following points were NOTED:

- 5.1.1 Thanks to the Board of Trustees for their support and warm welcome. The Vice-Chancellor would schedule individual meetings with all of the Trustees.
 - 5.1.2 The swift institutional response in relation to Operation London Bridge, and the challenge of managing student arrivals and the start of Welcome Week at the same time. The Vice-Chancellor had attended the state funeral.
 - 5.1.3 As part of her arrival the Vice-Chancellor had met with many different staff and student groups and engaged with local and national media.
 - 5.1.4 The Vice-Chancellor had also moved her team out of Beacon House, into an open plan space in Tyndall Ave, delivering a 45% space saving and a £250K cost saving. The move was also a symbolic attempt to dissociate space from status. She had introduced changes to the Executive Governance arrangements, particularly a reduction in and simplification of meetings which would save approximately 500 person hours annually.
 - 5.1.5 The Vice-Chancellor had engaged with the Civic landscape and had met with the Mayor of Bristol. She had attended a civic evensong at the Cathedral and met key representatives.
 - 5.1.6 She had also held her first livestream with staff, which was well attended, and has been utilising a new VC email address to gather feedback. Surgeries were planned in the coming months. Initial impressions were that colleagues were kind and considerate, ambitious and inclusive.
 - 5.1.7 The Vice-Chancellor congratulated Admissions colleagues on meeting targets and avoiding the accommodation issues which had impacted other regional institutions.
 - 5.1.8 Confirmation of three days of strike action by Unison, and the current UCU ballot in relation to pay and pensions. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**.
 - 5.1.9 That the COO would be leaving Bristol to take up a role at Imperial College. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]** . It was unlikely there would be a direct replacement for the COO and the Board would receive a further update at the November meeting.
 - 5.1.10 That the new government did not have a strong knowledge of the sector. That while not all of the proposed HE bills would make it through Parliament, the Freedom of Speech bill was progressing and could have real impacts on the sector. It would also be important to keep abreast of the hardening of attitudes to China, with the OfS having been tasked to look at the HE sector's overreliance in this area.
 - 5.1.11 The future of alliance with Horizon Europe continued to unclear, although a plan B had been published
- 5.2 The following points were DISCUSSED
- 5.2.1 How the Vice-Chancellor had engaged with students. She had met with the incoming officers before the start of her role and asked them to develop proposals for working together. A meeting had also been scheduled for the Board to meet with elected officers. The Vice-Chancellor was keen to identify a focussed number of issues where the Board and Sabbatical Officers could share concerns and work together. She noted the importance of academic representation and supporting Bristol SU to be effective, Full Time Officers had been invited to the UEB Residential to present their own priorities and to engage with sensitive plans and discussions, thus developing compromise whilst maintaining confidentiality.
 - 5.2.2 That in relation to the departure of the COO it was important to consider capability as well as capacity, noting the scale of ambition in relation to TQEC, Strategy implementation and the general scale of the University's ambitions. The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that she was sensitive to workload issues and the pressures on staff. It would be important to prioritise and schedule workstreams.
 - 5.2.3 Whether any key messages were emerging from discussions with staff. One key message was of wanting to be heard, e.g. colleagues have had ideas which they do not feel have been taken further.

- 5.2.4 Progress in relation to association with Horizon Europe, which generated significant funding. Whilst it was possible to apply for other funding pots, the sector stood to lose out. Horizon Europe also provided reputation and prestige for colleagues and contributed to league tables and institutional visibility

6 CURRICULUM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMME (reference BT/22-23/001)

- 6.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item, supported by a presentation. Tansy Jessop, PVC Education, and Jeremy Tavare, Dean of Life Sciences, were also in attendance for this item.
- 6.2 The following points were NOTED
- 6.2.1 That Curriculum Enhancement Programme (CEP) was one of the key programmes of strategy delivery alongside the Student Experience Programme. While it was led by the PVC and overseen by the Academic Portfolio Board. Deans were critical to delivering results.
- 6.2.2 The programme had diagnosed a lack of programme level focus and an over complexity in unit choices which was leading to a lack of a consistent experience. This was echoed in sectoral research on the issue. While there were many brilliant individual teachers and units, this did not constitute a brilliant programme for students.
- 6.2.3 The CEP aimed to simplify programmes and take a programmatic approach to curriculum design, driven by data. The implementation of the unit evaluation system (Blue) across all units had provided useful data although engagement with the system was at 23% with a target of 30%. Working with programme teams, the CEP sought to reduce, refresh and co-create the curriculum with students and employers.
- 6.2.4 CEP was halfway through a 5-year transformation programme, and was seeing “green shoots” of NSS improvement. Changes took time to work through to visibility in NSS results. The programme would strongly align with work on the new Structure of the Academic Year, which would have a two-year phasing in period. Whilst there had been an overall improvement in the Assessment & Feedback scores, this covered up a varied picture.
- 6.2.5 The Dean of Life Sciences illustrated some of the variations within his Faculty, which consisted of five Schools with 3 and 4 year UG programmes. Their NSS Assessment & Feedback scores were plotted against targets. The Faculty had some areas of excellent performance in the NSS, for example Biochemistry, which had also ranked second in the country in the REF. The team had tried to understand whether this success could be replicated in other Schools. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**.
- 6.2.6 That engagement with TESTA across the Faculty had led to rapid academic change for some programmes and was expected to improve future scores. Engagement with academics had been key, alongside external verification and the authority to give things up. Leadership at all levels was key to driving change.
- 6.2.7 The programme was evolving based on annual evaluation and recalibrations as a result of lessons learned. Some recent lessons had included providing leadership development for key stakeholders, publishing a roadmap with milestones and sharing benefits more strongly to demonstrate impact. The programme also kept a watching brief on the external environment and any changes, for example to NSS.
- 6.3 The following points were DISCUSSED
- 6.3.1 How colleagues were responding to the pace of change. The PVC noted that despite initial scepticism, colleagues had enjoyed the process. The importance was being able to tell compelling stories and link this to workloads and student success. There had been challenges during the pandemic, but also opportunities to disrupt. The change to the Structure of the Academic Year would provide further opportunity to make positive change.

- 6.3.2 The Board noted the helpful contributions from the Dean of Life Sciences which had contextualised the challenges. They asked how lessons and successes could be shared more widely. The Dean agreed that demonstrating impact and telling the story helped with buy in and this could be developed more strongly. He noted the establishment of a Teaching & Learning network across the Faculty, who were transforming and innovating and supporting colleagues. They had recently linked up with Engineering colleagues. Co-creation of curriculum festivals had also helped with buy in and in Law had resulted in an acceleration of the pace of assessment change.
- 6.3.3 Whether there was any tension in maintaining teaching and research excellence at the same time. The Dean of Life Sciences noted the importance of maintaining the staff student ratio (SSR) and the pressure when this is unbalanced. It was also critical to develop a School culture where teaching and education was valued and important.
- 6.3.4 The use of Blue data as lead indicators for the NSS and the multiple relevant SPIs, however, individual cohorts could have significant impacts which could not always be identified. The opportunity to complement the TESTA interventions with work on student belonging.
- 6.3.6 The importance of student voice in the process, and the relatively low scores in this area of the NSS results. The Quality team had chosen Student Voice as a main theme for this year and were working well with the SU Officers, however needed stronger engagement with Course and Faculty Reps.
- 6.3.7 The challenge of interpreting rich and complex data and effecting a change that would make a difference. The potential for skewing of data from big programmes. The PVC noted that large programmes could hide a lot of difference within the data, and there had been a process of prioritising larger programmes for smaller gains to increase the overall satisfaction score, for example with Law. Response rates were also critical, for example in Psychology, increasing the response rate also increased the satisfaction, as the low response rate tended to reflect only students who were invested in answering, particularly students who were unhappy.
- 6.3.8 At a strategic level, whether there was enough capability, competency and leadership to make enough impact, whether the University was able to change at speed. The PVC noted leadership development from the Academic Staff Development team, a more intentional recruitment process in relation to education leadership and the impact of the promotions framework in balancing education with research.
- 6.3.9 How the Structure of the Academic Year would support in key challenges by simplifying programmes and changing assessment patterns, particularly by encouraging removal of content. This would also allow for staff and students to have a wellbeing rest over the Christmas period.
- 6.3.10 How the quality of the physical estate could impact the student experience. The Dean noted the variation between quality of teaching spaces in the Faculty, including local labs and central spaces and the positive impact of shifting to smaller group teaching.
- 6.3.11 What lessons could be learned from other Universities to improve our scores. The PVC noted discussions with Exeter in relation to system improvements in releasing feedback separately from the actual mark and work with external consultants on inclusive assessment. The importance of timely feedback and reduction of summative assessment in favour of quicker formative feedback.
- 6.3.12 Specific issues relating to the experience of joint honours students, who can often inhabit a smaller cohort but have to deal with multiple processes which can vary between Schools. The PVC noted work ongoing with Philosophy and Maths this year and lessons learned from the Innovation programmes.

7. INSTITUTIONAL RISK EXPOSURE: CHINA (reference BT/22-23/002)

- 7.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item.

- 7.2 The following issues were NOTED:
- 7.2.1 The extent of the University's exposure to China, the trends and mitigations. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**.
 - 7.2.2 The increasing emphasis by China on high quality institutions, for example, allocation of residency permits in Shanghai requiring a degree from a global top 50 institution. The skewed demand for disciplines in Social Sciences & Law and Engineering. The importance of also growing the student population from the rest of the world on the programmes.
 - 7.2.3 The role of the International Foundation Programme, the Centre for Study Abroad and focussed conversion activity in mitigating risk. The establishment of overseas offices and a focused set of actions to progress diversification.
 - 7.2.4 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**.
 - 7.2.5 Key indications of the shift in relation to in-country education, including the removal of mandatory English language teaching in Schools.
- 7.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED:
- 7.3.1 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 7.3.2 The potential impact of a significant global or political event in China on the financial risk. Bristol had been more cautious in its growth and therefore had more space to diversify and grow. Revenue shortfall mitigation plans had been documented and stress tested. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**.
 - 7.3.3 Opportunities in relation to pricing and demand. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**. Scholarships could mitigate fee increases by country and increased student diversity would continue to generate more diversity. A detailed review of scholarships across the institution was underway with an aim to spend funds more efficiently and effectively.
 - 7.3.4 How support and interventions could be diversified to provide tailored support for different groups of students, and the variation in City facilities available for different groups. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**. Progress had been made through the provision of the global lounge, budget had been allocated to consider the international student experience and the Students' Union had been commissioned to carry out additional research with students who didn't normally respond to surveys, to understand the diversity of student experience.
 - 7.3.5 That there were opportunities in relation to the junior year abroad for students from the US and curriculum content had been mapped to a US audience.

8. DEVELOPMENT & ALUMNI RELATIONS ANNUAL REPORT (reference BT/22-23/003)

- 8.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Registrar & University Secretary (Lucinda Parr) introduced the item. The Executive Director of Development & Alumni Relations (Andrew Monk) also spoke to the paper
- 8.2 The following issues were NOTED:
- 8.2.1 An example of the positive and extensive impact of the Black Scholarship Scheme on a recipient who was a teacher in rural Cornwall for a group of Schools – at least 500 students this year and a further 20 years of teaching ahead of her.
 - 8.2.2 The success of the team last year and the performance of Bristol as compared to the Russell Group.
 - 8.2.3 That the team did not just support philanthropy, they also provided volunteering opportunities, supported recruitment activity and supported the development of an Alumni community. The digital events programme had extended the reach of the team around the world.
 - 8.2.4 There was an opportunity to mobilise alumni to support progress in global rankings, embedding activity and volunteering to support Faculties and Schools and to think about the Student Experience as a seamless transition from enquirer to alumnus.

- 8.2.5 The newly developed Divisional Plan, which mapped the University Strategy and sub-strategies to the role which the Division could play.
 - 8.2.6 The lifecycle of an alumnus, from graduation onwards, their changing engagement with the University and how this can be capitalised on.
[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]
 - 8.2.7 The potential contribution of alumni ambassadors in 198 countries around the world and how they could be harnessed to make progress in the top 50 rankings. Progress in large gifts over £1m in the last 5 years from legacies, trusts and foundations, alumni and friends.
 - 8.2.8 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests].**
- 8.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED
- 8.3.1 The importance of engaging alumni in structures which would keep them engaged, even if there were no financial return for many years.
 - 8.3.2 How Bristol could embed lessons learned from the Oxbridge collegiate system and recreate those relationships at School or Faculty level. The team were currently unable to service all the requests from Schools but were working through Faculties to select priority areas, including NSS challenges and Schools with increased student numbers.
 - 8.3.3 Whether the funds raised were limited by the capacity of the team, and if there was a need to expand the team. Whilst there was always more that could be done, it was important to consider the three-year average and respond to the data over time. The team was currently appropriate to the income received, but there would be a desire to grow in future.
 - 8.3.4 That Blackbaud had developed a monopoly in this area which had also impacted other Russell Group institutions. They tended to buy up new products within three years of launch.

9. RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK HIGHLIGHTS (Presentation)

- 9.1 RECEIVED the presentation. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item and the following colleagues contributed to discussions: Craig Butts (Professor of Structural and Mechanistic Chemistry), Pat Capps (Professor of International Law), Hilary Carey (Professor of Imperial & Religious History), Esther Dermott (Professor of Sociology and Social Policy), Emma Raven (Professor, School of Chemistry), Siobhan Shilton (Professor of French Studies and the Visual Arts).
- 9.2 The following issues were NOTED:
- 9.2.1 Pat Capps discussed the REF results in Social Sciences & Law, which were broadly in Panel C. This involved approximately 600 staff in the Faculty, as well as staff from Anthropology (Arts Faculty), and Geography (Science Faculty). The Faculty had been rated 7th overall in the UK and 6th for research outputs. When removing the specialist institutes Bristol had been 4th overall and 3rd for outputs. The Faculty were very pleased with the results which had built on the 2014 successes, within a context of significant growth in student and staff numbers. The management of that growth had an impact on the results.
 - 9.2.2 Esther Dermott discussed the particular success of the School for Policy Studies, within the wider Faculty context. Their results had been much better than anticipated. This success was linked to two areas – firstly, a key decision which had been made 4 years in advance of the REF to make strategic research-led appointments, which were balanced with teaching. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**. Secondly, that the discipline had existing expectations and a high bar in relation to impact activities, which included national and international impact e.g. for example measuring poverty globally, providing gender and violence consultancy work for external organisations. The School had also focussed time and effort on their submissions, including running an internal consultancy process, teaming colleagues up together to upskill and directing work to the most useful metrics.

- She noted the impact on results of the size of units - Social Work & Social Policy was the smallest unit to receive a 4* environment score.
- 9.2.3 Siobhan Shilton discussed the approach in Modern Languages which had been the result of several years of hard work from academics, professional services colleagues and research students. The School was made up of 5 departments, aligned around three research themes and had gained international recognition for their research. They had diversified their work, particularly in the area of media, working with video installations, graffiti and gaming among others. The REF success was a combination of contribution to national and international agendas, strategic staff recruitment, integration of collaboration and increased recruitment of PGR and post-doctoral colleagues.
- 9.2.4 Craig Butts discussed the approach in the Faculty of Science. All of the Schools in the Faculty had ranked in the top 5, making them to best Faculty in the UK for REF results. While Geographical Sciences had always been ranked 1st in REF, this was the first year Chemistry had ranked first, and Physics had moved from around 20th to the top 5. This was attributed to a number of factors including, the excellence and commitment of colleagues and the research infrastructure and support available. Key strategic research appointments had been made and the Faculty approach around community and collegiality had formed the basis of the environment statement. The University programme of support was also supportive and useful.
- 9.2.5 Rachel Flecker discussed the position of Geographical Sciences, and the pressure to remain at the top of the rankings. The breadth of the panel and the impact case studies which reached into Science and SSL, including mapping nuclear contamination, climate modelling and CFC emissions. Geography had seen success despite having doubled their undergraduate student intake since REF 2014. They related their success to recruitment and support of outstanding scientists, from early career researchers to professors. They felt that they had made good decisions in terms of submissions and had been supported by the central process. The impact case studies had initially been challenging and the School had needed to develop skills and learning in that area.
- 9.2.6 There was an opportunity to develop further in the area of impact case studies, and additional guidance and feedback would be appreciated. Faculties were likely to have different needs in this area, and impact may not come naturally to all e.g. scientists. It was agreed that support from the central REF team correlated to positive outcomes. Looking forward, Bristol would need to focus on how to maintain our top position in the face of increasing competition.

9.3 The Chair of the Board thanked and congratulated presenters on behalf of the Board.

9 TEMPLE QUARTER UPDATE REPORT (reference BT/22-23/004)

10.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer (Robert Kerse) introduced the item.

10.2 The following issues were NOTED:

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

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

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

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

10.3 The following issues were DISCUSSED

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

10.3.2 That the harbour walkway and the eastern entrance was a complex development with multiple partners and was subject to delays.

10.3.3 That Mike Jackson was leaving as CEO of Bristol City Council and Stephen Peacock would be taking over.

11. REPORT FROM COO (reference BT/22-23/005)

- 11.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chief Operating Officer (Robert Kerse) introduced the item.
- 11.2 DISCUSSED the financial performance for the year ended 31 July 2022 and the forecast financial outcome for 2021/22, including whether management was taking appropriate action to address areas of underperformance. Underlying education, research and enterprise activity for the year had ended in a positive position; however, the accounts would show a deficit position for the year as a consequence of the USS valuation and how it was required to be reflected on the balance sheet. The next valuation was due on the 31 March 2023 and could reverse a significant portion of that provision. Performance so far in the current financial year was not yet clear as it would be dependent on student registrations, particularly from overseas postgraduates; however, the report did set out early thoughts on the current year financial position. Energy costs for next year could be up to £18m above budget.
- 11.3 CONSIDERED the financial risk profile for 2022/23 and beyond. The long-term financial plan and the budget would be presented at the next Board meeting. There were key components of size and shape, home vs. overseas student substitution, IFP expansion and negotiating PGT targets. It would be important to consider staff headcount to maintain the pay envelope.
- 11.4 The following points were DISCUSSED
- 11.4.1 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
- 11.4.2 The longer-term impact of static HUG fees and the need to explore additional income streams, including industrial income.
- 11.4.3 Any impact of the REF results on our finances. There had been an uplift in QR funding, some of which had been ringfenced for e.g. PGR students.
- 11.4.4 That cost of living was a key issue for all staff. **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
- 11.4.5 The need to also consider hardship for the PGR community. The University would match the UKRI uplift in stipends for university funded students, but would also consider what more could be done for all students. There was an intention to increase the hardship fund and ensure it was easy to access and criteria.
- 11.5 APPROVED:
- 11.5.1 That any two persons listed in section 1.7 of the report may sign and instruct Rathbones on behalf of University of Bristol with regards to the Endowment Fund portfolio.
- 11.5.2 The Group A and Group B signatories for the National Westminster Bank mandate listed in section 1.8 of the report.
- 11.5.3 The resolution in respect of the authorised signatories for the £250m Barclays loan agreement.
- 11.5.4 The resolution in respect of the authorised signatories for the £75m RBS revolving credit facility.
- 11.5.5 The resolution in respect of the authorised signatories for the £200m private placement Note Purchase Agreement.

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

12. CHAIR'S REPORT (reference BT/22-23/006)

- 12.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Board (Jack Boyer) introduced the item. The Director of Legal Services (Jane Bridgwater) was present to provide legal advice. The Board does not waive legal privilege on the legal advice contained in the Chairs Report or given at the Board meeting and noted in paragraphs 12.3.1 to 12.3.3 below.
- 12.2 NOTED the decisions taken between meetings and the content of the report.

- 12.3 **[REDACTED: legally privileged]**
- 12.3.1 **[REDACTED: legally privileged]**
 - 12.3.2 **[REDACTED: legally privileged]**
 - 12.3.3 **[REDACTED: legally privileged]**
 - 12.3.4 **[REDACTED: legally privileged]**
- 12.4 APPROVED on the recommendation of Nominations Committee, that Andrew Carr become Deputy Chair on the Board of Trustees for an initial two-year term from 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024.
- 13. REPORT FROM DVC & PROVOST (reference BT/22-23/007)**
- 13.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost (Judith Squires) introduced the item.
- 13.2 The following points were NOTED:
- 13.2.1 The report of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost.
 - 13.2.2 The intention of Sarah Purdy to step down from her role as PVC Student Experience. The team were considering what to do with her portfolio rather than moving directly to a like-for-like replacement, on the understanding that PVC appointments were in the power of the Board.
- 13.3 The following points were DISCUSSED:
- 13.3.1 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 13.3.2 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]** The growth in the relevant subject areas, including approval of new programmes, was progressing well and would continue through the current Schools.
 - 13.3.3 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 13.3.4 A decision was communicated from the WECA meeting to confirm that the recommendation had been carried.
- 14. REPORT FROM REGISTRAR & UNIVERSITY SECRETARY (reference BT/22-23/008)**
- 14.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Registrar & University Secretary (Lucinda Parr) introduced the item.
- 14.2 The following points were NOTED:
- 14.2.1 The content of the report.
 - 14.2.2 A successful and smooth arrivals process for new students, despite the impact of the bank holiday. The Welcome Fair in Royal Fort Garden, in partnership with Bristol SU, had delivered over 150 events, many of which had sold out.
 - 14.2.3 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests].**
 - 14.2.4 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**
 - 14.2.5 There had been a Unison strike which covered approximately 300 members of staff and had seen minimal impact on students. Were UCU and Unison to strike at the same time, this would be problematic as we may not be able to utilise Professional Services staff to mitigate academics on strike.
 - 14.2.6 The institutional risk assessment had been revised, with a focus on respiratory diseases and ventilation. A programme of work was ongoing, and there was comfort around the protocols for outbreaks.
- 14.3 DISCUSSED the feedback in relation to the Good Governance Institute Review and APPROVED the revised action plan.
- 14.4 The following items were DISCUSSED
- 14.4.1 Student accommodation and the fact that every student who had sought accommodation had been placed in Bristol, including students who did not meet the accommodation guarantee. Plans to refurbish one of the catered

halls which was no longer popular and would be turned into a self-catering hall.

- 14.4.2 The key challenges around accommodation – a higher proportion of controlled beds than other Universities but no capacity in the City to grow and the challenges of UWE growing. There was a need to increase bed space supply but also to boost overall supply **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**. Discussions would return to the Board in the Spring.

ACTION: Head of Governance

15. REPORT FROM PENSIONS TASK & FINISH GROUP (reference BT/22-23/009)

- 15.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Pensions Task & Finish Group (Andy Poolman) introduced the item.

- 15.2 NOTED the report of the Pensions Task and Finish Group held on 9 August 2022.

16. REPORT FROM FINANCE & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE (reference BT/22-23/010)

- 16.1 RECEIVED the paper. The Chair of the Board (Jack Boyer) introduced the item.

- 16.2 APPROVED amendments to the Terms of Reference for the Finance & Infrastructure Committee to provide clarifications in relation to the delegated financial authorities (Appendix 1).

- 16.3 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**

- 16.4 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**

- 16.5 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**.

- 16.6 **[REDACTED: likely to prejudice commercial interests]**

- 16.7 NOTED that the Committee considered the emerging Campus Framework Development Plan (Appendix 5, item 9).

- 16.8 NOTED the update in relation to WECA (Appendix 5, item 12) and the positive outcome of the meeting.

17. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 17.1 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost confirmed that she had responded to the UCU email circulated to the Board, as per the briefing provided to the Board.

- 17.2 NOTED that the Value for Money statement would be considered at the next meetings of the Audit & Risk Committee and the Board.

- 18. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING: 18 November 2022.**