



## University Executive Board

### Minutes of the meeting of 10 January 2023

---

**Present:** Professor Shearer West (Vice-Chancellor), Neil Crout (PVC RKE), Dr Paul Greatrix (Registrar), Professor Jeremy Gregory (FPVC Arts) David Hill (CDO), Jaspal Kaur (Director of Human Resources), Professor Sam Kingman (FPVC Engineering), Professor Todd Landman (FPVC Social Sciences), Professor Katherine Linehan (PVC EDI and People) Professor Nick Miles (Provost UNNC) via Teams, Professor Jane Norman (DVC), Professor Robert Mokaya (PVC GE), Professor Sarah Speight (PVC ESE), Margaret Monckton (CFO), Professor Sir Jonathan Van-Tam (FPVC Medicine and Health Sciences), Professor Zoe Wilson (FPVC Science).

**Attending:** Rowena Hall (Secretary), Kylie Colvin (Chief Strategy and Operations Director, UNM), Professor Musa Mangena, (NUBS), Professor Praminda Caleb-Solly, (Computer Science), Andy Nolan (Operations and Sustainability Director) for minute 23.04, Katherine Tallant (Faculty Operations Director) for minute 23.04, Professor David Park, (NUBS via Teams) for minute 23.05, Caroline Glendenning-Platt (Programme Manager PPSC) for minute 23.05, Dr Lucy Jones (Director of EDI, Faculty of Arts) for minute 23.06, Sarah Wilson (EDI Coordinator) for minute 23.06, Alison Reeves (Associate Director for Education Excellence Support) for minute 23.07, Nalayini Thambar (Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change) for minute 23.08, Jason Carter (Director of Governance and Assurance) for minutes 23.09, Kev Thompson (Associate Director Risk Management) for minute 23.09.

**Apologies:** Professor Sarah Metcalfe (Provost UNM)

---

#### 23.01 Welcome, Apologies, Quoracy and Declarations of Interest

- .1 The Chair welcomed Kylie Colvin (Chief Strategy and Operations Director, UNM) and the Vice-Chancellor's Mentees, Professor Musa Mangena (NUBS), and Professor Praminda Caleb-Solly (Computer Science), to the meeting as observers.
- .2 The Secretary confirmed that the meeting was quorate and there were no declarations of interest.

#### 23.02 Minutes of 6 December 2022 and Action Log

- .1 The minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2022 were confirmed as a true record.
- .2 The Action Tracker was NOTED.

#### 23.03 Chair's business

- .1 The Vice-Chancellor had circulated an update to UEB members prior to the meeting.
- .2 UEB reflected on the University's activities and achievements in the last year with focus on a number of leadership changes across the University and the positive progress achieved in some of the University's larger strategic projects.



### 23.04 Future Estate for the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/02) presented by the FPVC MHS which outlined high-level options regarding the future of space at the Queen's Medical Centre, City Hospital and Medical School Building.
- .2 Context for the paper was provided by the Faculty Operations Director and included detail on the Government's New Hospital Programme and the Nottingham University Hospitals Trust (NUHT) planned major investment programme 'Tomorrow's NUH'. The space challenges related to NUHT, which were experienced across multiple sites, were outlined along with the outcome of the latest building condition survey undertaken on the Medical School Building.
- .3 The current condition and locations of the estate impacted the Faculty's ability to achieve KPI targets and increased challenges around the delivery of the Bio Support Unit's activities. The need for significant investment in the Faculty's space aligned to the University's and NUHT's vision and ambition was clear.
- .4 A full options analysis for the future of the Faculty's estate had been developed and was considered by the Estates and Infrastructure Committee. Two options were supported for further consideration: 1) Deep retrofit of the Medical School Building and construction of BDI 4, and 2) Retain A floor Medical School Building, and construction of a Health Education Building and BDI 4.
- .5 Development of either option would require integration with the Tomorrow's NUH project and alignment with University strategy. The development work would be complex in both scope and scale; therefore a six-month discovery project was proposed to undertake wider engagement activities and develop the options, focusing primarily on the two preferred options.
- .6 The importance of involving students and recent alumni at all stages of the development of the project, including the discovery phase, was highlighted by the PVC ESE. The project had the potential to have a significant impact on University KPIs, and during the course of building works, students were likely to experience significant disruption. It would be important to current students to feel that they had been consulted and involved in the development of the plans.
- .7 It was NOTED that even if it were decided to build a Health Education Building, the lead-in time for the project would mean that the capital backlog programme would still need to progress to undertake remedial work to the Medical School Building.
- .8 UEB NOTED that the focus of the paper presented was decision making around the physical estate. Assurance was sought that the longer-term vision for the School of Medicine was a reimagining of the provision of medical education. The FPVC MHS confirmed that the duration of the project would provide sufficient time to ensure that the necessary changes to the culture of the School could be achieved.
- .9 UEB AGREED the commissioning of a six-month discovery project to scope out the full details of the options presented. The proposal for the discovery project and a request for required resources should be submitted to Planning and Resources Committee in due course.

### 23.05 NUBS Quality Enhancement and Growth Investment Business Case – Phase one

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/03) presented by the FPVC Social Sciences which proposed investment in the Nottingham University Business School (NUBS).
- .2 UEB NOTED the following:
  - .1 The business case focussed on the size and shape of NUBS, quality enhancement across core education and research performance, and school culture.
  - .2 Proposed student growth was moderate. More ambitious growth strategies would be included in phase two.



- .3 Investment as set out in the business case would allow NUBS to meet its current KPI targets by 2025 in four key areas. Achieving those targets was unlikely without additional investment.
- .4 The current view from NUBS staff was mixed in connection with plans to deliver Executive Education and PGT courses at Castle Meadow Campus. There was a clear group of early adopters, a middle group of colleagues who were seeking greater clarity in a number of areas, and a group of colleagues who continued to remain dissatisfied with plans for Castle Meadow Campus. Significant activity was underway to work with the middle group of colleagues to ensure that the benefits of the proposed move could be identified and realised.
- .3 A number of suggestions were made for further consideration:
  - .1 Ensuring that the School had enough expert resource to deliver the culture change envisaged by the business case, particularly given the importance of delivering the change and the significant time it would take.
  - .2 Closer engagement with the Education Excellence team to ensure that PTES data was considered alongside NSS data.
  - .3 Given the level of curriculum change proposed, how to ensure that the Deputy Registrar was fully aware of the timing of activities which would have an impact on the operational teams in Registry and Academic Affairs.
  - .4 To explore opportunities for opening Castle Meadow Campus more regularly to all staff.
- .4 UEB was supportive of the revised business case and its approach to addressing quality issues within NUBS and establishing the right conditions for future growth, potential additional investment and the move to Castle Meadow Campus. UEB NOTED that the business case would be submitted to Planning and Resources Committee for consideration and approval.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.5	To consider opportunities to encourage more staff to visit and spend time at Castle Meadow Campus.	FPVC Arts, Castle Meadow Campus Programme Director.	28 February 2023

**23.06 Stonewall Review**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/04) presented by the PVC EDI and People. The paper provided the key findings and recommendations resulting from a review which considered whether the University should renew its membership of Stonewall’s Diversity Champions Programme.
- .2 An overview of the key findings of the review was presented. UEB NOTED that:
  - .1 Stonewall’s current positioning had led to a number of organisations distancing themselves from it.
  - .2 There had been a low response rate to the staff and student consultation survey and responses had not provided a conclusive position. Of the responses received, a number indicated that the LGBTQIA+ community did not yet feel fully supported and included at the University, and that membership of Stonewall increased the sense of safety on campus as result of its strong message of inclusivity to trans people.
  - .3 It was the ambition of the PVC EDI and People that the University reached a place where there was strong sense of inclusivity amongst all staff and students which would allow the University to be less reliant on organisations such as Stonewall.
  - .4 Most workplace training providers were not LGBTQIA+ specialists. Stonewall was the only organisation which also offered visible accreditation/charter marks.



- .5 The University had not fully exploited its Diversity Champions membership to date, and more effective use of it could be made.
- .6 As Stonewall did not provide legal advice, guidance should be sought from the University’s external lawyers as required.
- .7 Continued membership, together with a large number of other universities, including most of the Russell Group, provided an opportunity to feed into, and play a part in influencing, the future positioning of Stonewall.
- .8 The recommendation from the LGBTQIA+ steering group was that the membership should be renewed. A full and comprehensive report of the research underpinning the recommendation had been considered and endorsed by the EDI Committee.
- .3 UEB AGREED the following recommendations:
  - .1 The University’s membership of Stonewall’s Diversity Champions Programme should be renewed.
  - .2 The benefits of the Stonewall membership should be maximised and the impact measured.
  - .3 Regular reviews of the University’s membership of Stonewall and other external organisations advising the University on EDI matters should be conducted.
- .4 UEB further AGREED that the outcome of the review and the decision to renew the University’s membership of Stonewall should be communicated with care to staff and students and work should continue to engage with different groups within the University community to understand the support they needed. A reaffirmation of the University’s Freedom of Speech policy should accompany the communication.
- .5 UEB thanked the LGBTQIA+ Steering Group for its thoughtful and diligent work to carry out the consultation and develop the review report and its recommendations. The importance of, and sensitivities around, conducting such a review were acknowledged.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.6	To communicate the details of the review and the decision to renew the University’s Stonewall membership	VC, PVC EDI and People, Director of Communications and Advocacy.	14 February 2023

**23.07 Teaching Excellence Framework**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/08) from the PVC ESE which included the University’s draft Teaching Excellence Framework submission. UEB was asked to comment on the draft submission.
- .2 The PVC ESE provided an overview of the current context of the draft and affirmed that the TEF submissions were retrospective and were required to focus on 2018-22.
- .3 UEB acknowledged the significant progress of the draft submission since it was seen at the Senior Leaders’ Forum.
- .4 Suggestions for further refinement included:
  - .1 Reference to faith and belief and the correlation between protected characteristics and a sense of belonging.
  - .2 Reference to initiatives for students with neuro-diversities.
  - .3 Consider whether references to BAME students should be revised.



- .4 Ensuring consistency as to whether data was referenced or TEF indicators used such as 'material'.
- .5 Final review of the appropriate use of student surveys: NSES, SEM and Covid-19 survey data.
- .6 Review of the conclusion to ensure that it related clearly to the earlier parts of the submission, and it culminated in a sufficiently positive note.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.5	To consider and incorporate where appropriate the suggestions made by UEB during the meeting prior to the TEF's submission.	PVC ESE	19 January

**23.08 Performance Framework Bi-annual Performance Report**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/11) from the FPVC Engineering in his role as Chair of Planning and Resources Committee (PRC), and the Director of Planning, Performance and Strategic Change.
- .2 The report which would be received twice a year included:
  - .1 An overview of PRC's approach to performance monitoring and management.
  - .2 The Chair's management opinion resulting from the faculty and professional services quarterly performance reviews including a summary of risks by theme and recommended mitigations.
  - .3 Performance reports for each KPI and an update from each Senior Responsible Owner
- .3 It was RECOMMENDED that a mechanism was used to track the ownership and implementation of the recommended mitigations.
- .4 UEB DISCUSSED and NOTED the report.

**23.09 Council Risk**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/06) from the Director of Governance and Assurance which provided an overview of the approach on risk reporting to Council requested by the Chair of Council.
- .2 Reporting to Council would outline:
  - .1 New risks that had not previously been advised to Council.
  - .2 Existing risks that had seen a significant increase in score or severity.
  - .3 Risks that had not been sufficiently managed due to inadequate or failing mitigations.
  - .4 Risks that had de-escalated or closed and removed from the top-level register.
- .3 It was NOTED that risk reporting at Council would be presented by the DVC.
- .4 To facilitate the reporting to Council it would be necessary for more frequent updates to risks from risk owners, PPSC and Finance. More proactive management and updating of risks under their management and oversight would be required by UEB sub-committees. UEB NOTED ongoing activity designed to support committees to achieve this which included planned changes to committee operations and a PRC risk workshop.



- .4 UEB AGREED the move to more frequent risk updates to Council and that respective areas should commit the required levels of engagement, time and resource to fulfil the reporting and updating requirements necessary to meet the commitment to Council.

	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>	<b>DUE</b>
.5	To consider and discuss the presentation of the next risk report to Council.	DVC	7 March

**23.10 Post-REF Review Summary**

- .1 UEB RECEIVED the paper (UEB/23/010) from the PVC RKE which provided a summary of outcomes from the post-REF review conducted by Faculties, and identified actions that could be taken at University level.
- .2 UEB NOTED that many of the identified actions aligned with existing plans for the Research SDP. However, UEB was asked to consider in particular the issues raised in the paper which related to rolling output assessment, improved systems, and Appraisal and Development Conversations (ADC)/promotion.
- .3 There was support for mandating rolling internal peer assessment of selected outputs. The FPVC Social Sciences confirmed that the first round of rolling review in the Faculty of Social Sciences had been insightful.
- .4 It was NOTED that there was an initiative included in the Research SDP to look at ensuring internal systems and processes supported research. The PVC RKE reiterated that determined sponsorship and engagement would be required to ensure that it was effective.
- .5 The potential for personal research plans to support individual career and promotion prospects and drive research excellence was acknowledged.
- .6 The following suggestions were made for further consideration:
  - .1 Smaller and consistently trained groups of peer reviewers. The Faculty of Arts had recently agreed to move to a smaller cadre of reviewers.
  - .2 The potential opportunities for working in parallel with Education and Student Experience to consider career progression for research and teaching staff.
- .7 The PVC RKE confirmed that the REF Steering Group would be reconvened in the spring.
- .8 UEB NOTED the report and that progress in the implementation of actions would be reported as part of the Research SDP.