

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 JANUARY 2021

Present: Lord Keith Bradley (Chair), Temi Adebayo, Professor Dame Sue Bailey, Dr Tony Coombs, Phil Cusack, Garry Dowdle, Ben Gallop, Merlyn Lowther, Professor Helen Marshall, Councillor John Merry, Ian Moston [until COU.21.21], Sean O'Hara, Adedapo Oni, Sam Plant [until COU.21.21], Professor Susan Price, Alan Roff, Dr Karen Stansfield, Rik Sterken, Helen Taylor and Professor Mike Wood.

Apologies: None.

In attendance: Angela Adimora, Philip Green, Micheal Omoniyi and Dr Elsa Zekeng [from COU.21.08].

Julie Charge (Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Finance), Professor Karl Dayson (Pro Vice-Chancellor Research and Enterprise) [from COU.21.13], Louise Edwards-Holland (Director of HR and OD), Peter Gregory (Interim Director of HR and OD), Dr Sam Grogan (Pro Vice-Chancellor Student Experience), Janet Lloyd (Interim University Secretary), John McCarthy (Executive Director of Marketing, Recruitment and External Relations), Jackie Njoroge (Director of Strategy), Huw Williams (Chief Operating Officer) and Elaine Pateman Salt (secretary)

By Invitation: Ed Moloney (Chief Executive Officer, USSU), Akeem Ojetola (Sabbatical Officer for Business and Law) and Jessica Wilkinson (Sabbatical Officer for Health and Society) [COU.21.08].

Rebecca Bennett (Head of Environmental Sustainability), Jason Challender (Director of Estates and Facilities) and Nia Prys-Williams (Energy Manager) [COU.21.12].

COU.21.01 **WELCOME**

Noted:

- i) that in accordance with Covid-19 pandemic regulations (England) the entirety of the meeting was to be held via video-link utilising the encrypted software technology of Microsoft Office365 Teams;
- ii) that Peter Gregory was welcomed to his first meeting in the role of Interim Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development.

COU.21.02 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Reported: that Dr Karen Stansfield, Rik Sterken and Professor Mike Wood had an interest in Item 12: Total Reward Framework case due to their status as employees of the University.

RESOLVED: that Dr Stansfield, Mr Sterken and Professor Wood would listen to the proposal and participate in discussions but would take no part in the making of a resolution to approve or not the gateway review [COU.21.13 below].

COU.21.03 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Confirmed: the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 November 2020 (COU/21/01) subject to the undernoted amendment:

That for minute reference COU.20.91 it be noted '*that Audit and Risk Committee had reviewed the risks surrounding the GMP tender*'

COU.21.04 **MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING**

Confirmed: the minutes of the special meeting held on 11 December 2020 (COU/21/02).

COU.21.05 **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Noted: there were no matters arising raised from the minutes.

COU.21.06 **CONFIRMATION OF STARRED ITEMS**

Confirmed: that Item 23: Use of the University Seal (COU/21/18) would be noted without discussion.

COU.21.07 **MEMBERSHIP**

Considered: on the recommendation of Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, nominations to independent membership of the Council and co-opted membership of committees (COU/21/03).

Reported:

- i) that the nominations were the culmination of an extensive search and selection process;
- ii) that members were reminded that it had been the additional intention to increase diversity of membership from this round of recruitment;
- iii) that four independent members were nominated for membership of the Council, and three co-opted members were nominated for membership of a committee.

RESOLVED: that the appointment of four independent members of Council (Angela Adimora, Philip Green, Micheal Omoniyi and Dr Elsa Zekeng) and three co-opted members of committees (Claire Sproston, Natalie Walker and Nigel Wilcock) be approved.

COU.21.08 **STUDENT EXPERIENCE**

Received: [in advance] a video presentation updating on Sabbatical Officers' aims and objectives in their term of office, and planning for the remainder of the 2020/21 academic year.

Noted:

- i) that the matter of challenges in finding practical placements had been raised again in this update;
- ii) that this was a 'live issue' for the Sabbatical Officer for Health and Society, particularly for nursing, midwifery, health and social work students, and that some students had been forced to delay graduation whilst their placement hours were completed;
- iii) that in the case of mental health provision, many services had been forced to close for physical appointments and could not offer the same level of work experience online or via the telephone as it was not classified as 'critical worker' status;
- iv) that the University of Salford Students' Union (USSU) was working with the University to understand student needs regarding the new modality of working and learning hours;
- v) that the School of Health and Society was investigating the development of online mental health placements;
- vi) that the matter of placements was a national issue for all institutions offering similar programmes;
- vii) that the policy on recorded lectures had been under development prior to the Covid pandemic, and that it had been championed by USSU as a way for students to avoid gaps in their knowledge when missing lectures was outside their control;
- viii) the view from the USSU President that expectations built up through the University's response to the Black Lives Matter movement, and to address the black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) award gap had not been met;
- ix) that the USSU continued to work closely with the University on matters relating to equality, diversity, and inclusion but felt that implementation of the strategy could be faster;
- x) that the issue of tuition fees and rental costs had become another priority for Sabbatical Officers and the USSU, with student attention directed at the University but that it was recognised to be a sector-wide issue;
- xi) that the opportunity from September 2021 for renewed curricular and pedagogical learning developed from the blended learning offer during the pandemic was a positive

- outcome;
- xii) that the University had written a letter to the Secretary of State for Education regarding tuition fees;
 - xiii) that there had been some reports to the USSU regarding disparity in graduate subject knowledge to enable accreditation of prior learning for professional accreditation, and that the currency of those programmes highlighted was under investigation;
 - xiv) that the recent internal programme reviews undertaken in Salford Business School had led to action being taken for the accounting programme (to enable Association of Chartered Certified Accountants exemptions to be met);
 - xv) that the programme review period for an undergraduate degree programme was normally every five years, and that USSU was working alongside the Quality and Enhancement Office (QEO) to contribute towards programme review;
 - xvi) that members thanked Ms Adebayo, Mr Oni, Mr Ojetola, Ms Wilkinson and Ms Chaudhry (in absentia) for their valuable contributions to the work of the University and for their observations brought for discussion;
 - xvii) that view of the Chair that the lead item on student experience continued to provide valuable insight to members.

COU.21.09

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Received: a report from the Vice-Chancellor on key issues affecting the University (COU/21/04).

Reported:

- i) that the University had implemented a two-month rental rebate for students who had entered into a contractual agreement in halls of residence, with a view to a potential further two-month rebate dependent on the next phase of coronavirus regulations expected in late February 2021;
- ii) that it was not possible to offer a like-for-like rebate to those students in private accommodation, but that a hardship fund had been established and applications for assistance invited;
- iii) that the issue of tuition fee rebate was a national matter, but that the University had invested (and continued to spend) significant sums on online provision, IT equipment, and extended learning opportunities to enable students to achieve their learning outcomes;
- iv) that the University did not intend to offer tuition fee rebates at this time and that it was not aware of any other institution intending to do so;
- v) that the Department for Education (DfE) had published a White Paper on the future for technical skills, which was predominately centred around further education (FE) and lifelong learning, and a number of consultations around higher education (HE) provision;
- vi) that the White Paper and consultations had been expected for some time, and the University had already been working towards strengthening its technical skills offer;
- vii) that as a result of the White Paper, the terms of the post-qualification admissions system and process could potentially change;
- viii) that the publication on the intended financial grant (whereby individual programmes could still be awarded funding) had continued to focus on health and science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programmes, and that consequently there might be less funding support available for the creative arts;
- ix) that the White Paper, consultations and expected changes resulting from the earlier Augar Review in the delayed autumn comprehensive spending review meant the University was conducting significant internal policy analysis and scenario planning which would be shared at a future meeting;
- x) that, as anticipated, the potential changes to the approach for funding and support for FE and HE sectors had been a data-driven process.

Noted:

- i) that the University continued to promote pathways between FE and HE programmes and awards;
- ii) the view from the student members that the University be commended for the rental rebates given and the opportunity to apply to a hardship fund;
- iii) the view from the student members that digital delivery did not provide the same quality of experience as face-to-face delivery, and that consequently students were not

- receiving value for money on their tuition fee investment;
- iv) that the Government's Covid-19 restrictions directly led to the variations in methods of delivery during the pandemic, and that the University had put in place significant mitigation to ensure learning outcomes were achieved, and that it had no reason to believe this would not be the case from its monitoring processes;
- v) that a potential tuition fee rebate without financial assistance from the Government would have a substantial impact on the University;
- vi) the view that it would be a challenge for an institution to consider tuition-fee rebate, particularly in light of the construct of the student loans system;
- vii) that there were also students who paid privately for tuition fees, for example international students, who had a particular interest in the call for a fee rebate;
- viii) the view from the lead member for IT that the University should be seeking to differentiate itself due to its stated aims of digital innovation;
- ix) that the University had provided rapid IT skills and pedagogical development and enhancement for over 700 staff colleagues over the summer period;
- x) that the rate for Covid-19 testing before the December end of term was confirmed at 16.5% of the student body, and that this figure was similar to rates reported across the sector;
- xi) that testing had been voluntary, but had been widely promoted by the University;
- xii) that applications for 2021/22 entry were on track to meet recruitment goals, and this was largely attributed to an expectation of a return to a 'more normal experience' after the national vaccination programme;
- xiii) that the impact of deferred application and acceptance deadlines, or further potential disruption to GCSE and A-level examinations and schools, were not yet known;
- xiv) that, post-Brexit, there had been no further information released on an alternative capital funding scheme to replace the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), but that the University was part of lobbying for a replacement scheme under Universities UK (UUK);
- xv) that, post Brexit, the Erasmus Scheme (whereby students were able to apply to study at a participating European HE institution) was confirmed to be replaced by the Turing Scheme for Student Mobility.

(Secretary's note: a private memorandum on tuition fees from Mr Alan Roff, independent member, and a link to his paper published by the Higher Education Policy Institute '*Student Finance in England from 2012 to 2020: From Fiscal Illusion to Graduate Contribution?*' was circulated after the meeting).

COU.21.10

CAMPUS OPERATIONS (COVID-19)

Received: an update on the University's management and operation of the campuses during the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic (COU/21/05).

Reported:

- i) that the seven-day rolling average for reported cases remained low for both students and staff since the start of the year;
- ii) that the University continued to promote the availability of testing appointments;
- iii) that since the last update, the announcement of the deferred return to campus and face-to-face teaching for the majority of programmes had resulted in significant changes to the post-Christmas planning and organisation requirements;
- iv) that there had been recent clarification that University staff working on campus (delivery or otherwise) were classified as key workers;
- v) that the extension to national Covid-19 regulations was having an adverse effect on student and staff experience;
- vi) that granular monitoring across programmes and groups continued;
- vii) that support sessions had been put in place for staff, for example to understand the University's temporary flexible working policies;
- viii) that there had been two incidents of repeat poor student behaviour in halls of residence which had unfortunately led to eviction action with Campus Living Villages (CLV);
- ix) that the maximum capacity for the mass testing facility was planned at 55% of students and staff, but was currently running at approximately 15%;
- x) that the testing capacity was to be re-calibrated to demand, but with the capability to expand at speed if required;

- xi) that the Communications Team were commended for the quality and consistency for ongoing communications produced for students and staff;
- xii) that USSU were thanked for their input as key members of working groups and their significant contribution to planning and support;
- xiii) that regular meetings continued to be held with the recognised Trade Unions' representatives.

Noted:

- i) that the University response to the Covid pandemic was complex and multi-faceted;
- ii) that the member for Salford City Council reported that the extended definitions of key workers and vulnerable children had led to significant additional strain on the school system in Salford;
- iii) that the University recognised the equal pressures on its staff and offered support where possible.

(Secretary's note: the presentation COU/21/05 had been updated since it had been circulated with the issue of papers in order to keep members apprised of the most recent management responses to Covid-19).

COU.21.11

ANNUAL FINANCIAL RETURN TO THE OFFICE FOR STUDENTS CLOSED

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the annual financial return for submission to the Office for Students (OfS) (COU/21/06).

Reported:

- i) that the OfS had extended its normal return deadline in light of the external environment, and that members would be familiar with the requirement to make an annual financial return;
- ii) that a copy of the detailed technical return had been provided;
- iii) that the return covered a five-year period comprising the previous two years' actual accounts, the current year's forecast and the following two years' budgets (the latter two of which had been approved by Council in July 2020 [COU.20.50]).

Noted:

- i) the view that it was important but challenging in a prescriptive return to balance the data against the financial pressures faced by the sector as a result of the Covid pandemic;
- ii) that the OfS would amalgamate the returns to reach a sector-wide view;
- iii) that reduced rental income for 2020/21 should be reported in the assumed income for the year.

RESOLVED: that the financial return be approved and submitted to the OfS, subject to the adjustment of rental income on the assumed income for 2020/21.

ACTION: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

COU.21.12

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the University's Environmental Sustainability Plan and Net Zero Carbon Commitment (COU/21/07).

Reported:

- i) that in the past three years the University had successfully achieved a number of its goals including:
 - a) Platinum Eco Campus award;
 - b) ISO 14001 (Environmental Management) and ISO 50001 (Energy Management) certification;
 - c) a sustainable procurement policy introduced across the supply chain;
 - d) 12% reduction in waste;
 - e) all building work underway for the Campus Masterplan predicated on Building Research Environmental Establishment Assessment Method (BREEAM) excellent rating; and
 - f) Green Flag Award.

- ii) that the Environmental Sustainability Plan was the culmination of this work and the drawing together of the University's sustainable vision;
- iii) that the Plan provided a narrative to the existing policies and activities, and also a framework for the civic university commitment;
- iv) that the future goals included a commitment to improve the University's position in the People and Planet University League;
- v) that it had been increasingly clear students and applicants were interested in an institution's sustainable credentials;
- vi) that the Net Zero Carbon commitment was aligned with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) commitment;
- vii) that the Government would continue to introduce levies to remove reliance on crude oil;
- viii) that up to 40% of the University's energy purchase was via a renewable source.

Noted:

- i) that members thanked the Environmental Sustainability Team for their impact in a relatively short timeframe;
- ii) that there was good collaboration and dialogue regarding aligned environmental sustainability goals with the strategic masterplan partners (Salford City Council and English Cities Fund);
- iii) that there was significant strategic opportunity to influence and be part of the proposal for sustainable travel via the potential redevelopment of Crescent train station and reduced reliance on cars;
- iv) the view that there was a further opportunity to reflect on the impacts of the Covid pandemic on travel, for example remote working allowing for reduced daily travel or reduced requirements for international travel for conferences;
- v) the view that it would be important to present carbon accounting accurately for Energy House 2;
- vi) that both student accommodation (halls of residence) and staff travel were currently classified as 'indirect emissions' by the Government for reporting purposes;
- vii) that the University had been able to gather initial data last year for the halls of residence in conjunction with the management company and that this had resulted in a first recorded carbon footprint;
- viii) that, similarly, the first staff travel survey had been undertaken last year to capture an initial dataset;
- ix) that there was now an ethical incentive to improve both carbon footprints;
- x) that the Plan and work undertaken to date allowed the University to consider its public position on the declaration of a climate emergency;
- xi) the view that any potential declaration should be supported by action.

RESOLVED:

- 1) that the Environmental Sustainability Plan be approved;
- 2) that consideration of a declaration of a climate emergency be referred to the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team in the first instance.

ACTION 2): VICE-CHANCELLOR

COU.21.13

TOTAL REWARD FRAMEWORK CLOSED

Considered: on the endorsement of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team (VCET), the second gateway review of the implementation of the University's Total Reward Framework (TRF) (COU/21/08).

Reported:

- i) - redacted -

Noted:

- i) - redacted -

RESOLVED:

- 1) that the direction of travel and work undertaken through the TRF project continue to be endorsed;
- 2) - redacted -

COU.21.14

RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK

Received: an oral update and presentation on the University's submission to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021.

Reported:

- i) that whilst the REF submission deadline was the end of March 2021, the University was working towards a mid-February date for contingency purposes;
- ii) that over 300 academic staff would be submitted, covering over 700 research outputs;
- iii) that in light of the external environment, the majority of submissions would be in a digital format but that some original artifacts would be required to be posted to Research England;
- iv) that the external review of environmental outputs had been concluded, and the University had sought further external specialist guidance for the written narrative;
- v) that the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team (VCET) had received regular oversight reports;
- vi) that Research England had offered an exceptional maximum six-week extension to the deadline, but that the University was confident it would meet the original deadline;
- vii) that an extension could still be agreed if there were to be a late issue in the preparations.

Noted:

- i) that there had been a significant volume of work undertaken to prepare the submission;
- ii) that the University remained strong in the same disciplines that it had submitted to the previous REF exercise (REF2014), namely architecture, the built environment, acoustics, social work and social policy, culture, communications and media;
- iii) that allied health subjects had improved research outputs, but that, as the largest staff return (80) and representing a quarter of the total submission, this area also represented the greatest risk to the institutional assessment.

COU.21.15

COMMITTEE OF UNIVERSITY CHAIRS' HIGHER EDUCATION CODE OF GOVERNANCE 2020

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, adoption of the revised Committee of University Chairs' (CUC) Higher Education Code of Governance 2020 (COU/21/09).

Reported:

- i) that the CUC Code of Governance had been first published and adopted by the University in 2014;
- ii) that the revised Code had been published in Autumn 2020, and the University had engaged in a mapping exercise;
- iii) that the mapping exercise was appended to the recommendation paper, and that it evidenced a high level of compliance alongside an action plan to achieve further improvements, including in staff liaison and staff voice;
- iv) that the Statement of Primary Responsibilities was based on the Code, and consequently that a revised version had been included for approval.

Noted: that the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (GNEC) had not explicitly considered how the Council liaised with staff or the potential processes to increase the staff voice at its meetings (Sections 6.2 and 6.4 of the Code respectively).

RESOLVED:

- 1) that the adoption of the CUC Code of Governance be approved with immediate effect;
- 2) that the adoption of the Statement of Primary Responsibilities be approved with immediate effect;
- 3) that the findings of the mapping exercise and action plan for University practice be endorsed.

COU.21.16

UNIVERSITY ORDINANCES

Noted: that the proposed amendments to the University Ordinances (COU/21/10) were withdrawn to enable further consideration of sections noted prior to the meeting.

COU.21.17

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR STANDING SUB-COMMITTEES

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, proposed amendments to the terms of reference for Audit and Risk Committee, Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, and Remuneration Committee (COU/21/11).

Noted: the view that Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (GNEC) terms of reference might also include reference to equality, diversity, and inclusivity (EDI) in its purpose, in order that the EDI commitments made by the Council in its membership could be held to account.

RESOLVED:

- 1) that the amendments to the terms of reference be approved;
- 2) that GNEC consider including a reference to equality, diversity, and inclusivity for Council membership in its terms.

ACTION 2): CHAIR, GNEC

COU.21.18

MEMBER RECRUITMENT AND SUCCESSION PLANNING

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, the proposed Statement of Protocol for Member Recruitment and Succession Planning (COU/21/12).

Reported: that the proposed statement was to provide clarity and consistency in the recruitment and succession planning of members.

Noted: that the protocol would be included alongside a proposal for diversity targets for future membership.

RESOLVED: that the Protocol for Member Recruitment and Succession Planning be approved with immediate effect.

COU.21.19

SENATE

Received: the (unconfirmed) minutes of the Senate Meeting held on 9 December 2020 (COU/21/13).

Reported:

- i) that the Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Enterprise had taken the Chair at the December meeting;
- ii) that there had been an open and honest discussion regarding the operation of Senate and contributions of Senators during the 2019/20 session;
- iii) that Senate was to further consider its standing committees;
- iv) that a posthumous award for a Law programme had been approved;
- v) that adoption of the Academic Integrity Charter had been approved, and this committed the University to lobby the Government to bring inappropriate entities to account (so-called 'essay mills');
- vi) that a report on the REF2021 submission had been received;
- vii) that a report on strategic activities towards enabling student success had been received.

Noted:

- i) that the internal reflections and review of effectiveness by Senate were in parallel with the Council's due considerations on its relationship with the Senate;
- ii) that academic risk had been included in the new CUC HE Audit Committees Code of Practice and the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) would receive a copy of the outcome of considerations by the Senate on its effective operation.

(Secretary's note: for clarification, the Senate is wholly responsible for appointing external reviewers and/or undertaking internal review of its effectiveness, and for establishing standing committees).

COU.21.20

QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE AND RISK REPORT (IN THE CONTEXT OF VALUE FOR MONEY)

Received: on the endorsement of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team, a detailed report on student progression and the University's action plan for enabling student success, in the context of value for money. Also included was the University's performance against lead indicators during Quarter 1 2020/21, and the Top 10 Risk Profile was appended on the recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee (COU/21/14).

Reported:

- i) that student experience was fundamental to student outcomes, and that failure to progress had a lifelong impact;
- ii) that the University had to address the fact it had not made consistent improvements in student progression for several years;
- iii) that there had been a significant collaborative exercise undertaken to understand the lived experience which had led to a single set of actions to be undertaken;
- iv) that there were nine actions in the plan to enable student success, and that these were co-owned by the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team (VCET);
- v) that the action plan focused on cultural over technical issues, and addressed challenging systemic issues;
- vi) that the action plan was not a new initiative, but rather drew together and 'joined up' better practices;
- vii) that the action plan aimed to address issues around gaps in attainment for students admitted with BTEC qualifications, via clearing and those in the commuting cohort;
- viii) that the root causes of failure of successfully pass first time were to be addressed;
- ix) that at the introduction of the action plan 65 programmes had been identified as high-risk, but that since work had commenced on addressing the nine actions this had reduced by 19 programmes (to 46 high-risk flags);
- x) that a 4.6% improvement in first-year progression had been recorded;

- xi) that the improvement would have been partly influenced by the 'no detriment' assessment policy introduced in response to the Covid-pandemic;
- xii) that VCET received fortnightly updates on the action plan, and made decisions on the crucial issues;
- xiii) that it was understood there was significant further progress to be made.

Noted:

- i) the view that the University should be commended for admitting and owning the problem as the most important issue facing its students;
- ii) that cultural expectations were set at the point of recruitment for both academic and professional services staff.

COU.21.21

QUARTERLY EQUALITY, INCLUSIVITY AND DIVERSITY REPORT

Received: on the endorsement of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team, the Quarter 1 2020/21 report on the University's action plan for ensuring equality, diversity, and inclusivity (COU/21/15).

Reported:

- i) that significant activity for equality, diversity and inclusivity (EDI) had been undertaken since the last report;
- ii) that EDI work had been drawn together under a single structure to ensure appropriate line of sight and assure actions were effective;
- iii) that all Schools now had EDI targets and actions plans in place and had appointed EDI Champions;
- iv) that Salford Business School had additionally appointed a BAME Award Gap Champion;
- v) that it was acknowledged the structural work had seemingly delayed the practical application, but that it was anticipated that the outputs from the Black Lives Matter discussions would be revisited quickly;
- vi) that the Race Equality Charter (REC) action plan was due for publication in February 2021;
- vii) that application to the REC had been delayed to July 2021 to enable practical work on the actions first, with the final writing of the submission narrative extended;
- viii) that the Dean of Students was scheduled to meet with EDI staff colleagues to progress a revised BAME award gap action plan, and it was anticipated the timeline would be reported to the next meeting.

Noted:

- i) the view that the EDI-related reports received demonstrated very strong values for the institution and these should be promoted with industry partners;
- ii) that recognition had been given in workload time to staff involved with the EDI action plan or in champion roles to ensure effective resources were in place.

COU.21.22

QUARTERLY FINANCE REPORT CLOSED

Received: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the Quarter 1 2020/21 finance report (COU/21/16).

Reported:

- i) - redacted -

Noted:

- i) that the University had approved the request of the USSU President to increase the student hardship fund by £500k;
- ii) that the hardship fund had also been augmented by a small sum from the Office for Students (OfS);
- iii) that applications to the hardship fund were very active at the current time.

COU.21.23

COMMITTEE CHAIRS' REPORTS

Received: the Committee Chairs' Reports (COU/21/17).

Reported:

- i) that the Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee was for information only;
- ii) that the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee had considered the appropriate governance of 'people matters' and concluded that Finance and Resources Committee (FRC) retained oversight but that Remuneration Committee (RemCo) would be represented at FRC where it required (or requested) additional support;
- iii) that FRC had received the presentation on the action plan to enable student success as part of a deep-dive on student progression and members were unanimously supportive of the University's endeavours;
- iv) that RemCo had held a very detailed discussion on the TRF.

COU.21.24

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Noted: that members thanked Louise Edwards-Holland in recognition of her achievements and high-value contribution to the University and expressed best wishes for her new role.

COU.21.25

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Noted: that the next meeting would be held on Friday 16 April 2021.