

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 JANUARY 2023

Present: Lord Keith Bradley (Chair), Angela Adimora, Simeon Anyalemechi, Professor Dame Sue Bailey, Jennifer Bayjoo, Dr Tony Coombs, Councillor Phil Cusack, Garry Dowdle, Ben Gallop, Philip Green, Merlyn Lowther, Councillor John Merry, Sean O'Hara, Micheal Omoniyi, Sam Plant, Alan Roff, Helen Taylor and Dr Katherine Yates.

Apologies: Professor Helen Marshall, Ian Moston, Festus Robert, Professor Mike Wood and Dr Elsa Zekeng.

In attendance: Julie Charge (Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Finance), Professor Karl Dayson (Pro Vice-Chancellor Research and Enterprise), Dr Sam Grogan (Pro Vice-Chancellor Education and Student Experience) Professor Jayne Mitchell (University Secretary, interim), Jackie Njoroge (Director of Strategy), Jo Purves (Pro Vice-Chancellor Academic Development); Jonathan Winter (Executive Director for HR and OD) and Elaine Pateman Salt (secretary).

By invitation: Lauren Beckett (Director of Advocacy, University of Salford Students' Union) and Emma Lawton (student) [COU.23.07] and Huw Williams (Operations) [COU.23.11 and COU.23.12].

COU.23.01 **WELCOME**

Noted:

- i) that Mr. Jonathan Winter was welcomed as an attendee to the meeting as the newly appointed Executive Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development;
- ii) that Item 15 ii) - *an oral update from academic colleagues regarding enablement of student success* - had been deferred until the next meeting to allow sufficient time for colleagues to return from the seasonal break and to be available to attend and contribute.

COU.23.02 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Noted: that no new declarations of interest pertaining to the agenda were raised, but that attendees (except the University Secretary, Executive Director of HR, and committee secretary) would be asked to leave the meeting after Item 17, to facilitate a confidential update to members on the next Vice-Chancellor recruitment and selection process.

COU.23.03 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Confirmed: the minutes of the previous meeting held on 02 December 2022 (COU/23/01), subject to the undernoted corrections:

- i) that COU.22.101, reported i) [pg.6] be amended to read '*...a review of health and safety risk management at the University.*';
- ii) that COU.22.109, noted xix) [pg.10] be amended to read '*...had not changed...*'.

COU.23.04 **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Noted: that no matters arising from the previous minutes were raised.

COU.23.05 **CONFIRMATION OF STARRED ITEMS**

Confirmed: that Item 19 (Use of University Seal; COU/23/14) was noted without discussion.

COU.23.06 MEMBERSHIP

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, the re-appointment of a co-opted member to the Finance and Resources Committee (COU/23/02).

RESOLVED: that the re-appointment of Mr Stephen Gleave for a second term as co-opted member of Finance and Resources Committee be approved.

COU.23.07 STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Received: a video presentation (in advance) on how receiving the right support was a key enabler to a positive student and learning experience, followed by a deep dive discussion with a student on their experience.

Reported:

- i) that the research conducted by Alterline on behalf of the University of Salford Students' Union (USSU) had identified a number of reasons how students might feel about receiving the right support in their studies;
- ii) that a range of support services and projects had been put in place to achieve successful support to students, and that these included the USSU Advice Centre, disability awareness support, Uniskills and academic e-learning modules;
- iii) that it had been demonstrated through the comments made to the researchers that there was a quite general lack of awareness by students regarding the range of support services available and critically how to access those services;
- iv) that also the USSU had reflected on how many of its services and projects were reactive to student needs rather than anticipating them;
- v) that future student support developments included a refresh of the Reasonable Adjustment Process (RAP), advice outreach in collaboration with Schools, and the relaunch of the Student Led Teaching Awards (SLTAs);
- vi) that a personal experience journey through the RAP, coincidental to the period of online learning arising from the Covid-19 pandemic regulations, was shared;
- vii) that also, a personal experience with learning technologies was given.

Noted:

- i) that members sincerely thanked the invited student guest speaker for sharing her personal experience, and that those members had been moved by the personal account;
- ii) the view that several issues had been raised through the presentation and the personal account;
- iii) the view that it was important for the University to seek, and for the student to feel able and comfortable to share, information upon registration to facilitate the right support during the years studying at the University;
- iv) the view that support systems should be built up around reasonable adjustment needs, and that advisory processes should be in place to navigate students and staff to the right support;
- v) that it was accepted there were complex support needs across large student populations;
- vi) that the RAP review outcomes would be reported to a future meeting;
- vii) that also, the student customer relationship management (CRM) system was to be presented to the next meeting in April 2023;
- viii) the view that the need for effective communication was a recurring theme across the student experience presentations;
- ix) that not all students had a diagnosis or understanding of their needs at registration, and that often this understanding developed through their time with the University;
- x) that systems and processes should be agile enough to be able to cope with changing support needs;
- xi) that there were a range of hidden disabilities, and that it was challenging to understand how to support those students who did not or could not come forward for help;
- xii) the view that it was also challenging to find a way to hear from those students;
- xiii) that the University developed resources to address student support requirements through a student-centric approach;
- xiv) that the Enabling Student Success (ESS) workstream for organisation and management was implementing processes and systems to surface issues and raise visibility of support needs;

- xv) that Salford City Council (SCC) also offered support through its advice and welfare units, and that the member for SCC would find out how those services were targeted and made available to students;
- xvi) that the Chair thanked the member for his support in pursuing this in the interests of students living or commuting into the City.

RESOLVED: that the Report be noted, and that the outcome of considerations and reports relating to student support received at the April 2023 meeting be communicated to the USSU and guest speaker.

ACTION: UNIVERSITY SECRETARY

COU.23.08 **VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

Received: a report from the Vice-Chancellor on key issues affecting the University (COU/23/03).

Reported:

- i) that Neil Scott was to join the University as the Chief Operating Officer (COO) on 16 January 2023;
- ii) that Emma French was to join the University as the Executive Director of Governance and Assurance (including University Secretary) in early February 2023;
- iii) that since the Report had been compiled there had been an incident declared at MediaCity UK campus following routine cable maintenance undertaken by Virgin Media;
- iv) that unfortunately, several businesses had been affected including the University and that connectivity had been disrupted for several days;
- v) that the University had convened 'silver command' in its business continuity process, and had put in place alternative connectivity solutions;
- vi) that however, there remained a concern that the open day scheduled for Saturday 14 January 2023 would be affected;
- vii) that also since the Report had been compiled, 18 days of further national industrial action had been announced for the coming months;
- viii) that cost-of-living support measures for colleagues and students had been implemented;
- ix) that for students this included travel bursaries and from next week the availability of free meals on campus;
- x) that student briefings on the support measures had been circulated, and that the University was to monitor capacity and needs to ensure the offer could be adequately scaled up or down;
- xi) that 3,143 food bursaries had been made available to international students, and that to-date 47% of these had been either fully or partially drawn down;
- xii) that applications under the innovation accelerator funding made available from the Government had been assessed by Innovate UK but had been forwarded to the Treasury Department for final approval and that an announcement was awaited.

Noted:

- i) the view that international students were excluded from the enhanced cost-of-living offer available to the domestic student cohort;
- ii) that international students have been particularly impacted by challenges in finding adequate accommodation, rising costs of travel and costs of UKVI visas;
- iii) the view that increasingly international students were becoming more isolated due to rising costs and that it was unfair to exclude this cohort from financial support;
- iv) the view that it was critical that the University helped its most vulnerable students to find and access the right support;
- v) that regarding approval for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), the view that once shared amongst recipients that this funding would be significantly lower than that achieved through its predecessor scheme [the European Regional Development Fund – ERDF].

RESOLVED: that the Report be noted, and that the Executive meet with the student member to discuss the issues raised regarding international students accessing the cost-of-living student offer.

ACTION: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

COU.23.09 **CoSTAR FUNDING BID**

Received: an oral item of other business regarding funding available from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC).

Reported:

- i) that the AHRC had sent out a call to apply for funding to host a national centre for convergent screen technologies and performance in real time (CoSTAR);
- ii) that application notification had been published on 11 October 2022, and that initially the University had not considered it a suitable application to develop;
- iii) that funding was also available for the hosting of regional centres, and that it was expected Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) might consider submitting an application;
- iv) that a national facility would require a new building and that the bid was for £51m to accommodate this;
- v) that however, Media City UK (MCUK [Peel L&P]) had approached the University and were keen to take forward a bid submission;
- vi) that the lead bidder in any partnership had to be a research institution;
- vii) that the University had provided feedback to MCUK before the end of the calendar year which had highlighted a number of issues preventing the proposed submission;
- viii) that since that meeting MCUK had contracted with external bid-writers and returned to the University with a revised proposal which could result in a viable submission;
- ix) that the revised proposal included MCUK assuming the risk for the new build and that MCUK had identified an available plot of land on its existing portfolio;
- x) that MCUK would also assume inflationary risk;
- xi) that the AHRC had not yet defined the detail for delivery of a national centre in its first stage guidance documentation, and that this included no defined research outcomes at this time;
- xii) that it was expected submissions successful at first stage bidding would be provided with detailed information to progress to a second stage of the process;
- xiii) that the research institution would need to employ staff and that there would be an element of employment risk if the facility were to close at the end of the six-year period;
- xiv) that the University would need to assume this risk, but that if successful it would seek to set up a special purpose vehicle (SPV) to run the facility;
- xv) that MCUK would charge a peppercorn rent to the University for use of the facility, and would privately rent out the remainder of the research space available;
- xvi) that the bid application deadline was 02 February 2023;
- xvii) that the University was currently working in good faith with MCUK to develop an application, and that it was also mindful of the potential to further develop its long-term relationship with MCUK;
- xviii) that alongside build costs, staffing, rental and equipment costs would be funded for six years from the £51m available;
- xix) that the bid application was technically a research bid, not a capital funding bid but that given the value of the award that the Chair of Council was required to approve a submission under the University's policy on financial delegation;
- xx) that the University had also assessed potential reputational risk at this early first-stage submission and had deemed this low risk;
- xxi) that so little detail was known for Stage Two of the submission that it was not considered reputationally damaging if the University were to withdraw once further information was made available;
- xxii) that it was difficult to assess potential success or otherwise through a first stage submission by the University.

Noted:

- i) the view that there was an element of relationship risk with MCUK to be considered;
- ii) that the research reputational risk was deemed low;
- iii) that there was a clear 'right to withdraw' option available to the University given the lack of detailed information on delivery and potential caveats at this stage;
- iv) that the University would be the lead bidder, and that if successful would be accountable for monies made available in a grant award;
- v) that under the terms of the partnership, the University would award MCUK monies to undertake the build;

- vi) the view that there was reputational benefit in being partnered with MCKU, both at a regional and national level;
- vii) that to host a national research centre was also a significant reputational and research opportunity for the University;
- viii) that the first stage bid guidance documentation did not include a caveat on ownership of intellectual protocol (IP) and that consequently it could be assumed that unless directed otherwise later that the University would retain IP copyright and ownership;
- ix) that the potential value of IP to the University could be significant;
- x) the view that whilst the opportunity could be transformational to the University, that it could not be considered orally at this meeting and required careful consideration;
- xi) that however, several members highlighted greater risk in not proceeding with the partnership offer from MCKU;
- xii) the view that to decline MCKU's offer could also damage the University's reputation and future relationship at MediaCity UK campus;
- xiii) that MCKU had taken the original feedback from the University and had re-considered risk and revision to the proposal to the benefit of the University, and that this indicated they were keen to partner with the University;
- xiv) the view that if the University were successful, it could create wider benefit for it bidding to other capital schemes.

RESOLVED:

- i) that the continued preparation of a bid application as described be endorsed,
- ii) that final recommendation to Council be made through a special meeting of Finance and Resources Committee (FRC);
- iii) that Audit and Risk Committee (or member thereof) provide a risk perspective to FRC for its deliberations;
- iv) that Chair of Council be approved to take Chair's Action on behalf of the Council if a positive recommendation be forthcoming from FRC, and in advance of the application deadline.

**ACTION ii): FINANCE AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
ACTION iii): AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE**

COU.23.10 ANNUAL FINANCIAL RETURN WORKBOOK AND COMMENTARY CLOSED MINUTE

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the annual financial return workbook and financial commentary for submission to the Office for Students (COU/23/04).

Reported: - *redacted* -

RESOLVED: that approval for the Return be ratified.

COU.23.11 CAMPUS MASTERPLAN: HEALTH QUARTER DIRECTION OF TRAVEL

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the strategic direction of travel for the Health Quarter (re-development of the Frederick Road area and underlying business case components) (COU/23/05).

Reported:

- i) that there had not been a lot of detail regarding Frederick Road campus in the original Campus Masterplan, but it was now proposed a masterplan approach be adopted for that area;
- ii) that the proposal document outlined how a masterplan for Frederick Road campus, including demolition of Allerton Building as a key logistical aspect for the campus site;
- iii) that it was proposed individual business cases were brought forward as the masterplan progressed;
- iv) that the first business case would be for the health clinics, and that this was due to additional capital funding being secured from the OfS for this project;
- v) that the School of Health and Society (HS) was based at Frederick Road campus, and that it was the largest school in the University;
- vi) that HS had grown significantly in the previous five-year period;

- vii) that NHS long term planning for skills and integrated care systems had been woven into the proposed direction of travel for the campus development;
- viii) that HS was one of the largest providers of nursing and allied health care training in the country, and that it was keen to expand further;
- ix) that however, it needed a vibrant campus and strong clinical offer to attract, retain and develop students;
- x) that modest student number growth of 3% over five years had been included in the proposal, but that this would enable HS to exceed 10k registered students;
- xi) that the OfS had awarded the University £5.8m additional capital funding to be spent by March 2025;
- xii) that integrated care services were a new approach for the NHS, and not its traditional care structure;
- xiii) that there were several million users of care services in the Northwest alone;
- xiv) that physical and simulated clinics would provide significant social value, a 'place-based' approach, and would be a community asset;
- xv) that there was expected to be shortage in nurses in the near future, and that there was demonstrable evidence of a need to increase and develop health care skills;
- xvi) that integrated health care skills included policy development and social work;
- xvii) that the University would be in a position to claim placement tariff from the NHS for simulated clinic hours which would enable it to fund the resource intensive simulation service;
- xviii) that the University would also be able to manage the quality of its student experience in simulated clinical placement hours;
- xix) that there was a significant opportunity to expand provision for upskilling the current care workforce;
- xx) that there was a known issue with retention in the health care sector;
- xxi) that in developing a proposal for a Frederick Road campus masterplan, the School had also developed its strategic ambition and vision.

Noted:

- i) the view that the vision of the School for the Health Quarter was exemplary, and that in particular simulation was the 'way forward';
- ii) that Allerton Building had reached the end of its serviceable life and could not offer the teaching and learning environment required for by the School;
- iii) that demolition of Allerton Building would be required to take place on a phased plan due to its size and current activities;
- iv) the view that the proposal to develop the Health Quarter on a masterplan approach was a natural extension to the overall Campus Masterplan, but that the proposed design programme timeline appeared challenging;
- v) that regarding the Health Clinics design phase, an appointment for the project manager was expected imminently, but that it was acknowledged that the timeline was under pressure for this build proposal;
- vi) the view that potential impact on the development of the Innovation Zone arising from this programme of work should be assessed;
- vii) that accommodation of car park spaces had not been included in the presentation, but that the issue of car parking capacity was attributable in part to this proposal;
- viii) that the notion of 'collision' between quarters in the Innovation Zone was to be considered as part of development for both sites;
- ix) that a car parking survey was due out shortly to assess demand for parking in the 'post-Covid' environment;
- x) that a balance needed to be struck between car parking needs and longer-term carbon footprint goals;
- xi) that potentially the building could be elevated on stilts to accommodate some under-building car parking, but that this would need to be assessed as part of the design options and associated costs;
- xii) that patient parking demand would also need to be factored in, and particularly in light of the public service being provided to the community;
- xiii) that currently 80 per cent of the School's student body commuted to campus;
- xiv) that IT was critical to a digitally enabled learning environment, and that their involvement had been omitted from the composition of the project team in the document;

- xv) the view that a place for the commemoration of Mr. Roy Allerton [late principal of the former Salford Technical Institute] should be considered once Allerton Building was demolished.

RESOLVED:

- i) that a masterplan approach and strategic direction of travel for the redevelopment of the Frederick Road campus be endorsed;
- ii) that redevelopment of the site and demolition of Allerton Building be approved;
- iii) that the health clinic building be the first development in the Health Quarter to be taken forward;
- iv) that provision of new buildings to provide learning, teaching and ancillary spaces appropriate for the future 'society' aspects of portfolio and non-specialist teaching be endorsed;
- v) that consideration for alternative commemoration of Roy Allerton be undertaken.

ACTION v): ASSOCIATE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

COU.23.12 Student Accommodation CLOSED MINUTE

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the University's plans to address limited supply in student accommodation in the short- and longer-term (respectively, a proposal of room nominations for 2023/2024, and the intention to propose a business case for a self-funded student accommodation development) (COU/23/06).

Reported:

- i) – *redacted* -

Noted:

- i) the view that the issue of student accommodation was complex, and that it went beyond simply the requirements of supply and demand;
- ii) that the University of Salford Students' Union (USSU) had written to the Chair to request his representation in the House of Lords on behalf of students struggling to find and access appropriate accommodation;
- iii) the view that collaboration was required between local councils and universities to address the issues concerned;
- iv) that the University had exceeded its student number plan, including increased admission of international students requiring accommodation;
- v) that the student member called upon the University to acknowledge that increased intake had led to a poor student experience regarding accommodation;
- vi) that the student member called upon members to consider a different approach, and particularly in view of the next cohorts due to arrive with no accommodation secured;
- vii) that vulnerable students had spoken previously at Council meetings about their difficult experiences securing accommodation, and that the student member called for a declaration of crisis in accommodation;
- viii) the view of the student member that a message sent to new international arrivals not to travel with dependents if accommodation had not been secured should have been discussed with the Union and Salford City Council before issue;
- ix) that the Chair had received the letter from the USSU and would discuss the content with his fellow peers;
- x) that securing appropriate accommodation was a Greater Manchester and wider regional challenge, and that more widely, city-based institutions across England were particularly affected;
- xi) that following the increase in international student admissions, the University had placed greater emphasis and resource in supporting processes directed at international cohorts;
- xii) that emergency accommodation had been provided, and that a specialist team was working to support all affected students;
- xiii) that those present were encouraged to signpost support services to students in need;
- xiv) the view that there seemed to be an issue in accessing support once 'outside' the process;
- xv) that proposals to increase accommodation would help alleviate the challenges faced by students;

- xvi) that the message to international students to not bring families with them if accommodation had not been secured had been sent to a specific cohort due for admission in January 2023, when emergency accommodation was being provided to the September 2022 intake;
- xvii) that the message had been intended to avoid an accommodation crisis for that cohort, and to further facilitate the University putting in support measures;
- xviii) that it was sincerely hoped there would be no need to advise travel without families in future;
- xix) that the message had only been intended for those who had not yet secured appropriate accommodation, as emergency hotel room bookings were likely not suitable for family accommodation;
- xx) that Salford was a large city that was planning toward accommodating an expanding student population;
- xxi) that however, the building material supply chain had been affected by a number of variable issues including inflation on costs and shipping, as well as manufacturing delays;
- xxii) that it was fairly standard practice to advise international students not to travel with families or dependents if appropriate accommodation had not been secured;
- xxiii) that to-date the University had not been advised of any issues relating to the next cohort of admissions, but based on comments made today would re-visit communications and support channels;
- xxiv) that the University had taken a considerable amount of time to reach the current legal position regarding development of new student accommodation;
- xxv) the view that the student portal should be prioritised for review, and especially to consider accessibility and clear navigation options for student users.

RESOLVED:

- i) – *redacted* -

COU.23.13 **TEACHING EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK**

Received: the University's draft written submission to the Office for Students' Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) (COU/23/07).

Reported:

- i) that it was not the preferred practice to share a draft iteration to members, but that due to the pending TEF submission deadline that a copy of the latest version of the written submission had been shared with VCET, the Senate and members this week;
- ii) that it had been critical to provide evidence of the impact of the University's interventions within the written narrative, and that the iterative narrative had been developed in the intervening period since this version had been circulated;
- iii) that the TEF panel would read the University's submission alongside the USSU written submission, and that the two productions had taken place concurrently and collaboratively;
- iv) that the TEF panel would also consider the wider data set produced by the Office for Students (OfS), and that this included the shape and size of the institution as well as the indicator metrics produced under the B3 and B6 Conditions of Regulation;
- v) that comments on the narrative would continue to be sought until the deadline;

Noted:

- i) the view that it was positive to hear that the narrative had been developed and strengthened during the intervening period since circulation, as the presented version did not seem to have a coherent message;
- ii) that several of the considering fora had reported a loss of the 'essence and power' of the University's interventions within the volume of evidence, and that much effort had been put in to restore a single message of success across the narrative.

COU.23.14 **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR STANDING COMMITTEES**

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, a proposed amendment to the terms of reference for the Remuneration Committee (COU/23/08).

RESOLVED: that the amendments be approved with immediate effect.

COU.23.15 **COUNCIL EFFECTIVENESS AND MEMBERSHIP**

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (GNEC), a proposal from the Chair of Council on matters relating to Council effectiveness and membership (COU/23/09).

Reported: that the University had waited for the regulatory direction to unfold before pursuing reflection on the Council's practices and development of the membership, but that it was appropriate now to address both areas.

RESOLVED:

- i) that the Council members' annual evaluation for 2021/22 be undertaken in early 2023;
- ii) that a programme of work be undertaken on these matters, led by the Chair of Council and Chair of GNEC;
- iii) that a report setting out the conclusions and proposed actions arising from the work programme be brought for consideration to the GNEC and Council meetings on 02 March 2023 and 28 April 2023 respectively;
- iv) that a council effectiveness review be commissioned following completion of the work programme and recommendations made to GNEC and Council (as above);
- v) that the Chair of Council make recommendation to GNEC on 18 May 2023 and Council on 14 July 2023 regarding appointment of the new Deputy Chair.

ACTION iii): GOVERNANCE, NOMINATIONS AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

ACTION v): CHAIR

COU.23.16 **ENABLING STUDENT SUCCESS / QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE AND RISK REPORT**
CLOSED MINUTE

Received: on the endorsement of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team, a detailed report on 'educational sustainability' in the context of the Enabling Student Success action plan. Also included was the University's performance against lead indicators during Quarter 1 2022/23, and the Top 10 Risk Profile was appended on the recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee (COU/23/10).

Reported:

- i) – *redacted* -

Noted:

- i) – *redacted* -

COU.23.17 **QUARTERLY FINANCE REPORT CLOSED MINUTE**

Received: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, the Quarter 1 2022/23 finance report (COU/23/11).

Reported:

- i) – *redacted* -

Noted: the view that the University consistently presented a good financial position.

COU.23.18 **SENATE**

Received: a Chair's report from the meeting of the Senate held on 07 December 2022 (COU/23/12).

Reported:

- i) that Senate had discussed the implications of the National Security and Investment Act which had become law on 04 January 2022;
- ii) that export controls introduced related to both individuals and institutions;
- iii) that the Act covered asset and information acquisition and transfer for research, enterprise and teaching;

- iv) that proposed amendment to the Scheme of Academic Governance had been approved, including that the new title for the committee considering academic ethics was the 'Academic Ethics and Research Integrity Committee';
- v) that a report was received on progress of a proposal to replace the curriculum management system.

COU.23.19 **COMMITTEE CHAIRS' REPORTS**

Received: a report (COU/23/13) from:

- i) Honorary Degrees Committee (08 December 2022);
- ii) Remuneration Committee (08 December 2022);
- iii) Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (08 December 2022);
- iv) Finance and Resources Committee (15 December 2022);

Reported:

- i) that Remuneration Committee (RemCo) had received an update on the consultation period for potential industrial action arising from the 2020 valuation of the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) which was still underway;
- ii) that RemCo had received an update on succession planning for the Executive roles, and had discussed a common recruitment process for senior appointments;
- iii) that Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (GNEC) had considered a number of governance items raised by the Chair of Council;
- iv) that GNEC had approved the annual Modern Slavery Act Statement;
- v) that GNEC had discussed the experience of hybrid meetings and continued to encourage in-person attendance where possible;
- vi) that comments regarding hybrid meetings were invited from standing committee Chairs (to be directed to the Chair of GNEC in the first instance).

COU.23.20 **COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT CLOSED MINUTE**

Received: an oral report of the Vice-Chancellor Recruitment and Selection sub-group meetings to-date.

Reported:

- i) that two meetings had been held, and that the focus had been on appointing an executive search agency partner;
- ii) that following a competitive tender, Odgers Berndtson had been appointed;
- iii) that an indicative recruitment timeline had been agreed;
- iv) that engagement with stakeholders was to commence imminently, and that this included with the Mayor and Chief Executive of Salford City Council (SCC);
- v) that a preliminary discussion had been held regarding the approach to selection at long-list, short-list and interview stages;
- vi) that the next meeting was to review the outcome of initial stakeholder engagement sessions which would shape the production of a job description and candidate information;
- vii) that the Chair would receive regular briefings and that a high level of interest in the role was expected;
- viii) that a detailed update would be provided to the next meeting, or sooner if there was a requirement to brief members during the intervening period.

Noted:

- i) - redacted -

COU.23.21 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Noted: that no additional items of business had been notified to the Chair.

COU.23.22 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Reported: that the next meeting was scheduled for Friday 28 April 2023.