

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 NOVEMBER 2021

Present: Lord Keith Bradley (Chair), Angela Adimora, Professor Dame Sue Bailey, Brian Boag, Councillor Phil Cusack, Dr Tony Coombs, Garry Dowdle, Ben Gallop, Philip Green, Merlyn Lowther, Professor Helen Marshall, Councillor John Merry, Ian Moston, Micheal Omoniyi [until COU.21.113], Sam Plant, Festus Robert, Alan Roff, Rik Sterken, Helen Taylor, Professor Mike Wood and Dr Elsa Zekeng.

Apologies: Sean O'Hara and Akeem Ojetola.

In attendance: Julie Charge (Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Finance), Professor Karl Dayson (Pro Vice-Chancellor Research and Enterprise), Peter Gregory (Interim Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development), Dr Sam Grogan (Pro Vice-Chancellor Student Experience), Alison Jones (Interim University Secretary), John McCarthy (Associate Chief Operating Officer), Jackie Njoroge (Director of Strategy), Jo Purves (Pro Vice Chancellor Academic Development) Huw Williams (Chief Operating Officer) and Elaine Pateman Salt (secretary).

By Invitation: Eta Ojiji; Ibrahim Bakoji and Eloise Roscoe (students) [COU.21.101], Dr Katherine Yates (Director of the Doctoral School) [COU.21.101], Ian Dempsey (Head of Financial Accounting) [COU.21.109 to COU.21.113], Andrew Hartley (General Counsel, Director of Legal and Compliance) [COU.21.114].

COU.21.95 WELCOME

Reported: that this was the first meeting of Mr Brian Boag who was the newly appointed academic staff member, and Mr Boag was cordially welcomed.

Noted: that the meeting was being held via video-link utilising the encrypted software technology of Microsoft Office365 Teams.

COU.21.96 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Reported:

- i) that for Item 8v): Oral Update on University and College Union (UCU) Member Ballot Outcome, that some members and/or attendees could be a member of the Union;
- ii) that for Item 15iv): Integrated Report/Audited Financial Statements – that some members and/or attendees could be members of the Universities Superannuation Scheme;
- iii) that for Item 16): Subsidiary Companies: University Letters of Support – that Mr Garry Dowdle was a permanent observer/attended the University of Salford Enterprise Ltd (USE) Board, and that attendees Mr Huw Williams, Professor Karl Dayson and Mr Ian Dempsey were members of the USE Board/Directors, and in the case of Professor Dayson was also a member of the Board/Director of Salford Professional Development Ltd (SPD).

Noted: that no action was proposed following these declarations and that those concerned remained free to comment on the details therein.

COU.21.97 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Confirmed: the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 October 2021 (COU/21/75).

COU.21.98 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Reported: that for minute reference COU.21.79 – *member diversity characteristics survey* – the data collection would now take place in early 2022 to allow for timely collection, analysis and consideration of the data.

COU.21.99 CONFIRMATION OF STARRED ITEMS

Confirmed: that Item 22 (Use of University Seal; COU/21/94) was noted without discussion.

COU.21.100 CHAIR'S ACTION

Received: an update on Chair's Action taken since the previous meeting regarding approval for the appointment of the academic staff member to the membership (COU/21/76).

Noted: that Mr Boag had been welcomed to the membership of Council at the start of the meeting [COU.21.95].

COU.21.101 STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Received: [in advance] a video presentation from postgraduate research (PGR) students on their experiences at the University.

Reported:

- i) the personal experiences of PGR students Eta Ojiji; Ibrahim Bakoji and Eloise Roscoe, alongside presentation from Dr Katherine Yates, Director of the Doctoral School;
- ii) that PGR students undertook unique research and often developed a smaller range of relationships than those developed via the larger taught cohorts;
- iii) that - redacted - had undertaken a masters programme at the University, but since commencing his PGR studies had felt more isolated and less in contact with his peers;
- iv) that it was acknowledged across the sector that research studies were more detached than traditional taught programmes;
- v) that - redacted - suggested that PGR students could be included in masters-level classes or laboratory work to mitigate against isolation and to 'give-back' to the University;
- vi) that - redacted- was a doctoral researcher at the University and had also undertaken roles as practical demonstrator and hourly paid academic;
- vii) that - redacted - experience had been impacted through faulty lab equipment which had been raised with their supervisor;
- viii) that - redacted - was the first candidate to undertake an enterprise PhD which had allowed her to begin to establish a job prior to completion of her doctoral studies;
- ix) that -redacted - felt that the scheme had afforded her the opportunity to apply her research, and that it should be highly commended to other applicants as soon as possible.

Noted:

- i) that research continued throughout the year and was not limited to trimesters, and consequently PGR students required continuous support which was not always available at higher education institutions;
- ii) the view that it was concerning to hear about the differences in experience and particularly the isolation felt by some students;
- iii) that it was clear there were very limited routes for PGR students to make their experience known or to raise issues;
- iv) the view that the Executive should reflect on the presentations made;
- v) that the University would also lose out if it did not make full use of the expertise developed in its PGR cohort;
- vi) that - redacted - was working in industry and not on research one day per week and felt that this provided a positive different structure and experience;
- vii) that there was a traditional view that PGR students provided 'cheap resource' in undertaking academic support (teaching, tutorials etc), but that this was not the view of the University and adequate recompense was offered;
- viii) that however, not all disciplines required (or could offer) academic support work;
- ix) that - redacted - indicated that despite being allocated a personal tutor that this relationship had not been established;
- x) that an academic citizenship programme was open to PGR students, and that this had been expanded from teaching experience;
- xi) that the programme developed pedagogic practice through to a qualification and associate fellowship of Advance HE, but also development of skills for example in public engagement and project management;
- xii) that resource for lecturing experience was through school budgets for hourly paid

- academics (HPAs);
- xiii) that the discussion raised two different issues: cohort identity at a range of levels but also individual experience issues;
 - xiv) the view that there could also be scope to support research supervisors in their roles;
 - xv) that with regards to cohort identity, it was the intention of the Doctoral School to develop three 'intakes' per year so that groups could experience the journey together;
 - xvi) that in-school development had been via sharing of best-practice and this would be further developed over time;
 - xvii) that supervisor training was under development and would include connectivity and peer learning;
 - xviii) the view that the structure of the welfare support provided by the University should be reviewed in light of the discussion;
 - xix) that in contrast to the popular perception that PGR students progressed into academic careers, it was in fact the case that a high proportion did not go into the field of academia;
 - xx) that the University was increasingly mindful of this and was thus seeking to expand the enterprise PhD cohort;
 - xxi) that it was the University's responsibility to its PGR students and through its values as an industry-focused institution to address this issue, and that this included providing more realistic expectations for applicants;
 - xxii) that improvements in employability were a focus for both taught and research students;
 - xxiii) the view that the University of Salford Students' Union (USSU) should also be consulted on ways to improve support to (and the experience of) PGR students;
 - xxiv) that - redacted - ended the comments by confirming that she felt her experience would be the best model for future PGR students as she did not feel isolated and was involved 'day-to-day';
 - xxv) that the Chair thanked the students for providing open and honest feedback, and for sharing their personal experiences with members.

RESOLVED: that the discussion be noted and that an update on progress towards a successful PGR student experience be provided at a future meeting.

ACTION: PRO VICE-CHANCELLOR RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE

(Secretary's note: that at the conclusion of the resolution it was noted that issues raised during previous student experience item discussions should be reported on as a matter of course, and that the Chair would ensure an update was prepared).

COU.21.102

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Received: a report from the Vice-Chancellor on key issues affecting the University (COU/21/77) alongside an oral update on the outcome of the recent University and College Union (UCU) member ballots.

Reported:

- i) that the sector still awaited the outputs from the Augar Review and the Government's white paper on education;
- ii) that the Office for Students (OfS) had issued a high-level consultation on its future strategy, which was notably consistent with a value-for-money agenda;
- iii) that the OfS draft strategy was focused on graduate outcomes but had failed to provide clarity on the benchmark data that would be used to measure institutions, for example the definition of a graduate job or graduate level salary;
- iv) that the Covid Operations Group continued to manage safe operation of the campuses very well for both students and staff;
- v) that it was clear the pandemic was not yet over with the prevalence of new variants and infections, and that the University was continuing to monitor its Trimester Two position statement (to remove social distancing requirements);
- vi) that the University was actively and strongly promoting the use of face coverings in all indoor spaces;
- vii) that members of UCU had been balloted on two items, namely the Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS) pension proposal and the 2020/21 national pay award;
- viii) that regarding the University, UCU members had voted in favour of strike action for the pay item only, and that this vote had exceeded the required 50% threshold by a small margin;

- ix) that strike action had been notified for the period 1 to 3 December 2021;
- x) that the University had convened the Potential Impacts in the event of Strike Action Group (PISA) to manage and mitigate impact to the student experience;
- xi) that UCU members were not obliged to notify the University of individual strike action, but that scenario models had been developed and a small number of 'hotspots' identified in advance.

Noted:

- i) that financial support for Salford Rise had been announced as part of the Government's Autumn Budget Statement;
- ii) that Salford Rise would link the two sides of The Crescent and provided tangible connectivity for the campus;
- iii) that members of the Executive had visited the University of Lincoln to tour the Lincoln Science and Innovation Park;
- iv) that this visit had provided an opportunity to learn from Lincoln's experience;
- v) that the Park had been running for approximately five years and continued to grow and attract industry partners;
- vi) that the announcement of Salford Rise was positive news for the joint initiative with the Private Sector Partner in that it would improve the whole public realm and provide support in the design and planning for connection and collision in the innovation district;
- vii) that ground had been broken for the building housing the North England Robotics Innovation Centre (NERIC);
- viii) that these activities were the first stages of physical delivery of the innovation district;
- ix) that there had been some reports of lobbying against Salford Rise on social media, and the view that there was an opportunity to ensure positive public relations were maintained by emphasising this was not a vanity exercise or 'land grabbing' by the University, and that the project was not diverting funds from worthier causes;
- x) that Salford City Council (SCC) had led the bid application and that a meeting with the Ward Councillor was due shortly as part of the University's support role;
- xi) that members were reminded Salford had been given second level priority originally for potential levelling-up funding, but that the successful outcome was a tribute to the hard work put into the application on behalf of the Salford community;
- xii) that regarding Covid, the rates of infections in the area were rising again;
- xiii) that the University had very few registered students from the African countries entering the Government's 'red list', but that it was providing support to those students where necessary;
- xiv) that the current split between face-to-face and online delivery was approximately 80% to 20% respectively, but varied by programme;
- xv) that planning for the 2022-23 timetable had commenced;
- xvi) that plans were in place to move to wholly digital delivery if necessary or mandated, and that the University had more experience of the capacity and capability required (arising from the previous 18 months);
- xvii) that the University could mandate the wearing of face-coverings on campus, and it had done so in instances where risk assessment noted it was not possible to socially distance, but that unless a public health issue became apparent through the institutional risk assessment (or the Government issued national regulations) that so-far it had not chosen to make face coverings mandatory;
- xviii) that some institutions had done so but had found compliance to be a challenge;
- xix) that the University would review its position statement for Trimester Two in the coming weeks.

COU.21.103 **CAMPUS OPERATIONS (COVID-19)**

Received: an update on the University's management and operation of the campuses during the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic (COU/21/78).

Reported:

- i) that 16 students and 10 staff had reported positive cases and were currently isolating;
- ii) that these reports were not from a single area or building;
- iii) that there had been high rates of infection and rising rates again in the Salford area, and that the University had undertaken a survey of its student body to ascertain why it had experienced lower reported rates of infection;
- iv) that the survey had elicited a response rate of approximately 10% (2,000 students), and

- of the respondees 81% had received two vaccinations;
- v) that one factor of the lower rates of reported infection could be the high level of vaccinated students;
- vi) that the Trimester One timetable had also continued to be run at social distance (where possible) which should have contributed to fewer transmission.

Noted: that Salford was the second highest borough for rates of infection in the Greater Manchester area, and the view that even if face-coverings were to be mandated on campus there remained risks associated with living and working in the local community.

COU.21.104 **ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY RETURN REQUIREMENTS OVERVIEW**

Received: an overview of the University's annual accountability returns requirements under the terms and conditions of funding for Higher Education Institutions, to the Office for Students (OfS) for the year 2020/21 (COU/21/79).

Reported: that the overview laid out the statutory returns the University was required to make to the OfS, which had reduced slightly since the previous year.

Noted: that assurances had been received from independent and external parties as to the quality of the returns.

COU.21.105 **ANNUAL ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT 2020/21**

Received: on the recommendation of the Senate, the Annual Academic Quality Assurance Report for 2020/21 (COU/21/80).

Reported:

- i) that the Report had not been a formal requirement for a number of years but continued to be produced for Council;
- ii) that the Report was a retrospective review of the previous year, and following feedback its format had been restructured around the Office for Students' (OfS) conditions of registration (where applicable and it could be aligned);
- iii) that the University's academic regulations, policies and procedures were well established and fully mapped to the OfS conditions, the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) framework and to sector best practices;
- iv) that further to this annual report, reporting was via the business assurance framework which was regularly received by Audit and Risk Committee and the regular updates to Council made from the Senate;
- v) that the Senate had commenced internal review of its structures and operations, and that it was hoped that the Government's white paper on education will have been published before the Senate review workshop scheduled for March 2022;
- vi) that the OfS had published its proposed strategy which outlined its view of quality and standards, and this was also to be addressed by Senate;
- vii) that there was also the task and finish group convened by Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee (GNEC) which was aware of the work being done by Senate and was mindful of the potential overlap with the work of the TFG;
- viii) that the Senate would consider how best to provide assurances to Council on academic governance priorities before the next report was due.

Noted:

- i) the view that it was important to receive assurances for due process on student continuation, progression, and retention;
- ii) that each School had established a Learning and Teaching Committee to focus on programme performance which included BAME (black, Asian and minority ethnic) attainment, and that these committees would provide assurances to (or seek address from) the Senate;
- iii) that it was intended the revised structure would generate greater oversight across academic quality and governance;
- iv) that the Enabling Student Success (ESS) standing item would provide regular reports to Council and that it was intended to improve the standing report from the Senate, for example through an update beyond a copy of the minutes as was currently provided;

- v) that the ESS Board met fortnightly and that it drew upon on the 'liveness' of performance updates through the new Senate committee structure, and that Council would be updated on performance for protected characteristics;
- vi) the view that the establishment of the Festival of Learning and more recently the learning and teaching network were positive activities;
- vii) that Professor Jess Power had joined the University to lead the Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Centre (LTEC) which was a reconceptualisation of the network;
- viii) that LTEC intended to recognise and elevate good practice and progress the highest levels of academic achievement for staff, for example in working towards fellowship of Advance HE;
- ix) that the re-aligned Quality Management Office (QMO), LTEC and School committees would jointly monitor performance and resolve issues;
- x) that the Senate would oversee and be the assurance body for academic programmes, and that Council would ultimately see outcomes in the corporate key performance indicators (KPIs) reported quarterly;
- xi) the view that it was recognised that the report and underlying changes this year represented a period of transition, and that this potentially impacted on the depth of assurance received by Council members;
- xii) that however, Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) would want to be assured on academic risk and that all members would expect more depth in future in order to develop collective assurances;
- xiii) that the full extent of Government policy and quality metrics was not yet known, and that the University was seeking to develop agility in its preparations;
- xiv) that it was clear the Senate had to transition towards a different approach to academic governance;
- xv) that regarding the section on compliance, staff complaints were handled through HR processes and student complaints were handled through a well-established set of processes involving professional and academic colleagues;
- xvi) that external judgement (for complaints raised by students) was provided by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) should internal resolution not be achieved, and that the OIA was the appointed body of the sector.

(Secretary's note: consent was given to circulate the Report to co-opted members of ARC for information).

COU.21.106 **INTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21 CLOSED**

Received: on the recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC), the Internal Audit Annual Report for 2020/21 produced by PricewaterhouseCoopers (COU/21/81).

Reported:

- i) - redacted -

COU.21.107 **AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21 CLOSED**

Considered: on the recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee, its Annual Report to Council for 2020/21 (COU/21/82).

Reported:

- i) that the Report had previously formed part of the statutory returns but was now an internal presentation for members' consideration, and that it had been revised in structure accordingly;

- ii) that the Committee had sought to offer its opinion in three areas: risk management, control and governance; value for money; and management and quality assurance of data;
- iii) that it had also given a positive overall assurance opinion.

Noted: that ARC members were thanked for their conscientious hard work on behalf of the Council, and in particular commended for their focus on cybersecurity during the period of the pandemic.

RESOLVED: that the Report be endorsed.

COU.21.108 **ANNUAL REMUNERATION REPORT 2020/21**

Received: on the recommendation of Remuneration Committee, the Remuneration Report for 2020/21 (COU/21/83).

Reported: that the Report had been approved by Remuneration Committee, but that additional information which had been outstanding at the time of the meeting had since been provided to the Committee in order that presentation be made to Council.

OFFICE FOR STUDENTS (OFS) ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY RETURNS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION 2020/21 CLOSED

COU.21.109 **EXTERNAL AUDITOR'S AUDIT HIGHLIGHTS MEMORANDUM AND MANAGEMENT LETTER CLOSED**

Considered: on the recommendation of Audit and Risk Committee, the External Auditor's Audit Highlights Memorandum and Management Letter for 2020/21 (COU/21/84)

Reported:

- i) - redacted -

Noted:

- i) that the Finance team were commended for the quality of the accounts produced;
- ii) that thanks were also extended to the data team under the Associate Chief Operating Officer's remit.

RESOLVED: that the Audit Highlights Memorandum and Management Letter be submitted as part of the statutory returns due to the Office for Students.

COU.21.110 **'GOING CONCERN' STATUS CLOSED**

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee (FRC), the evidence for the University as a 'going concern' (COU/21/86).

Reported:

- i) t- redacted -

Noted:

- i) that the Chair of ARC confirmed that the discussion held on this item by the Committee had been done with FRC in attendance, and that it had been useful to hold the considerations simultaneously;
- ii) - redacted -

RESOLUTION: that the accounts for year-ending 31 July 2021 be approved on the basis that the University was a 'going concern'.

COU.21.111

INTERGRATED REPORT; AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING 31 JULY 2021 CLOSED

Considered: on the recommendation of the Audit and Risk Committee, the Integrated Report; Audited Financial Statements for the financial year ending 31 July 2021 (COU/21/87).

Reported:

- i) that the Integrated Report had been produced in this format for several iterations, and the view that it had improved year-on-year;
- ii) that there had been a considerable amount of work conducted by the University over the period but that the Report had successfully captured the essence of what had been undertaken;
- iii) that ARC and FRC had held a detailed discussion and a number of adjustments had been made for this final presentation;
- iv) that the financial results were very close to the results outlined in the Quarter 4 Finance Report, but that a summary of differences had been included for information;
- v) - redacted -

RESOLVED: that the accounts be approved and signed by the Chair (the Rt. Hon Lord Bradley), the Vice-Chancellor (Professor Helen Marshall) and the Executive Director of Finance (Ms Julie Charge) on behalf of the Council.

COU.21.112

UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATION LETTER CLOSED

Considered: on the recommendation of Audit and Risk Committee, the University Management Representation Letter (COU/21/85).
(Secretary's note: taken after the resolution on the accounts, and not as indicated in the proceedings on the agenda)

Reported: that this was the standard format letter for members to approve the Chair to sign in accordance with statutory requirements and confirming that the accounts had been properly prepared.

RESOLVED: that the Chair be approved to sign the University Management Representation Letter on behalf of the Council.

COU.21.113 **SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES - UNIVERSITY LETTERS OF SUPPORT CLOSED**

Considered: on the recommendation of the Finance and Resources Committee, University letters of support to subsidiary companies (COU/21/88).

Reported: that the following specified wording be entered into the record:

- i) - redacted -

Noted:

- i) - redacted -

RESOLVED: that the Executive Director of Finance be approved, on behalf of the University, to write letters of support to the USE and SPD boards confirming that the University will provide appropriate financial support to allow the companies to continue in existence until at least 31 December 2022 including non-collection of any intercompany debt.

COU.21.114 **PREVENT ANNUAL DATA RETURN AND ACCOUNTABILITY STATEMENT 2020/21 CLOSED**

Considered: on the recommendation of the Governance, Nominations and Ethics Committee, the annual report on the discharging of the University's duties under the Government's Prevent anti-terrorism strategy (Prevent Annual Data Return and Accountability Statement 2020/21) (COU/21/89).

Reported:

- i) that the OfS template this year had reduced the narrative required, and that it had been more data driven;
- ii) that three areas were reported on – welfare (specifically referrals to channel); events and external speakers (specifically where refused or conditional mitigation was agreed); and training (especially of key staff);
- iii) - redacted -

RESOLVED: that the Prevent Annual Data Return and Accountability Statement be

approved and signed by the Chair and Vice-Chancellor, for filing with the OfS.

COU.21.115 **ENABLING STUDENT SUCCESS**

Received: a presentation on the University's strategic plan for enabling student success, in the context of value for money (COU/21/90).

Reported:

- i) that focus remained across four key areas – academic success; customer service; leadership; and environment;
- ii) that the OfS had appointed John Blake as the new Director of Fair Access and Participation, and it was anticipated that Mr Blake would further influence regulation and quality assessment metrics;
- iii) that the University continued to adjust its position as Government policy became clearer;
- iv) that there had been emerging successes recorded for the strategic plan, for example through the establishment of the Quality Management Office (QMO);
- v) that there was more work to be undertaken, and that in summary the University continued to focus on a differentiated mode of practice to ensure success;
- vi) that curricula changes had been made during the period of the pandemic which had been planned but also as a result of the impact of Covid-19;
- vii) that a whole University almanac was being developed, with a view to proactive planning on future issues and challenges;
- viii) that the student voice had been prioritised and underpinning structures and adjusted;
- ix) that each month quantitative and qualitative data was triangulated to measure success;
- x) that the next 'live' issue would be submission of first assessments, as non-submission was a clear indicator of non-engagement;
- xi) that the University had put in place agile intervention for in-year retrieval on assessment;
- xii) that there was a high degree of assurance through the regular transactions that the plan was understood and adopted by colleagues.

Noted:

- i) the view that the report of emerging success and cultural change was welcomed, but that it would also be useful to see evidence of the initiative building toward a culture of 'business as usual', the impact on the baseline metrics and the interventions undertaken;
- ii) that outputs would also be evidenced in the quarterly key performance indicator reports;
- iii) the view that the University should seek to improve student success but in doing so not put at risk its position as a widening participation institution;
- iv) that the purpose of ESS was to align the University's practice to its values;
- v) that in seeking to develop higher technical qualifications the University continued to seek to attract those who had not previously felt able (or welcomed) to access higher education;
- vi) that such qualification would develop phased pathways into higher education programmes and increase outreach to applicants;
- vii) the view that seeking to attract students from marginalised groups was evident in the discussions across several items;
- viii) that further assurances for ESS would be sought through associated projects, for example implementation of the Salford Academic.

COU.21.116 **EQUALITY, DIVERSITY AND INCLUSIVITY**

Received: on the endorsement of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive Team, an update on the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity action plan for the period June to November 2021 (COU/21/91).

Reported:

- i) that the update was a summary report across a significant number of activities relating to equality, diversity and inclusivity (EDI);
- ii) that the University was finalising its written submission in application to the Race Equality Charter (REC);

- iii) that a detailed data analysis on BAME staff and student attainment had been undertaken in tandem with the work on ESS;
- iv) that an internal audit for EDI matters was to be undertaken in January 2022.

Noted:

- i) that the Chair thanked the contributors for the important work undertaken;
- ii) the view that sustained progression would likely take a number of years and that it would be useful to understand more about short term impacts and emerging results, for example was there any disadvantages identified for BAME colleagues through grievance processes;
- iii) that detailed data had been fed into school and professional service actions plans arising from the data collection for the REC submission;
- iv) that some areas had been identified as requiring more focus on improving processes and outcomes for BAME staff and students;
- v) the view the University should seek to address the reasons why it was behind on the 'Rooney Rule' (commitment for interview of underrepresented characteristics for appointments);
- vi) that there had also been a high turnover of staff in the Human Resources Directorate which had impacted on recruitment capacity, but that the commitment had been achieved with regards to gender representation and the intention was to ensure that candidates from minority backgrounds were represented as soon as possible;
- vii) that there was a high number of vacancies and HR was also mindful of the potential impact on the student experience if recruitment was delayed;
- viii) that it was also the intention to increase recruitment outreach and candidate development opportunities as soon as resources allowed;
- ix) the view that there had been a lack of progress to ensure equality impact assessments (EIAs) were undertaken for senior executive committees.

RESOLVED: that the update be received subject to the undernoted being provided in the next report:

- i) an update on the shorter-term outputs expected from local EDI action plans (and evidence if available);
- ii) an update on the progress for EIA's;
- iii) an update on recruitment capacity and an up-to-date position toward achieving the Rooney Rule.

ACTION: PRO VICE-CHANCELLOR ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT

COU.21.117 SENATE

Received: the (unconfirmed) minutes of the special meeting of Senate 20 October 2021 (COU/21/92).

Reported:

- i) that a workshop had been scheduled for members of Senate to discuss the refresh of the corporate strategy;
- ii) that as had been discussed earlier, there was work underway for Senate to review its operations [COU.21.105].

COU.21.118 COMMITTEE CHAIRS' REPORTS

Received: the Committee Chairs' Reports (COU/21/93).

Reported: that the substantive business of the two committees had been recommended to the meeting.

Noted: that the Chair of ARC was thanked for her contribution and leadership of the committee during the previous year.

COU.21.119 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

COU.21.120 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Reported:

- i) that in view of the resolutions made regarding the statutory returns [COU.21.109 to COU.21.113] that the special meeting scheduled for 10 December 2021 would not be required and was cancelled;
- ii) that the next meeting would be held on Friday 28 January 2022;
- iii) that in agreement with the Committees, it was intended that meetings would start to transition back to on-campus events from February 2022 (subject to an appropriate risk assessment);
- iv) that the Chair thanked members for their contributions and engagement during the calendar year and wished all a happy break and healthy new year.