

## People, Culture and Engagement Committee

TIME /DATE / VENUE	1400, Tuesday 27 September 2022 in Room 0.32, Unit 1, St Andrew's Court
PRESENT	Claudia Iton (Chair) Professor Graham Galbraith (from Minute 4 to Minute 5) David Wilding Christopher Williams
IN ATTENDANCE	Professor Richard Thelwell, Academic Staff Governor Kim John-Williams, Staff Representative Becky Miles, Professional Services Staff Governor Fiona Hnatow, Chief People Officer Wayne Bowen, Head of HR Strategic Planning Zoe Irvine, Organisational Development Manager (Minute 5)
SECRETARIAT	Adrian Parry, Executive Director of Corporate Governance Jacqui Bryden, Senior Governance Officer

To facilitate the attendance of staff for specific items, some items were taken out of the order designated in the agenda.

### 1 Welcome, Quoracy, Conflict of Interest and Apologies

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies were received from Jenny Crighton, Chair of the Board and Bernie Topham, Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
- 1.3 The Executive Director of Corporate Governance confirmed that the meeting was quorate and could proceed to business.
- 1.4 There were no conflicts of interest declared.

### 2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2022 were confirmed subject to the following amendments:

- 29(iii) The nine themes would each be underpinned by one key performance indicator (KPIs) for each theme. These would be updated regularly to enable the University community to see progress.

- 29.1(iv) The People Strategy and KPIs would be launched in September 2022 to the University community.

### 3 Matters Actioned and Matters Arising

There were no matters actioned and no matters arising.

### 4 People Strategy

Fiona Hnatow, Chief People Officer and Wayne Bowen, Head of HR Strategic Planning provided a presentation on the University's People Strategy. UEB would shortly discuss, finalise and approve the final strategy and its associated key performance indicators (KPIs). The People Strategy had been developed following a significant number of conversations and workshops with key stakeholders across the University.

4.1 The key points raised in the presentation were:

- i. The People Strategy reflected the vision, mission, values and purpose of the University Strategy. Its strapline would be: "A global employer of choice where our exceptional people will work in collaboration to achieve excellence – together we are Portsmouth" and it would be owned by the University community.
- ii. There were three themes attributed to each of the three University values. Each theme identified key enablers for the delivery of the People Strategy. It was important that the People Strategy was underpinned by an environment of trust and that it was taken forward proactively.
- iii. Recruitment processes would be modernised and streamlined, including vacancy advertising. A new online recruitment system would be introduced. It would be important to analyse and understand the reasons for those who withdrew applications. The equality impact of HR processes would be assessed and measured.
- iv. Retention of talent was important and retention rates would be monitored to identify any trends and patterns during the first five years of employment. Branding to better promote the University as an employer of choice was under review both locally and internationally in conjunction with Marketing.
- v. Flexibility in salary management would be reviewed. Following the pandemic, there had been a marked change in the pay and reward expectations of potential employees. Pay structures and policies would be reviewed as a priority to ensure their alignment with the post-pandemic recruitment market. Recent changes included the introduction of payments for additional duties and market supplements.
- vi. Emphasis should be placed on creating a culture of openness and engagement that encouraged staff to have the confidence to challenge managers constructively.



- vii. There would be one published KPI for each theme, with the remaining KPIs being for internal use only. The KPIs had yet to be confirmed by UEB.

4.2 In discussion, Committee noted:

- i. The People Strategy was ambitious and sought to achieve significant outcomes.
- ii. The University environment was changing in response to the increased adoption of innovative digital technologies and the physical environment was also being reshaped to offer different working and open social spaces. It was important for the People Strategy to facilitate and shape new ways of working such as the use of hybrid models and working in balance.
- iii. Changes in working practices were being driven by changes in the recruitment market. However, it was important to emphasise that working practices should be determined by the needs of the business, rather than the preferences of employees.
- iv. The proposed KPIs would provide important management information and encompassed a “golden thread” that incorporated equality, diversity and inclusivity (EDI). The Office of National Statistics would release updated population data shortly, which would be used to provide comparisons with the University’s EDI statistical data. The University was considering its use of terminology and in particular its use of the term BAME to describe black, Asian and minority ethnic. This might, in time, be replaced by the term GM, meaning global majority.
- v. Increasing diversity within the University’s workforce was a priority, especially in professional services. Although the University had the ability to recruit staff internationally, this was sometimes affected by visa and sponsorship issues.
- vi. There had been an increase in the number of disabled staff employed at the University, which was not reflected in the KPIs due to timing issues. This increase, in part, reflected greater willingness amongst staff to declare their status.
- vii. The University lost in excess of 17,000 days due to sickness absence in the last year, which would be costed and analysed by faculty and department. This figure was high and it was important to ensure that accuracy of data collection was maintained.
- viii. Performance and Development Review (PDR) completion was lower than expected and there should be greater accountability for non-completion. Management assessment of their appraisees would be introduced in 2024/25.
- ix. There would be a fuller review of the online PDR process in 2023/2024, including the potential to establish separate academic and professional services versions to facilitate tailored career and succession planning. In future, there was the potential to link pay progression to PDR outcomes.
- x. Engagement was measured by the staff survey return rate. There would be a check-in staff survey in early 2023 and the biennial staff survey in November 2023.
- xi. The number of female professors at the University was low at 23%. It would be important to identify how to better support, develop and retain female

academics and to foster their progression from early career to reader to professor in a structured and strategic way.

- xii. It was important that the KPIs were meaningful. Consequently, there might not be a need for one per theme. Each theme would encompass a discrete set of actions and progress would be measured via KPIs. There should be a focus on those areas where there was most need to change.
- xiii. Externally published KPIs could include representation figures, cultural and engagement information and staff outcomes, which would be subject to change over time if successfully achieved.

4.3 The Committee noted the presentation.

## 5 Inclusive Leadership Programme Update

Zoe Irvine, Organisational Development Manager delivered a presentation that provided an update on the rollout of the Inclusive Leadership Programme (ILP). This was an extensive programme that had been launched seven months previously, in March 2022. It had not been designed as an isolated management development programme but had been developed as a blended, connected and inclusive programme that encompassed all levels of the University. It was strongly linked to the University Strategy and aligned to the nine themes in the People Strategy.

5.1 Key points noted in the presentation were:

- i. A number of charters and agreements had been reviewed and linked to the ILP to provide good benchmarking data. This would enable evaluation at the organisational level.
- ii. Internal BAME data provided a rich source of information and had been incorporated into the Programme to ensure that it addressed issues of diversity.
- iii. Digital technologies had been utilised to support delivery, networks, communication and learning so that the Programme was interactive as well as classroom based. Action learning sets would be used to facilitate learning to address change through experiential learning.
- iv. There was evidence to suggest that the Programme had facilitated more successful PDR conversations and outcomes because staff now felt better encouraged to aspire to leadership roles.
- v. The framework that underpinned the Programme had been designed to create a community of learning and good practice. There were four levels within the programme, with each level based upon a different stage of the management journey. 109 delegates had attended the Programme in 2022, and a further 293 delegates were scheduled to attend over the coming year to August 2023.
- vi. Delegates undertaking the Programme would be able to demonstrate the behaviour of an inclusive and visionary leader by continuing to develop outside the learning environment and by sharing their experience. The Programme was designed to improve self-confidence and the confidence to manage effectively.



- vii. The impact of the Programme would be measured by formal evaluation using the four stage Kirkpatrick Model and, eventually, via 360° feedback.
  - viii. The Programme had been mapped to accredited qualifications, including degree apprenticeships. It was also planned to map the Programme against the accreditation requirements for Fellowships of the Higher Education Academy and the Institute of Leadership and Management.
  - ix. The Portsmouth Hallmark and Leadership Attributes would be reviewed in the light of the lessons and outcomes of the Programme.
  - x. The Programme would be continuously improved. Future plans included a focus on talent management and succession planning. These activities would be overseen by a dedicated Steering Committee.
- 5.2 In discussion, it was noted that:
- i. The PDR online process would be reviewed in 2024/2025, with an aim to simplify the process and the user experience. It would be important to encourage conversations throughout the reporting year, to thereby gain more meaningful outcomes for all parties. This could be facilitated by the design and use of simpler update forms. The PDR system itself was not currently agile enough for change and amendment.
  - ii. In order to build confidence, inspire self-belief and leadership ability, it would be important to provide support networks, allow the ability to make mistakes within the safety of the Programme, and provide the ability to learn from each other in a safe space environment.
  - iii. The action learning sets would be called Leadership Exploration Groups (LEGs). Each would consist of a mix of academic and professional services staff, to better facilitate learning of how to collaborate effectively on projects.
  - iv. The Steering Committee would meet twice a year. It would provide an external perspective from across the University and thus enable the Programme to meet staff development needs effectively.
  - v. The Programme would be submitted to the 2022 Developing Excellent Practice Awards.
- 5.3 The Committee noted the update and expressed their appreciation for the detail and ambition of the Programme and looked forward to hearing about future updates and successful outcomes.

## 6 Annual Review of the Terms of Reference

Adrian Parry, Executive Director of Corporate Governance provided a report on the assessment of the work undertaken by the Committee in 2021/22 when mapped against its terms of reference, the current terms of reference for the Committee, and an indicative work programme for the academic year 2022/23.

- 6.1 Key points noted were:



- i. The assessment of the work undertaken indicated that the Committee had discharged its terms of reference in 2021/2022.
  - ii. A number of HR policies were due for review in the near future and their submission to the Committee would be scheduled to ensure that xxx be able to manage the business accordingly.
  - iii. The terms of reference had been updated last year. It would be important to ensure that they were regularly reviews and remained relevant to the work of the Committee.
  - iv. The indicative programme of work identified potential agenda items to be addressed at Committee meetings. Its purpose was to ensure that business was planned efficiently and effectively.
- 6.2 In discussion, it was noted that:
- i. It was important that the HR policy reviews were scheduled to be able to manage their approval in a structured way and this should be reflected in the forward programme of work.
  - ii. An annual report would be submitted to the Committee to provide an overview of employee client management, including any trends or patterns emerging from special meetings. This would be added to the Committee's indicative programme of work.
  - iii. The presentations on "lived experience" and delivery of the University Strategy were very beneficial and helpful for understanding the contribution of staff and where it would be helpful for the Committee to provide constructive challenge as a 'critical friend' to the Executive.
  - iv. The new Chief People Officer had been appointed following a period of instability in the HR Department. Her appointment provided opportunities to rebuild the team using different approaches to enhance the effectiveness of the Department.
  - v. The establishment of the London Campus provided an opportunity to explore new forms of contract and models of working.
- 6.3 The Committee:
- i. Noted the assessment for the year 2021/2022 and to report its assurance to the Board that it had discharged its terms of reference.
  - ii. Agreed that there were no changes required to the terms of reference at this time.
  - iii. Discussed and commented upon the indicative work programme for 2022/2023.

## **7 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee would take place on Tuesday 6 December 2022.

Confirmed Committee Dates for 2023:

- 28 February 2023
- 24 May 2023
- 27 September 2023
- 30 November 2023