

Board of Governors

DATE / TIME / VENUE

1130, 7 July 2021, via videoconferencing (Zoom)

PRESENT

Jane Hoskins (Chair)

Bahram Bekhradnia (up to minute 103x)

Roger Burke-Hamilton

Jenny Crighton

Dr Catherine Carroll-Meehan (up to minute 103v and excluding Minute 99)

Bishop Christopher Foster Professor Graham Galbraith

Claudia Iton

Liz Jolly (excluding minute 97xii to 97xvii) Vineet Khurana (up to minute 103v)

David Madoc-Jones Frances Morris Jones

Paul Myers

Professor David Sanders

Mike Kiddell Lyuda Wade David Wilding

Christopher Williams (from minute 95vi)

IN ATTENDANCE

Hans Allnutt, Partner Beachcroft LLP (Minute 99) Dr Jason Arday, Runnymede Trust (Minute 97)

Chris Chang, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement and Student Life)

Christine Dyson, Employment Lawyer (Minute 98) Professor Paul Hayes, Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor

Yvonne Howard, Interim Director of Race and Equality (Minute 97)

Fiona Loughran, Director of Planning (Minute 96)

Eleanor Ludlam, Senior Associate Beachcroft LLP (Minute 99)

Brendan McCarthy, UPSU Student Focus and Advice Service Mgr (Minute

101)

Professor Bob Nichol, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research, Innovation and External

Relations)

Bernie Topham, Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice-Chancellor

Emma Woollard, Executive Director of Finance

Martin Perrin, Head of Strategic Programmes (Minute 96)

Jon Ward, Chief Information Officer (Minute 99)

SECRETARIAT

Adrian Parry, Executive Director of Corporate Governance

Annette Mills, Head of Governance Services Helen Malbon, Senior Governance Officer

To suit the availability of participants, some agenda items were taken out of

the published order.



90 Introductions, Apologies, Quoracy and Conflicts of Interest

- 90.1 The Chair welcomed Mike Kiddell, UPSU Development Officer, to his first meeting of the Board.
- 90.2 Apologies were received from External Governors: Mark Cubbon and David Willan; and Academic Council Staff Governor: Dr Jenny Walden. Dr Catherine Carroll-Meehan attended the meeting in accordance with the job share arrangement that existed for the role of Academic Council Staff Governor.
- 90.3 The Executive Director of Corporate Governance confirmed that the meeting was quorate and could proceed to business.
- 90.4 There were no new declarations of interest.

91 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2021 were confirmed as an accurate record.

92 Matters Actioned and Matters Arising

- 92.1 Action was reported on five matters: two were for note; two would be received at a future meeting; and one would be discussed later in the agenda. There were no further matters arising that were not addressed elsewhere on the agenda.
- 92.2 It was noted that the Board had approved the appointment of KPMG LLP as the University's external auditors via correspondence on 10 May 2021.

93 Board Membership

Adrian Parry, Executive Director of Corporate Governance, provided a report on Board membership issues following the deliberations of the meeting of the Nominations Committee held on 22 June 2021. Key points noted were:

93.1 New student governor.

- The previous student governor had needed to interrupt their studies for personal reasons and had ceased to be a registered student.
 Consequently, they were no longer eligible to hold the role.
- ii. An advertisement for the student governor vacancy had been placed on relevant student facing University websites and social media channels, with a closing date of 26 July 2021. Interviews of suitable candidates would then take place.
- iii. To enable the student voice to be fully represented at governors' meetings from September 2021, the Board agreed that the appointment of the student governor should be considered via correspondence.



Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

93.2 Chair of Infrastructure and Finance Committee

- Given the outcome of the election of the Chair of the Board of Governors, a new Chair was required for the Infrastructure and Finance Committee (IFC).
- The Executive Director of Corporate Governance had issued an email to seek expressions of interest from external governors on 26 June 2021.
 The deadline for responses was 9 July 2021.
- iii. If more than one nomination was received then the members of the IFC Committee would be asked to vote for their preferred candidate.
- iv. The Board of Governors noted the schedule for the election of the Chair of the Infrastructure and Finance Committee

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

93.3 Committee membership

- i. The Board of Governors currently had a membership of 21 governors but the retirements that would take place on 31 July 2021 would bring the membership of the Board to 18 governors.
- ii. Although the Board had previously agreed that a notional membership of 18 members, this was intended to be a desired approximation rather than an absolute figure.
- iii. Following its review of each Board committee's membership to ensure that each had the desired complement of members and an appropriate spread of skills and experience, Nominations Committee proposed that some rebalancing of membership across Committees would be required, in addition to the recruitment of a small number of new governors.
- iv. Given its role and remit, it was essential for the membership of the Infrastructure and Finance Committee to encompass governors with professional finance qualifications.
- v. Forthcoming retirements from the Audit and Quality Committee would create a need to ensure that the committee was able to draw upon governors with requisite skills and knowledge.
- vi. To mitigate the impact of changes to committee membership,
 Nominations Committee proposed that the Board should seek to recruit
 two governors with skills and qualifications in the fields of finance and
 audit for 2021/2022 and that a further governor should be recruited in
 2022/20 23 to fill a vacancy that would occur at that point.
- vii. A transfer of membership between the Infrastructure and Finance Committee and the Audit and Quality Committee was proposed to maintain membership numbers during 2021/2022 and to ensure an appropriate allocation of skills and experience.
- viii. It was also proposed that a limited governor recruitment exercise should be held each year to ensure that recruitment cycles were staggered and that the risk of multiple retirements in a single year was mitigated more effectively.



ix. The Board noted that a transfer of membership between committees was proposed and agreed to delegate approval of the changes in membership to the Chair of Nominations Committee.

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

x. The Board agreed to the recruitment of up to three new external governors to ensure the continued effective conduct of business.

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

xi. The Board agreed to an ongoing limited recruitment exercise to be held each academic year to support succession planning

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

94 Chancellor second term – confidential item

95 Budget 2021/2022

Emma Woollard, Executive Director of Finance, presented the proposed University Budget for 2021/2022. Key points noted were:

- i. The budget proposals had been discussed and supported by the University Executive Board and by the Infrastructure and Finance Committee. The projected deficit forecast was a strategic choice and was not due to financial instability.
- ii. The 2021/2022 budget projected a deficit of £10 million, with income totalling £289 million. The University had significant cash balances and could support a deficit of this size.
- iii. The expenditure contained within the budget was designed to support the future financial sustainability and organisational strength of the University and would enable the delivery of the University Strategy.
- iv. The budget took into account the possible impact of increasing the student entry tariff which might result in fewer new entrants to home full-time undergraduate courses. In response to a question, the Executive noted that government policy might in mandate higher entry tariffs in future but, by acting now, the potential pool of applicants available to the University would be bigger. The potential impact upon the current budget of increased student entry tariffs would be a reduction of c.£3 million in income.
- v. It was anticipated that costs associated with operating a Covid-secure campus would continue into 2021/2022 and an estimate of these had been included in the budget.
- vi. The budget included proposed cost savings. The capacity for further significant savings was questioned as these had now been requested for several consecutive years. The Executive responded that the projection of a deficit budget was designed to mitigate the impact of required efficiency savings. The budget also contained an aspiration to increase income generation.
- vii. In response to a question, the Executive confirmed that financial scenario planning had been conducted. This had included scenarios based upon variations in student numbers, a mix of on and off-campus delivery and variable tuition fee ranges. The mid-point derived from these scenarios had been selected to calculate the 2021/2022 budget. Once the Government's comprehensive spending review had taken place in the autumn, then any necessary adjustments to budget assumptions would be made.



- viii. It would be important to ensure that communications to staff made clear the reasons for the deficit budget and that care was taken to manage any resulting implications for morale.
- ix. The Board approved the 2021/2022 budget.

96 Implementation of University Strategy 2025

Fiona Loughran, Director of Planning and Martin Perrin, Head of Strategic Programmes provided an overview of the ongoing development and implementation of the University Strategy 2025 and Vision 2020. Key points made were:

- The Board of Governors had approved the University's ambitious Vision 2030 and Strategy 2025 in 2019. The successful implementation of the University Strategy was imperative for the University's future success and long-term sustainability.
- ii. The Vision 2030 and Strategy 2025 had been developed through extensive consultation with staff, students and other stakeholders during 2018 and 2019.
- iii. Feedback from staff and governors during the development of the University Strategy had highlighted the following prominent messages:
 - a) The University Strategy should be more ambitious;
 - b) Plans needed to be uniquely Portsmouth distinctive so that not all other universities can make the same claims;
 - c) The ambitions outlined in the University strategy should have a unifying theme and must avoid being a series of discrete and disconnected aims.
- iv. The University's Vision was that by 2030 it would be the UK's top modern university and one of the top 100 young universities in the world. The Strategy set out a series of ambitions to 2025 which would be fundamental for securing the 2030 vision.
- v. The approach to strategic delivery had three elements:
 - a) Future Readiness: This involved a whole organisational approach to upholding the University's values and creating the conditions for the delivery of the of the University Strategy;
 - Strategy Delivery Groups: This entailed responsibility for coordinating, championing and measuring improvements in the 2025 priorities and ambitions;
 - c) Enablers: These supported the University's future readiness and Strategy Delivery Groups through cross-organisational strategy and support.
- vi. Foundations had been established to help to ensure that staff recognised and were able to play a full part in the implementation of the University Strategy.

 This underpinning activity included leadership programmes to upskill staff in the delivery of transformational activity.
- vii. Some activities to advance the ambitions and priorities of the University Strategy had been taken forward. These included an increase in the recruitment of degree apprenticeship students and the establishment of the Civic Partnership Board.



- viii. Activity had also been undertaken to facilitate the enablers that underpinned the delivery of the University Strategy. This included work to review and update the 2016 Estate Masterplan and technology and data improvements that would feature in the developing digital masterplan.
- ix. Strategic delivery groups (SDG) would be formed, each with a UEB sponsor and lead manager. Each SDG would work across the University to deliver their allocated ambition/priority by engaging staff and championing the work of their delivery group.
- x. From now until September 2021, the SDGs would begin to Identify and prioritise existing and/or new activity which would deliver desired strategic outcomes and begin to identify associated delivery risks.
- xi. UEB would review the prioritised plans and risks identified by each SDG to ensure consistency and to confirm that the proposed outcomes could be met.
- xii. The UEB away day held on 5 July 2021 had agreed the following strategic priorities for 2021/22:
 - a) To reverse the ongoing decline in Home/EU full-time undergraduate applications and boost conversions
 - b) To improve student experience at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, reducing variation in outcomes across courses and student groups.
 - c) To rapidly improve graduate employment/employability.
 - d) To focus research and innovation efforts on engaging with thematic areas and international collaborations, raising more R&I income and surplus, and increasing funded PGR student numbers
- xiii. SDGs would provide quarterly reports to UEB and at appropriate intervals to the Board of Governors.
- xiv. Work was underway to re-draft the University Risk Management Policy to provide for a consistent University-wide approach to risk management that would also facilitate the identification and mitigation of risks associated with the delivery of the University Strategy. This reflected the recommendations of a recent internal audit.
- xv. It was confirmed that there would be student representation on appropriate SDGs. Similarly, external stakeholders such as the NHS and Navy were represented on the Civic Partnership Board.
- xvi. In response to a question, it was confirmed that the promotion of equality and diversity was at the heart of the University Strategy. It should feature in the considerations of each SDG. In addition, the appointment of a Director of Race and Equality was part of a broader framework for further embedding diversity and equality within the culture of the University.
- xvii. The role and remit of the existing Human Resources Committee would be reconfigured and broadened to encompass a wider range of people-centric activities. It would play a key role in supporting the monitoring of progress against targets, which would include awarding gaps and diversity within staff promotions.



xviii. It was agreed that the list of which UEB member was leading each activity strand within the University Strategy should be circulated to the Board.

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

- xix. The Board welcomed the implementation framework as a useful tool for reporting and monitoring progress against defined targets, together with the proposed stronger linkage to risk management.
- xx. The Board thanked all those involved and supported the planned approach to delivery, planning and implementation of the University Strategy.

97 Race Equality Review

Chris Chang, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement and Student Life), Yvonne Howard, Interim Director of Race and Equality and Dr Jason Arday, Runnymede Trust provided the Board with an interim report on the University's Race Equality work and its implementation of the Race Equality Charter Action Plan. Key points noted were:

- The University had recently achieved the Race Equality Charter Bronze Award.
 The action plan submitted in support of the application for the award outlined comprehensive tasks and targets and provided a robust framework for monitoring delivery.
- ii. The review of race and related issues within the University had been commissioned to inform the Executive of the issues to be addressed, areas for prioritisation and any other issues of note.
- iii. This summary report provided the interim findings of the review. The full report would be completed in the autumn.
- iv. Eight Focus groups had been held with 52 people participating. They were asked:
 - a) What has been your experience of racial equality at the University?
 - b) Have you felt a sense of belonging at the University?
 - c) Do you think the University has done enough to address racial equality?
- v. The focus groups had placed emphasis upon the identification of potential solutions and the cultural change that would be required to facilitate these solutions.
- vi. There had been consistent feedback from all groups that the internal structures of the University compounded inequality and that there appeared to be a disconnection between intentions and actions.
- vii. Staff had highlighted lack of career progression as a barrier and it was likely that the final report would recommend that this was addressed as a prelude to further focus upon recruitment practices. Students had indicated that they would feel more connected to the University if the staff cohort better reflected its diverse student population.
- viii. The focus groups would resume in September and a report would be produced that would include a series of recommendations.



- ix. In response to a question, it was noted that these issues were uncomfortable and challenging. It was essential that difficult conversations could take place in a supportive environment, where language or beliefs could be challenged constructively and people felt able to make mistakes as part of the learning process.
- x. Workshops in racial literacy could assist with changing the culture of the organisation if offered to all staff as part of their continuing professional development.
- xi. It was acknowledged that as well as confronting overt racial hatred, it was also necessary to eliminate micro- aggressions that were frequently unintentional but still hurtful. Information briefings would be recommended as an approach to help to ensure that white privilege was better understood and addressed.
- xii. In addition, wellbeing support should be offered to those experiencing these harmful attitudes to equip them to navigate the situations and disrupt the white privilege pattern.
- xiii. Some intersectionality existed between the negative experiences cited by staff and students. In the light of the issues raised, the Human Resources Department would be redesigning the University's inclusive leadership course to ensure that it was fit for purpose.
- xiv. Receipt of the REC Bronze Award was an important milestone for the University. However, it was important to recognise that this was only a starting point for the cultural change necessary to ensure that all members of the University could achieve their potential and that the University became a better and stronger organisation.
- xv. The Board would welcome training in racial literacy. This would better equip their role and would signal their commitment to setting an inclusive culture. .

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

xvi. The Board thanked the team for their interim findings and acknowledged that although some difficult messages had needed to be conveyed, it was important to bring these issues into the open so they could be changed. The Board would receive the final report and recommendations in the autumn.

Action: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement and Student Life)

- 98 Employment Liability Insurance confidential item
- 99 Cyber Incident Response confidential item
- 100 Optometry Review confidential item



101 UPSU Articles

Brendan McCarthy, UPSU Student Focus and Advice Manager, provided an update on the approval process for the revision of UPSU's Memorandum and Articles of Association. Key points noted were:

- The Board of Governors had a statutory duty to approve the UPSU
 Memorandum and Articles of Association. It was a requirement of its
 registration with the Charity Commission that UPSU must review and revise its
 Memorandum and Articles every five years.
- ii. The Board had approved the current Memorandum and Articles in 2016. Since January 2020, UPSU had been conducting a review of the Memorandum and Articles of Association as it worked towards the deadline for the five-year review.
- iii. The current Memorandum and Articles only allow for changes to be approved at an AGM of students, and this could not be held digitally under current company law. Current Covid-19 restrictions had prevented an AGM from being held.
- iv. Legal advice had been sought and two options suggested:
 - a) Hold an AGM with minimal attendees in physical attendance (the chair and a minute taker) and encourage at least 50 students to proxy vote in advance. Students would be able to watch the AGM on camera but would not be able to vote during the meeting itself.
 - b) Submit approval of the Memorandum and Articles as a Written Resolution to all members. However, this would require 75% of the student body (approx. 22,000 students) to sign and return the Written Resolution.
- v. Neither option was considered to provide students with a chance to fully participate and contribute to a meaningful AGM. Consequently, the UPSU Student Focus and Governance Committee on behalf of the UPSU Trustees had agreed to defer approval of the revised Memorandum and Articles.
- vi. The AGM would now take place in the autumn 2021 term and the Board of Governors would be asked to approve the final document in January 2022.
- vii. It was confirmed that the University approved UPSU's efforts to ensure that the Memorandum and Articles were revised via a meaningful democratic process and supported the action and timeline proposed.
- viii. It was noted that by delaying approval the 5-year period would be exceeded. However, advice received was that the exceptional Covid-19 pandemic was an acceptable reason to delay proceedings and this decision was unlikely to be challenged by either Companies House or the Charity Commission.
- ix. In response to a question, it was stated that if Covid-19 restrictions remained in place during the autumn then no changes would be made to the Memorandum and Articles and the current version presented to the Board of Governors for reapproval.
- x. The Board agreed to the delay in approving the revised version of the UPSU Memorandum and Articles of Association and noted that the final Memorandum and Articles would be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval in January 2022.

Action: UPSU Student Focus Manager



102 Chair's Business

The Chair reported that she had attended a Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) meeting which had provided an update on the final sector-wide pay offer. There were no further matters to report that were not otherwise covered on the agenda for the meeting.

103 Vice-Chancellor's Report

The Board received an oral report from the Vice-Chancellor and other members of the Executive on recent activities, developments and matters of importance for the University and for the sector. The following updates were provided:

- i. The Vice-Chancellor reported that the Office for Students (OfS) had issued a number of consultations in advance of the autumn government spending review. He had also had a one-to-one meeting with the Minister of State for Universities and hoped that she might accept an invitation to visit Portsmouth in the future.
- ii. The Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice-Chancellor reported that a staff survey would soon be conducted by an independent company. The results could be analysed at University and department level. . The Human Resources Committee would receive a report on the overall responses received.
- iii. It was reported that work on the Indoor Sports Centre may not be completed by September 2021. Discussions were ongoing with the contractor regarding matters associated with time and costs. An update would be provided to the September 2021 meeting of the Infrastructure and Finance Committee.

Action: Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Vice-Chancellor

- iv. It was noted that the planning application for the Victoria Park development would be submitted by the end of July 2021.
- v. The Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor reported that the University's position in the Complete University Guide rankings had fallen from 61 to 74 in the overall ranking score, due in part to the nature of the metrics used. However, work was underway to better understand the underpinning data, with work underway to analyse tariff scores on entry and employment opportunities and outcomes.
- vi. An external company was currently conducting a portfolio review of the University's full time on-campus courses, which the Executive would consider in August. Recommendations would be brought to the Board in the autumn.

Action: Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor

vii. Plans for the start of the next academic year would include the expectation that most large-scale lectures would take place online and some social distancing and ventilation would continue to be required in seminar rooms. Government advice would be monitored. Similarly, government travel guidance would also be monitored as this would have implications for international students' ability to return to campus.



- viii. The University of Portsmouth Academy Trust would formally be established on 1

 November 2021 with an initial membership of three local primary schools.
- ix. Graduation ceremonies would be held virtually and in person over a three-week period. All ceremonies to be held in the Guildhall would comply with the requirements of social distancing.
- x. The UK Visas and Immigration Service had stated that international students would not contravene the terms of their student visa if they were not residing in the UK at the start of term in autumn 2021.
- xi. The University had been selected by the OfS for a 2019-20 HESA reconciliation exercise. This exercise compared the data returned to Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) with Higher Education Students Early Statistics (HESES) data. Minor discrepancies were apparent in the data between HESES19 and the outturn position for 2019-20, and so a report was required by the OfS by 16 July 2021 as to the reasons.
- xii. The Executive Director of Corporate Governance reported that the OfS had published seven expectations about the way that universities should approach and tackle issues of harassment and sexual misconduct.
 - a) A number of issues across the sector in recent years had given cause for concern and an impression, particularly in Westminster, that universities were not good at handling these issues.
 - b) The OfS had therefore asked that all Universities review and revise their policies and approaches to ensure that its expectations were met. The University had begun that process.
 - c) The OfS expectations required the University to have and to communicate clear and transparent policies and processes; to have clear ownership and responsibility for tackling these issues; to ensure that staff were trained to deal with these issues; that the University had easy to access reporting processes and that were transparent about the action taken.
 - d) Underpinning these expectations, was a need to engage with students to develop and evaluate policies and processes but there was also a very clear expectation that governors must ensure that all approaches were adequate and effective.
 - e) A formal report would be presented to the October Board, outlining the work undertaken, findings and what would be done to strengthen things to reflect each of the expectations.

Action: Executive Director of Corporate Governance

- xiii. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research, Innovation and External relations) reported that following the University's submission to the Research Excellence Framework, work was now underway to review the process as experienced by the University and to assess how effectively the thematic research areas were operating individually and collectively.
- xiv. It was noted that a recent Academic Promotion round had seen the appointment of 18 new Readers and 7 new Professors, 38% of these were women.



xv. The University had joined the recently established Solent Free Port as an associate member of the consortium and this would help the aspirations contained in the developing University Innovation Strategy.

xvi. The Board welcomed the updates reported.

104 Board Effectiveness working group report

Francis Morris-Jones, External Governor presented a report on behalf of the Board Effectiveness Steering Group that updated the Board on the work of the group. Information had been gathered from a number of sources and discussions held in three group meetings. A number of recommendations were in development and a full report would be presented to the Board at its November 2021 meeting.

Action: Board Effectiveness Steering Group

105 Remuneration Committees Chair's Report

The Board received and noted a report from the Chair of the Vice-Chancellor's Remuneration Committee and the Senior Postholders' Remuneration Committee on a joint meeting held on 4 May 2021.

106 Nominations Committee Report

The Board received and noted a report from the Chair of the Committee on the meeting held on 22 June 2021 and accepted the work of the Committees as reported.

107 Audit and Quality Committee Chair's Report

The Board received and noted a report from the Chair of the Committee on the meeting held on 13 May 2021 and accepted the work of the Committees as reported.

108 Human Resources Committee Chair's Report

The Board received and noted a report from the Chair of the Committee on the meeting held on 19 May 2021 and accepted the work of the Committees as reported.

109 Infrastructure and Finance Committee Chair's Report

The Board received and noted a report from the Chair of the Committee on the meeting held on 23 June 2021 and accepted the work of the Committee as reported.

110 Management Accounts to 30 April 2021

The Board noted the University Management Accounts and Subsidiary Company Management Accounts.



111 Academic Council Chair's report and minutes

- 111.1 The Board received and noted a report from the Academic Council on the meeting held on 23 March 2021.
- 111.2 It was noted that the draft minutes of the Academic Council meeting of 23 March 2021 had been circulated electronically on 17 June 2021.

112 UPSU Review of 2020/2021

The Board received and noted a summary from each UPSU Elected Officer for 2020/2021 of their achievements during the year.

113 Prevent Duty

Adrian Parry, Executive Director of Corporate Governance, provided an update report on the University's continued delivery of the Prevent duty. The Board noted the update.

114 Confirmed Meeting Dates

The Board noted the meeting dates for 2021/2022:

- Wednesday 13 October 2021 from 1130 to 1630
- Thursday 25 November 2021 from 1130 to 1630
- Tuesday 25 January 2022 from 1130 to 1630
- Thursday 31 March 2022 from 1130 to 1630
- Wednesday 6 July 2022 from 1130 to 1630

and for 2022/2023:

- Wednesday 12 October 2022 from 1130 to 1630
- Wednesday 23 November 2022 from 1130 to 1630
- Tuesday 31 January 2023 from 1130 to 1630
- Thursday 30 March 2023 from 1130 to 1630
- Wednesday 5 July 2023 from 1130 to 1630

115 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Board of Governors would take place on Wednesday 13 October 2021. The Board noted that it would receive an online briefing on the plans and progress of two major strategic projects on Thursday 8 July 2021.

116 Record of Thanks

i. The Chair thanked all governors for their contribution to the work of the Board and to the success of the University over the past year. In particular, she wished to record her thanks to the Deputy Chair for his support behind the scenes, to the Chairs of Committees and to the staff of Corporate Governance team.



ii. It was noted that the following governors would retire from the Board on 31 July 2021 and so thanks were recorded for their significant contribution to:

a) Bishop Christopher Foster

Bishop Christopher had been a member of the Board since February 2014 and a member of Infrastructure and Finance Committee since its formation in April 2019 and, previously, a member of Finance Committee . He had also served on the Committee that had helped to select the current Chancellor. In addition to his duties as Bishop of Portsmouth, he had served in the House of Lords where he had spoken on the need to care for less advantaged members of our society - a message that resonated with the University's values and mission.

b) Paul Myers

Paul had been a member of the Board since August 2013 and a member of Audit and Quality Committee. He had served conscientiously as a director of two of the University's subsidiary companies and had also served on the Project Board of the Sports Centre. He had also given great assistance to the University by regularly serving on appeal panels.

c) Lyuda Wade

Lyuda had been a member of the Board since August 2018 and a member of the Human Resources Committee since September 2018. She had provided valuable insights and perspectives as the governor representative for professional services. She would be shortly leaving the University to take up a new role and so was unable to continue her term of office into 2021/2022.

d) Tim Lee-Lewis (in absentia)

Tim had been a student governor since August 2019 and a member of the Audit and Quality Committee. Tim was due to retire from the Board on 31 July 2021 at the end of his term of office. However, Tim had needed to interrupt his studies on 1 April 2001 for personal reasons and was therefore no longer able to serve as a student governor.

- iii. It was normal practice in face to face meetings to mark these departures with a small token of appreciation. However, this would be arranged outside of the meeting and it was hoped that departing governors could be invited back for an event that enabled a more appropriate marking of their contribution and commitment.
- iv. Professor Galbraith thanked Jane Hoskins for her eight years as a governor and her four years as Chair. The Executive and the Board had valued her wise counsel and immense contribution to the University. They wished her well for the future.
- v. The Chair wished the University continued success and was pleased that the profile of the Board had changed over the years to better reflect the diverse community of students.