

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Governors held on Tuesday 20 September 2022.

Present: David Lamb (Chair), Richard Bacon, Jenny Body, Laura Claydon, Carolyn Donoghue (from G22.09.), Priya Kaur, Professor Dame Julie Lydon, Grant Mansfield, Rania Regaieg (until G22.09.14), Tim Simmonds, Margaret Simmons-Bird, Professor Jim Smith (until G22.09.14), Dave Tansley, Professor Steve West (until G22.09.14), Kalpna Woolf.

Apologies: Professor Marc Griffiths, Domini Harewood, Ian MacKenzie, Andrea Young.

In Attendance: Dr Jodie Anstee, Clerk (until G22.09.14), Professor Amanda Coffey, DVC and Provost (until G22.09.14), William Liew (from G22.09. to G22.09.), Professor Jim Longhurst, Assistant Vice-Chancellor, Environment and Sustainability (for G22.09.13), Jo Midgley, Registrar and PVC Student Experience (from G22.09.5 until G22.09.7.3), Christine Gledhill, Deputy Clerk (minutes, until G22.09.14).

G22.09.1 MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES

G22.09.1.1 Apologies received were noted as set out above.

Confirmation of Chair and Deputy Chair of the Board of Governors

G22.09.1.2 Members confirmed David Lamb as Chair of the Board of Governors.

G22.09.1.3 Members confirmed Jenny Body as Deputy Chair of the Board of Governors.

G22.09.2 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Members were invited to declare any agenda items for which they may be conflicted.

No declarations were received.

G22.09.3 OPENING DISCUSSION

G22.09.3.1 The Chair invited Members to raise any further matters for consideration at the meeting or for a future meeting of the Board. No further matters were raised.

G22.09.3.2 The Vice-Chancellor also invited Members to advise of any areas of interest that could be addressed in one of the regular VC Update to Governors sessions.

G22.09.3.3 The Chair reminded Members that they were able to contact him at any time.

STRATEGIC ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

G22.09.4 VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Paper G22/09/01 was received

G22.09.4.1 Members noted the content of the report and received an update from the Vice-Chancellor. Members noted the following in particular:

G22.09.4.2 *Student Recruitment*

- i. First year students had arrived on campus and that day was the first day of the autumn term and of Starting Block.
- ii. Industrial action by Unison was taking place that day, but there was no indication of significant disruption. It was anticipated that balloting of other trade unions may follow and may lead to co-ordinated industrial action.

G22.09.4.3 *External Policy Environment*

- i. The appointment of a new Secretary of State for Education, the Rt Hon Kit Malthouse, who:
 - a. had indicated an intention to focus on the whole education system;
 - b. recognised the strength of universities in terms of economic impact and wished to promote this;
 - c. wished to focus on the quality of education system and the quality of degree qualifications;
 - d. had an interest in innovation and research in universities and how this could drive investment.
- ii. The Vice-Chancellor had met with Andrea Jenkyns, MP, the new Minister for Skills. The Minister wished to continue her predecessor's work on HE and FE working collaboratively, creating pathways for apprenticeships.
- iii. Horizon Europe funding programme –
 - a. The recent anxiety with regard to the government's position on association with the programme had started to shift, with the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) having expressed a wish to associate the UK with the programme.
 - b. UUK was working with BEIS with regard to an alternative programme and would make clear to the Treasury that such monies were not to be moved or assigned to other activities.

G22.09.4.3 *UUK Annual Conference*

Members noted that the conference had taken place earlier in the month in Leicester and that a copy of the Vice-Chancellor's address to the conference as UUK President was available on the UUK website.

G22.09.4.4 *Guardian League Table*

Members noted that the publication of the Guardian League table, expected on 10 September, had been delayed due to the period of mourning following the death of Her Majesty The Queen. An update would be provided to Governors via the Teams site.

G22.09.4.5 *Senior Staff Recruitment*

Members received an update on the current position with regard to the Chief People Officer recruitment process.

G22.09.4.6 Members referred to the UUK report on 'Closing the Gap: three years on', and asked whether the impact of the ethnicity awarding gap on employment opportunities was tracked per ethnic group.

G22.09.4.7 Professor Amanda Coffey, DVC and Provost reminded Members of the Graduate Outcomes Survey that was undertaken 18 months after graduation. Members noted that the survey was heavily promoted and its data was then disaggregated. The latest survey data did not indicate any significant gaps across ethnic groups.

Members were reminded that this was considered by the People, Culture, Quality and Standards (PCQS) Committee at its first meeting of the year.

- G22.09.4.8 Members remarked upon the term 'Clearing' and the negative connotations that this may have and whether an alternative term could be used.
- G22.09.4.9 Members noted that a lot of students would be in Clearing, with many choosing not to actively engage with the applications process until their exam results were known. It was therefore perceived in a more positive sense, as students used it as a first entry point to the process, or as a means of 'trading up' (the process is referred to as Clearing and Adjustment) when results were better than expected. The University had used the term very positively in its marketing for this reason.
- G22.09.4.10 Members were reminded of the Government's previous consideration of post-qualification admissions in Higher Education and the decision then not to pursue this reform. Members noted however, that the new Secretary of State had indicated an inclination to relook at this. At the time of the earlier considerations, the University had undertaken its own modelling exercise, which had indicated that it was able to manage the impact of such reform.
- G22.09.4.11 Members remarked upon a report in the press of universities doubling their tuition fees. The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the report stemmed from one journalist having telephoned a very small number Vice-Chancellors and upon those conversations had constructed this story. Members also noted that despite what was reported, there was no evidence to support the claim that International student recruitment was suppressing Home student recruitment.
- G22.09.4.12 Members were reminded of the Government's position that the £9,250 tuition fee for England was fixed for at least two years (Scotland and Wales would determine their own position in this regard, as devolved nations). Members noted that the tuition fee was not inflation-linked.
- G22.09.4.13 Members asked how the University would ensure that the combined factors of the cost-of-living crisis, accommodation issues, etc. were not disproportionately impacting upon particular groups of students.
- G22.09.4.14 Members recognised the importance of understanding the data for the University and its comparative position with national data. Members noted that this particular topic would be a timely focus of a Board seminar.
- G22.09.4.15 Members were reminded that in terms of student recruitment, contingency had been set within the budget to accommodate any shortfall. Members noted that student numbers would not be known until later in the term (November), although it was already clear that some students had deferred and that some international students were in significant hardship and may struggle to meet entry/visa requirements.
- G22.09.4.16 Members noted that the viability of the University's postgraduate programmes were reliant on international student recruitment and the whole portfolio would be evaluated. Members also noted that the University offered Integrated Masters programmes.
- G22.09.4.17 Members noted that the University held awarding gap data at module and programme level, which was available to Colleges and Schools via the University EDI portal. Members also noted that through analysis of NSS profiles, admissions and student exposure to Clearing, it was possible to see patterns emerging.
- Members were reminded that for many of its programmes, the University was ahead of the sector in closing awarding gaps.
- G22.09.4.18 Members asked whether an issue of obtaining research grants could be a factor in deterring Home students for applying for postgraduate study. Members noted that

this related to Postgraduate Research (PGR) study – namely, 3-year PhD programmes – and there was a correlation with external research grant capture. The University would continue to invest significantly in these programmes; however, there was an issue of PhD applications waning across the sector.

G22.09.4.19 Members noted that the Office for Students was also looking into addressing awarding gaps among international students. Members noted that the most recent University data had shown that 571 international part-time Masters graduates had achieved very good grades and there were no awarding gaps in the relevant programmes of study.

G22.09.5 PEOPLE FIRST: STAFF VOICE INSIGHTS AND NEXT STEPS

Paper G22/09/02 was received

G22.09.5.1 Jo Midgley, Registrar and Pro Vice-Chancellor, Student Experience led Members through the key features of the high-level results summary of the Great Place To Work (GPTW) employee engagement survey, recently undertaken by UWE Bristol staff.

G22.09.5.2 Members noted:

- i. The survey consisted of 59 core statements.
- ii. The University achieved an overall score of 62% (employers were required to achieve 65% and achieve in other areas to be certified a great place to work).
- iii. Respondents' statements provided in the feedback were unsurprising, with themes for change already having been identified by the VCE and captured in the People Strategy planning work.
- iv. The survey allowed for testing/comparison against the national average and across all industries.
- v. The areas of inconsistent scores were a focus for the VCE, the addressing of which would make a significant difference to the overall staff experience.
- vi. Academic staff were less happy than Professional Services colleagues. Members noted that the University had undertaken and recently completed an initial review of academic workload and would work in partnership with the trade unions and academic staff to find sustainable solutions to this key issue.

G22.09.5.3 Members asked whether the low scores also applied to academic staff in the (then) Faculty of Engineering and Technology. Members noted that qualitative feedback had indicated particular frustrations with bureaucracy holding back innovation and creativity.

G22.09.5.4

- vii. There was a clear difference in score between non-disabled staff assessing the experience of disabled staff, and that of disabled staff assessing their own experience.
- viii. Change leadership was not being translated as effectively as was needed.
- ix. Significant commentary around cost of living, pay and reward recognition.
- x. Positive themes included:
 - a. Work-life balance.
 - b. Great colleagues.
 - c. A sense of community and a welcoming environment.
 - d. Supportive line managers.
 - e. Focus on EDI.
 - f. Campus grounds.

G22.09.5.2 During discussions Members noted that the weekly VC Q&A online sessions, introduced in the first Covid lockdown, reached on average 150 staff, the majority of which were Professional Services colleagues and often the same questions were asked. There was, therefore, a need to find a different way to reach to staff more widely.

- G22.09.5.3 xi. Recommendations included:
- a. Celebrate staff successes and with greater frequency.
 - b. Use the resources available through GPTW and Engaging with Success.
 - c. Senior staff workshop – 4 key themes:
 - i. Organisational integrity.
 - ii. Strategic narrative.
 - iii. Employee voice.
 - iv. Engaging managers.
- xii. The details of next steps were being worked through and would be shared with the PCQS Committee.
- G22.09.5.4 During discussions Members expressed the view that the GPTW survey was a positive thing to do and that the results showed that the University was close to achieving the threshold of certification. Members noted that key to this would be addressing the issue of the strategic narrative whilst simultaneously addressing the matters raised through the survey responses.
- G22.09.5.5 Members were invited to share examples from their own workplace, or their experience of strategies deployed to make organisations a ‘fun place to work’, or to share more general feedback on the results.
- G22.09.5.6 Members commented that organisations that were very client-focused – such as universities – often overlooked talking about their talent; much of this was also about communications and it was difficult to share all the great things that staff and the University were doing.
- G22.09.5.7 One Member shared that senior team members of their organisation sent weekly emails to all staff that were anecdotal, rather than strategic.
- G22.09.5.8 Members acknowledged that making the University a fun place to work was about creativity, rather than costly solutions.
- G22.09.5.9 Members recognised also that staff who were student-facing seemed to have felt they were unable to do their job within hours and their disquiet potentially could affect NSS results.
- G22.09.5.10 During further discussions Members noted the following:
- i. The importance of connecting the survey results with other feedback, in order to understand the different approaches to address these that may be required across different areas of the University.
 - ii. That an individual’s happiness at work was linked to the line manager, therefore consideration should be around how best to tackle those managers who were not cascading and engaging colleagues in that strategic narrative.
 - iii. Reward/recognition – there was a need to embed a culture that this was not about pay.
 - iv. The message of the University being a ‘great place to work’ had to come with credibility, from those who cared, such as immediate line managers or heads of department. The results were indicating that a disconnect existed between Professional Services staff and Academics, e.g. commentary about workload. The University was looking to address some of the workload issues through the Target Operating Model (TOM).
 - v. The importance of working with all staff at all levels.
- G22.09.5.11 Members asked whether the absence of a Chief People Officer was an inhibiting factor. Members noted that whilst it was expected that the CPO would have

expertise in such matters, the quality of the staff experience remained the responsibility of all.

- G22.09.5.12
- vi. Employee recognition scheme – normalise celebrating success in a visible way; this would be empowering for those in junior positions.
 - vii. Consider continuing with senior team ‘sofa sessions’ (Q&A), but make these more focused and less frequent.
 - viii. Consider connecting with other organisations that were achieving higher ratings in terms of engagement/fun.
 - ix. For smaller organisations ‘Company Days’ worked very well, with external speakers, sports and sessions around strategy, including the lower-level detail of how to deliver strategy together.
 - x. Leadership at different levels should be about creating hope, opportunity and joy; doing this would transform the University.

G22.09.6 STRATEGY: STRATEGY 2030 IMPLEMENTATION

Paper G22/09/03 was received

G22.09.6.1 Strategy 2030 Roadmap Report
Jo Midgley, Registrar and Pro Vice-Chancellor, Student Experience referred Members to the Strategy 2030 Roadmap, which included details on progress to date, current and emerging issues and next steps.

G22.09.6.2 Members noted the following:

- i. The updating of the roadmap with RAG rating against activities, providing a high level view of progress; reasons for the current rating were also provided.
- ii. Further changes to sequencing to reflect changing context, priorities and early learning were yet to be made and a more detailed update would be provided to the Board at the next meeting.
- iii. The delay to the implementation of the Ellucian student information system. Following the decision made by the Programme Board and the VCE to align the implementation to the supplier roadmap, the implementation plan was being reprofiled and a new business case to capture impact was being prepared for the Finance, Estates and IT (FEIT) Committee meeting in October.

G22.09.6.3 Members endorsed the decision to pause the implementation of the new student information system and noted that the FEIT Committee would consider the matter in detail.

G22.09.7 STRATEGY: CORPORATE SCORECARD

Paper G22/09/04 was received

G22.09.7.1 The Registrar and Pro Vice-Chancellor, Student Experience shared with Members a short animation which explained what a TOM meant for the University and how this connected all strategic projects to the core purpose to deliver on Strategy 2030.

The animation was highly commended by Board Members.

G22.09.7.2 During discussions of the Corporate Scorecard and revised KPIs, Members asked the rationale for the removal of elements relation to student performance. Members noted that there were a number of scorecards that sat below the Corporate Scorecard, which the University was seeking to align to enable further detailed enquiry.

G22.09.7.3 Members also noted the following:

- i. The need to see and measure progress across KPI data from one year to the next.

- ii. The need to ensure that the data also flowed into requirements elsewhere, e.g. OfS.
- iii. The Board received a top level view, with the data provided being the same as that used across the University.
- iv. The removal of the KPIs 'Module Pass Rate' and 'Graduate Wellbeing'; Members felt that whilst these were the areas that ought to be measured, the current 'labels' were unsuitable and another way of capturing this information was needed. Members noted that these measures were still captured via OfS reporting requirements.

STUDENT VOICE

G22.09.8 UPDATE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENTS' UNION

Paper G22/09/05 was received

- G22.09.8.1 Rania Regaieg, UWESU President and Student Nominee highlighted to the Board the matters that were exercising the Students' Union – both nationally and locally.
- G22.09.8.2 Members noted the following:
- i. Cost-of-living crisis –
 - a. The impact on the health and wellbeing of students.
 - b. Students were spending less but focusing more on essential needs.
 - c. Reports nationally that students were dropping out of their studies. The UWESU President informed Members that she had spoken to a few UWE students about the matter, none of whom had shared an intention to withdraw from their studies.
 - d. The NUS had issued a national cost-of-living complaint to the Government, signed by 50 students' unions.
 - e. Food deliveries for students living off-campus were still being developed.
 - ii. International students –
 - a. There was a misconception that these students had money and a certain level of means. For example, non-EU students from countries that were considered to be under-developed and those from countries affected by climate or other emergencies – the savings of those students could be affected. There was a need to consider how best to support these students in terms of their health, wellbeing and student experience so that they were able to continue to graduation.
 - b. Government ambition was to increase the international recruitment, yet its support excluded international students. There was a question as to whether universities were being provided sufficiently to support these students once they had arrived.
- G22.09.8.3 Members asked how the decision was made as to who received support from the Students' Union and noted that for activities such as 'bring your own bowl' which was administered on a first-come-first-served basis, it would be a matter of observing those who came to ascertain a sense of level of need.
- G22.09.8.4 Members recognised that there may be an element of anxiety or shame among some individuals who were most in need.
- G22.09.8.5 Members also noted that the University was working with the UWESU in seeking an aligned approach, given that the resources of the UWESU were limited. Initiatives included daily hot meals, free sanitary products and hardship funding.
- G22.09.8.6 Members noted that whilst some groups such as care leavers and those from families with low income (less than £25,000) were well supported because they were easily identifiable through the University's systems, there was a challenge in

distinguishing the next level up from that which the University was seeking to address.

- G22.09.8.7 Members also noted that the University was facing a £4m-£5m squeeze on energy costs and food inflation costs, and was working through a range of possible support for students, for example interest-free loans.
- G22.09.8.8 Members further noted that there was a call from the sector to the Government to do more to help students, for example:
- i. It was unlikely that students in private accommodation would receive the energy support scheme discount, with this going to the property owner.
 - ii. Students were experiencing huge increases in rent.
 - iii. The debt profile for international students had increased and continued to impact. This was unsustainable and there was no evidence of Government support for this, or how monies were distributed. It was important that the Board was assured that the University was not in breach of its EBITDA rule and loans covenants.
- G22.09.8.9 Members endorsed the imperative that the University and the UWESU continued to work collaboratively and that the UWESU CEO held a critical co-ordinating role.
- G22.09.8.10 Members asked whether the University would also consider hardship payments for staff and noted the confirmation that this was also being explored.
- G22.09.8.11 Members also remarked upon the initiatives around food need that had been described and the importance of galvanising the involvement of as many people as possible. For example, it would be helpful for academic staff to know background information such as this as it would be likely to have an impact on their studies.
- G22.09.8.12 Members noted that the food offered was culturally appropriate and that on occasion students would cook together, thereby making connections.
- G22.09.8.13 Members also noted that students were staying on campus because it was cheaper than being at home and the University was looking to put together a package “set up at 7”, promoting its campuses as comfortable and warm, with places to eat.
- G22.09.8.14 The UWESU President and Student Nominee continued with the highlights of the report. Members noted:
- i. Bristol Student Accommodation – there was an excess of demand to supply; was there a case for the University to look at how the student recruitment target was set.
- G22.09.8.15 Members noted that the University had a plan in place to build additional student accommodation, as did the University of Bristol. Members also noted that because of the pandemic, many property owners had chosen to discontinue providing private accommodation in light of tax changes and many such properties were sold. This had not been predicted and many of the larger cities were impacted by this, including Bristol.
- G22.09.8.16 Members also noted that UWE Bristol was not a nationally recruiting institution and there was evidence that students whose homes were in Bristol were now choosing to live in student accommodation. Members further noted that were the University to choose to reduce its recruitment targets and build its accommodation, it could only then hope that it could recoup those student numbers; there would be no guarantee. Members endorsed the view that it would be sensible for the University to continue on its current plan with the necessary contingency plans in place.

- G22.09.8.17 Members were clear in that the University was not legally responsible for providing accommodation for students.
- G22.09.8.18 Members commented that the numbers in 6th Forms were down, significantly so in some areas, with many of those students choosing not to apply to university and encouraged the University to be mindful of this and the impact it may have. Members noted that considerations such as this also influenced the building of new accommodation to enable future conversion if required.
- G22.09.8.19
- ii. Drug and Alcohol Impact Accreditation – UWE Bristol and the Students’ Union at UWE were the first university partnership to receive a national Drug and Alcohol Impact Accreditation in 2022.
 - iii. The removal of a Senior Drugs and Alcohol Practitioner within the Wellbeing Team.
 - iv. In-house sexual violence victim support provision – SafeLink had ended its contract with the University.
- G22.09.8.20 Members noted that the Senior Drugs and Alcohol Practitioner had been an external worker who had moved from the end of their contract to a new appointment in-house; the University continued to work with the external provider. Members also noted that all of the University’s Wellbeing Team had received enhanced training in relation to the use of drugs and alcohol.
- G22.09.8.21 Members further noted that the University was transitioning away from the relationship with SafeLink, with additional training being provided for the team and the appointment of a Safeguarding Manager without their own caseload. The University wished to progress further towards having a number of anti-sexual violence officers and a more proactive service in place.
- G22.09.8.22 Members noted that this would be kept under review and the University would continue to work on this with the Students’ Union.

REPORTS

G22.09.10 COMMITTEE ASSURANCE REPORTS

Paper G22/09/06 was received

G22.09.10.1 Emergency Committee

The Chair of Governors and Chair of the Committee informed Members that the Emergency Committee had considered and approved the recommendation that the University join the Bristol Futures Partnership Community Interest Company (CIC).

G22.09.10.2 Nominations and Governance Committee

The Chair of Governors and Chair of the Committee informed Members that the Nominations and Governance Committee had met earlier that day to consider the results of the Governance effectiveness survey undertaken by Governors over the summer.

G22.09.10.3 Members noted that discussions had included:

- i. Widening the attendance of members of the VCE through Board meetings – i.e. the Registrar and PVC Student Experience, the Chief Financial Officer and the Chief People Officer (when appointed).
- ii. The breadth of meeting papers and the articulation of where these had been considered prior to presentation to the Board/committee, to demonstrate diversity of thought and voice that had contributed to them.

G22.09.11 CLERK'S REPORT

Paper G22/09/07 was received

G22.09.11.1 Members noted the content of the report. Dr Jodie Anstee, Clerk to the Board of Governors highlighted the following in particular:

G22.09.11.2 Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Annual Statement 2021-2022
Members were reminded that the University's annual Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement was considered for approval by the Board in September each year, for publication on the website and inclusion in the University's Annual Report. The progress made in the 2021/2022 academic year, changes to the risk environment and plans for 2022/2023 were noted by the Board.

Members **approved** the annual statement for signature by the Vice-Chancellor and publication.

G22.09.11.3 Board and Committee Diversity Project

- i. The development of two interactive training modules (one for committee members, one for Chairs and Officers).
- ii. These modules would be supported by an intranet guide which would include practical resources and further reading to support inclusive practice throughout the University's governance arrangements. This was planned for launch in January 2023.
- iii. The intention to engage one or two Board Members to share their expertise and experiences in this space as these resources were developed and tested, particularly in terms of their impact for the Board.

G22.09.11.4 Members were invited to contact the Clerk to register their interest in engaging further with this project work.

ACTION: Board Members to contact the Clerk

G22.09.12 MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

Paper G22/09/08 was received

G22.09.12.1 Members **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2022.

G22.09.12.2 **Matters Arising**

Vice-Chancellor's Report – National Student Survey (G22.07.5.10 refers)

Members asked whether a summary analysis of the NSS results would be shared with the Board. Members noted the intention for the qualitative feedback to be checked against the Subject Readiness Review roadmaps when complete, to ensure that key themes were picked up and any gaps addressed.

G22.09.12.3 The DVC and Provost advised Members that there were some analyses that were able to be shared, which were more concerned with programmes having detailed roadmap/plans. Members welcomed this offer of the DVC and Provost.

ACTION: DVC and Provost

G22.09.12.4 Members noted the role of the PCQS Committee in its scrutiny of data such as the results of the NSS and the staff survey which, when pieced together, demonstrated areas of both outstanding practice, as well as risk. Members also noted that the University was working on an Annual Academic Quality Report, which would pull together various data including: NSS, complaints, appeals, etc. that had been previously presented as separate reports.

G22.09.13 STRATEGIC SEMINAR: SUSTAINABILITY

Paper G22/09/09 was received

- G22.09.13.1 Professor Jim Longhurst, Assistant Vice-Chancellor, Environment and Sustainability joined the meeting for this item and shared the presentation 'Climate Action and Sustainability at UWE Bristol'. A Q&A session followed the presentation.
- G22.09.13.2 Members referred to the planned relocation of Glenside to Frenchay and asked whether this would be built/designed sustainably. Members noted that whilst passivhaus would be the preferred approach that would be promoted for new builds, it was also recognised that the more that sustainable features were built in, the better it would be in terms of costs and the future use of buildings. Much would also be learned from the new Bristol North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Integrated Care System.
- G22.09.13.3 Members also asked whether sustainability featured in the University's international partnership arrangements and noted that whilst there was no formal mechanism, there could be elements that arose through the course of other discussions.
- G22.09.13.4 Members enquired as to the extent of research into technologies at the University and noted the confirmation that this was happening (e.g. microplastics). Members encouraged the University to increase the visibility of such research activity, so that students were able to see that there were opportunities to be involved.
- G22.09.13.5 Members noted that the Research with Impact case studies on the University's website included a statement of how its research aligned to the UN 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.
- G22.09.13.6 Members commended the impressive and comprehensive work that was being undertaken and the positive impact that this could have on some of the comments made by respondents to the staff survey. Members encouraged the University to communicate this more widely across its community.
- G22.09.13.7 University staff, Staff and Student Nominees left the meeting.

G22.09.14 INDEPENDENT GOVERNOR DISCUSSION

This session involved Lay Governors only and was not minuted.

***G22.09.15 RECURRENT FUNDING FOR 2022-2023 (PREVIOUSLY OFFICE FOR STUDENTS' GRANT LETTER)**

*Paper *G22/09/10 was received and noted.*

***G22.09.16 CORPORATE SEAL**

*Paper *G22/09/11 was received and noted.*

***G22.09.17 ACADEMIC BOARD MINUTES**

*The minutes of 6 July 2022 (Paper *G22/09/12) were yet to be received and would be provided as a starred agenda item at the next meeting.*

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

29 November 2022	13:00 – 18:00	Frenchay
21-22 March 2023	inc. Away Day	Clevedon Hall
11 July 2023	13:00 – 18:00	Starting with a joint strategic seminar with Academic Board

OUTSTANDING ACTIONS			
Meeting	Minute	Action	Status
20 Sept 2022	G22.09.11.4	Members were invited to contact the Clerk to register their interest in engaging further with the Board and Committee Diversity Project training modules development.	
20 Sept 2022	G22.09.12.3	DVC and Provost to share selected summary analyses of qualitative feedback with Board Members.	