



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

Office UEB/2020/2104/01
Of
The President &
Vice-Chancellor.

Minutes

University Executive Board

- Date:** 18 February 2020
- Present:** Professor K Lamberts (KL) (in the Chair)
Professor J Derrick (JD), Professor S Fitzmaurice (SF), Professor S Hartley (SH), Professor M J Hounslow (MJH), Mrs J Jones (JJ), Professor D Petley (DP), Mr R Sykes (RS), Professor C Watkins (CW)
- In attendance:** Dr T Strike (TS), Mr J Verity (JV) & Mr Berren Maddison (BM) & Mrs F Carr (FC) (Item 3), Mr D Barcroft (DB) & Mrs L McCarthy (LC) (item 4), Mrs E Titterington-Giles (ETG) (Item 5), Mrs S Grocutt (SG) (Item 6), Mrs E Wheat (EW) (Item 7)
- Apologies:** Professor W Morgan (WM), Professor G Valentine (GV), Professor C Newman (CN)
- Secretary:** Ms K Sullivan (KS), Mr D Swinn (DS)

1. Closed Minute and Paper

2. Minutes of UEB held on 14 January 2020

2.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

3. Minutes of UEB held on 21 January 2020

3.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

4. Student Union Vision Feedback (Mr Jake Verity, Mrs Franziska Carr and Mr Berren Maddison in attendance for this item)

4.1 UEB received and noted an update on the key findings and recommendations from the Students' Union following student consultation on the Vision Green Paper. Key points highlighted included:

4.2 Academic Life

UEB noted that students valued research-led education and diverse perspectives and would welcome a greater provision of academic support.

4.3 Promoting Employability

UEB noted that there was a desire for increased support with careers and more diverse career options. In particular, international students expressed a feeling of increased pressure to secure employment after graduation.

4.4 **PGR Students**

UEB noted that while only a small sample size of PGR students had contributed to the consultation, there had been a general feeling of isolation amongst this group and a desire for their contribution to the University to be better recognised.

4.5 **Infrastructure, Facilities and resources**

UEB noted that students had expressed a desire for a more efficient use of space and more study space, with increased accessibility and a more participative approach to developments on campus. Environmental sustainability was strongly supported.

4.6 **Student Life and Wellbeing**

UEB noted that this had been a key theme of the consultation. Students had highlighted a wish for an integrated approach to student support and improved communications between academic departments and support services. Another strong theme had been a desire for increased extra-curricular activities.

4.7 **Listening to Students**

UEB noted that students wanted to feel valued and heard. Whilst it was recognised that SU Officers were already well represented on University Committees, there was a desire for opportunities for other students to be more involved decision making. UEB noted that it was important to ensure good communication to students about ways they are already influencing decision making.

4.8 **Recommendations and Reflections**

UEB welcomed the valuable feedback from students and noted the six recommendations. UEB was also pleased to note that the strongest themes aligned with the direction of travel supported by UEB, namely: a holistic approach to the Strategy, environmental sustainability, student wellbeing, inclusion and diversity and the need for students to feel heard and valued.

5. **Closed Minute and Paper**

6. **UK's Future Relationship with the EU**

(Mrs Emma Titterington-Giles in attendance for this item)

6.1 UEB considered an update from the Brexit Coordination Group (BCG) on its work to ensure University preparedness for a No Deal Brexit. It was highlighted that work had focused on the risks associated with a No Deal Brexit and action to mitigate these risks. Attention was drawn to proposals about how the role of the BCG might change; how the University should seek to lobby and influence Government; the policy landscape, possible scenarios for the University, and the risks associated with each; key issues; and the University position during the negotiations between the UK and the EU.

6.2 During discussion, UEB noted the following:

- 6.1
- Now that the Withdrawal Agreement was in force it was proposed to change the Brexit Co-ordination Group's role from planning for a worst-case. No Deal, outcome, to coordinating internal planning and external influencing for the University's desired outcomes.
 - Key issues for focus included Erasmus, research funding, immigration and EU student recruitment (including fees), export controls and mutual recognition of qualifications.
 - It was important to focus on opportunities and seek to positively influence policy making in support of desired outcomes.
 - It was important to ensure the University was prepared for a number of scenarios and that plans were in place to mitigate key risks.

- UEB was assured that plans were in place to mitigate risks associated with supply chain issues and that trigger points had been identified.

6.2 UEB approved the five recommendations, as set out in the report.

7. **Closed Minute and Paper**

8. **Race Equality Steering Group**

(Mrs Elizabeth Wheat in attendance for this item)

8.1 UEB considered a proposal from the Race Equality Steering Group for the Strategic Change Office to provide ongoing support for delivery of the Race Equality Action Plan. During discussion, UEB was updated on deliverables and was assured that the SCO had capacity to support this work.

8.2 UEB approved the recommendation that the SCO provide project management and change management expertise to support three recommendations in the Delivery Plan, as set out in the related paper:

9. **SCO Support for the implementation of Plan S at TUOS**

9.1 UEB received and noted a proposed plan for the Strategic Change Office (SCO) to provide support for the implementation of Plan S to ensure compliance with funder open access policy. The SCO would work in close partnership with SH, the University Library, Research Services and other key stakeholders, to ensure Plan S compliance by January 2021. During discussion, UEB noted that UKRI were currently consulting on the implementation of Plan S.

9.2 **Actions:**

- (a) Await the outcome of the UKRI consultation before proceeding further.
- (b) UEB would consider the outcome of the UKRI consultation and implementation plans to future meeting.

10. **Report of UEB Estates and Capital Sub Group (Meeting held on 10 February 2020)**

10.1 UEB received the Report and approved a number of proposals set out in the related paper and accompanying business cases, subject to Finance Committee and/or Council approval where relevant in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation.

10.2 **UEB:**

- (a) New Spring House: Approved the release of funds to cover the fees and total construction cost to carry out backlog maintenance works at New Spring House. UEB noted that ECSG supported the case on basis of strategic need to mitigate further dilapidations and ensure continuity of service provided by the building users. UEB also noted that funding sources included an element of sinking fund contribution and capital backlog maintenance budget.
- (b) Transformer (Energy Centre): Approved the release of additional funding to cover cost increases.
- (c) Northumberland Road Building: Heating Strategy: Approved the release of funds from the Sustainability Opportunities Fund to support the next phase in development of the Ground Source Heat Pump network. UEB noted that ECSG had supported the case on the basis of strategic fit with the University's commitment to manage its atmospheric emissions and energy consumption responsibly.

- (d) Psychology Space Development: Approved the release of funds from the capital programme to support the space refurbishment works required at Cathedral Court. UEB noted that ECSG had supported the proposal on the basis of strategic need to grow UG and PGT numbers, mitigate against the risk of lost income and to improve staff satisfaction and working conditions for research staff.
- (e) Factory 2050 Barriers & HGV Access Solution: Approved the release of funds from the capital programme to support the design and implementation of new Secure by Design Certified barrier and HGV solution for Factory 2050. UEB noted that ECSG supported the case on the basis of need and the assessment of the level of security required for the Factory 2050 site.
- (f) Hendersons Building: Approved the release of funds from the capital programme to support the RIBA stage 0 to 1 design process for the refurbishment of the Hendersons building. UEB noted that the plan would help to address wider issues across the University and the estimated cost of the full refurbishment.
- (g) Refurbishment of Regent Court: Approved the release of funds from the capital programme to support RIBA Stage 4 design stage. UEB noted that these additional costs would be underwritten by the Faculty of Engineering in lieu of full business case approval; Concern was expressed that this decision had been taken outside of the governance framework, which would be considered as part of the review of the approval processes.
- (h) Disposal of Tapton Court: Approved entering into further negotiations with PJ Livesey to explore the current offer in more detail.
- (i) Edwardian block: Noted the position and way forward with regard to the findings of a condition survey and further investigations of the North elevation of the Edwardian Block.
- (j) CRAG Report – UEB noted the approval of two BID assessment forms.

10.3 With regard to other proposals not approved the following was noted:

- (a) 388 Glossop Road (Husband Building): UEB considered a proposal to refurbish and extend 388 Glossop Road to relocate the Psychology department back to the central campus until permanent accommodation was available. UEB agreed to pause the project until the requirements of Psychology and the intended final occupier were understood.
- (b) Refurbishment of Chemistry North East Wing: UEB noted that the proposal was an enabler of the Science Estates Development Framework but felt that the request was premature because the SEDF and associated business cases had not yet been formally approved through the usual governance processes.
- (c) Lease of 605 Ecclesall Road: UEB paused to proposal to continue negotiations with a prospective tenant, to allow time to better understand the case to lease the property rather than dispose of it.
- (d) Performance Space: UEB was updated on an opportunity to secure a city centre site as a strategic opportunity to develop a performance art space, thereby also increasing the attractiveness of the SCR to potential students and future staff members. ECSG had recognised these potential benefits but was keen for UEB to have the opportunity explore this further and to consider it in the context of wider institutional strategy and the capital pipeline.

10.4 During discussion of the governance approval process for capital projects and budget increases the following were noted:

- A need for better oversight of the overarching framework for linked projects,

for example those within the SEDF.

- It was important to ensure a robust mechanism for requesting budget increases, to mitigate overspends without appropriate approval.

10.5 **Actions:**

- (a) Business cases approved at paragraphs 10.2 (a), (b) and (c) would be presented to Finance Committee and Council for approval in November.
- (b) The Matters relating to the governance approval process referred to at paragraphs 10.3 (a) and (d) would be considered by the Capital Prioritisation Pipeline Group in March 2020.

11. **Report of the IT Sub-Group**

11.1 UEB approved the Report, including updated terms of reference and membership and noted an update on the matters discussed at the ITSG meetings on 9 December 2019 and 30 January 2020. Attention was drawn to the Phase One Business Case to the Technology Enabled Strategic Framework (TESF) and an update on the Identity and Access Management (IDAM).

11.2 During discussion UEB noted the following:

11.3 **TESF**

- It was important to ensure robust governance and approval mechanisms for the approval of each phase of the TESF and the individual business cases within each phase.
- It had been agreed there should be separate business cases for the overall TESF and Phase One.
- It was important to manage expectations about individual projects across the organisation, including at department level, particularly projects that had been in the pipeline for some time.

11.4 **IDAM**

- The project had failed its most recent Gateway Review.
- UEB were assured appropriate actions were in place.

10.4 **Actions:**

- (i) **TESF Business Cases** – The business cases for the overall TESF and Phase One would be shared with UEB.
- (ii) **TESF Governance** – Further thought would be given to how governance and approvals of IT projects were linked to the Finance Committee.

12. **Round Table**

- (a) Work Allocation Task and Finish Group: CW updated UEB on ongoing discussions about how best to ensure transparent work allocation processes. The group was broadly receptive to recommended changes but further discussions were needed with colleagues in some departments; CW would meet with the relevant UEB member and colleagues. UEB noted that UCU wished to communicate progress to their members.

Actions:

- (i) Draft wording for UCU to be shared with UEB for comment.

