



The  
University  
Of  
Sheffield.

Office  
Of  
The President &  
Vice-Chancellor.

UEB/2020/2508/02

## Minutes University Executive Board

**Date:** 21 July 2020

**Present:** Professor G Valentine (GV), (in the Chair)  
Professor J Derrick (JD), Professor S Fitzmaurice (SF),  
Professor S Hartley (SH), Professor M J Hounslow (MJH), Ms J Jones (JJ),  
Professor W Morgan (WM), Professor C Newman (CN),  
Professor D Petley (DNP), Mr R Sykes (RS), Professor C Watkins (CW)

**In attendance:** Dr T Strike (TS), Ms A Morgan (AM) (item 1), Mr K Lilley (KXL) (item 2),  
Ms H Morgan (HM) (item 3)

**Apologies:** Professor K Lamberts (KL)

**Secretary:** Mr E Smith (ES) / Mr D Swinn (DS)

### 1. Engaging with the Student Lifecycle Project

(AM in attendance for this item)

1.1 UEB considered a paper that set out the Student Lifecycle Project's (SLP's) proposed approach for engaging with stakeholders to ensure that the programme was delivered on time and on budget. Attention was drawn to the importance placed on such engagement work in Gemserv's independent report. Progress made to date included efforts to enhance working relationships with the FDOs and SLP Faculty Representatives. The approach proposed was intended to give the SLP a renewed identity and purpose, aid colleagues' understanding of what the programme intended to deliver and the benefits to be realised, and the rationale for prioritising investment in SLP at a time of financial challenge.

1.2 During discussion, UEB noted the following points:

- The SLP Programme Team would update Faculty staff on what the programme aimed to deliver, the timescales over which it aimed to deliver it, and differences from current business processes.
- Communications to staff should focus less on framing the programme and more on the practical changes that would arise from the implementation of SITS, including functionality and processes that were not possible under the current system.
- Communications would be explicit about the problems that SLP would solve, recognise the risks of not delivering the SLP, and acknowledge that delivering the SLP required effort and resource from across the institution.

- It was also important to recognise that SITS would enable the University to significantly expand the services available to students, such that they would be at least comparable to those offered elsewhere in the sector.

1.3 UEB endorsed the proposed approach.

1.4 **Actions:**

- (a) The stakeholder engagement plan and accompanying communications would be supplemented by the development of a summary of changes, benefits, and additional functionality, including reflecting on examples.
- (b) As previously agreed at UEB, FVPs committed to drive Faculty engagement with the SLP until completion in 2021.
- (c) In due course, AM may be invited to attend Faculty Executive Board meetings to engage with each Faculty's senior leaders about the SLP.
- (d) UEB would receive regular reports on progress from the SLP Sponsoring Group.

2. **Closed Minute and Paper**

3. **Leadership and Management Development Proposal**

(HM in attendance for this item)

3.1 UEB received a paper that outlined a series of proposals for the University's Leadership and Management Development offer in the 2020/21 academic year. This included both the Sheffield Leader: Impact and Essentials programmes and the online People Management Development provision. Clarification was provided that, although the proposals would secure cost savings and therefore contribute to the University's response to Covid-19, they aligned with existing Human Resources plans for refreshing and reshaping its offerings in this area to embrace online opportunities and better cater to staff needs.

3.2 During discussion, the following points were raised:

Executive Team Development Programme

- There was scope to examine what had worked well across the teams that had participated to date.
- The programme had highlighted the variation in capacity and capability across departmental executive teams.

Heads of Department

- The focus on coaching and people management responded to HoDs' assessments of challenges for the upcoming academic year.
- The efficacy of 1:1 coaching would depend on how it worked alongside the management aspects of the programmes.

3.3 UEB agreed:

- (a) A reduction in the number of departments participating in the Sheffield Leader: Impact, Executive Team Development Programme and to identify which academic HoDs, and their respective executive teams, would benefit from participating in the programme during the 2020/21 academic year.
- (b) To pause the Sheffield Leader: Impact, Personal Development and Future Leaders Development Programme for the 2020/21 academic year.

- (c) To disaggregate the Sheffield Leader: Essentials programme and move it into a series of open access management development courses delivered through the People Management offer.
- (d) The proposed themes for the new People Management development offer, as set out in the related paper.

#### 3.4 **Action:**

- (a) FVPs would be consulted about which executive teams should be proposed to embark on the Executive Team Development Programme in 2020/21.

### 4. **Coronavirus Update**

4.1 UEB received an update on recent developments and related monitoring and reporting requirements. It was reported that a revised Major Incident Team (MIT) would be reconstituted, with revised membership. MIT would undertake specific work in parallel to the Return to Campus Group, which would focus on the complex issues around the resumption of learning and teaching activities in the autumn, and the range of other actions that were now embedded within normal management structures and business processes, e.g. research and learning & teaching. UEB noted the membership of the revised MIT, which would be co-chaired by RS and the incoming Executive Director of Corporate Services. While maintaining links with the RTC Group, MIT's remit would focus on specific issues around Public Health England guidance and expectations around reporting, information sharing and outbreak control. PHE was satisfied that the University's existing protocols were effective, but consideration was nevertheless being given to potential enhancements. The RTC Group had discussed the stakeholder communications plans, i.e. for applicants, students and staff, and the need for appropriate targeting and prioritisation. UEB noted that decision making for issues relating to learning and teaching, students and prospective students rested with the RTC Group, which had essentially subsumed activity previously undertaken in various sub-groups under the original incident management structure.

4.2 During discussion, UEB noted the importance of regular reporting and updates on the breadth of institutional activity in response to the impact of Covid-19. It was recognised that the current arrangements had been implemented to provide a coherent framework within which the University could take the necessary action, with input and engagement from the necessary colleagues.

#### 4.3 **Actions:**

- (a) Colleagues would be advised that the sequencing of communications would prioritise current and prospective students.
- (b) UEB would receive a written summary of the various groups involved in managing the University's response to Covid-19, including their interaction with normal business and decision making processes.
- (c) As a standing item on UEB agendas for the foreseeable future, the Coronavirus Update would be sub-divided to facilitate dedicated updates from the RTC group and the new MIT, including written reports when appropriate, and from FVPs.

### 5. **Report of the UEB Sexual Violence and Harassment Steering Group**

5.1 UEB received and approved the Report, including terms of reference and membership, subject to adding additional colleagues to ensure sufficient coverage and expertise of issues relating to research (see 5.2, below).

## 5.2 **Actions:**

- (a) The Deputy Vice-President for Research & Innovation would be invited to join the Steering Group, given her expertise in relation to PGR students.
- (b) A senior representative from Research Services would be sought, to provide an operational perspective.
- (c) A senior academic with an understanding and appreciation of how the Group's work related to research would be proposed.
- (d) Further consideration would be given to the wider institutional support available to early career research staff, which had also been raised during staff consultation on the new University Vision.

## 6. **UKRI Grant Extension Allocation**

- 6.1 UEB considered a paper on the confirmation of UK Research and Innovation's (UKRI's) grant extension allocation to the University, and the principles that would underpin the internal distribution of this allocation. This included the policy proposed for 'change of use' funds. It was noted that the University would receive an allocation of £3,696k, having received a formal offer letter to this effect, but would not be able to make any internal distributions until UKRI had approved a governance plan for managing this funding. Attention was drawn both to UKRI's guidelines for institutions' use of the allocation and the University's own principles for governing its deployment of the grant extensions. The University had two outstanding queries with UKRI.
- 6.2 During discussion, clarification was provided about the level of institutional flexibility in allocating funding for grant extensions and the University's intended approach, which aimed to achieve parity across projects, departments and faculties.
- 6.3 UEB endorsed the principles proposed for managing the internal allocation of grant extension funding, pending the resolution of the ongoing queries with UKRI.
- 6.4 **Action:**
  - (a) SH would clarify any outstanding queries from UEB members about the operation of the principles.

## 7. **Closed Minute and Paper**

## 8. **Round Table**

- (a) NSS Results: The recent launch of the reporting service was reported, and UEB congratulated the Faculty of Engineering's success in being ranked number one in the Russell Group for overall satisfaction and strong performance against a number of other measures. It was noted that UEB would receive a full report on the NSS Results following more detailed analysis, and Council would be updated at the next informal Dial In meeting, on 25 August.
- (b) SLP Workstream Leads: RS reported on the successful recruitment to one of two workstream lead posts, and sought suggestions for potential secondment to the second vacancy.
- (c) Industrial Relations: IW reported on the initial consultation meeting and subsequent correspondence between the University and Trade Union (TU) representatives. It was noted that a further staff update would be circulated on 23 July to provide further explanation of the University's position, in the interests of openness and transparency. UEB noted that the significant majority of other universities were engaged in some form of TU consultation in relation

to measures that might be necessary to ensure institutional financial sustainability.

- (d) National Pay Negotiations 2020: IW reported that the UCEA proposal had been rejected by two of the campus TUs, without input from members. UCEA was awaiting the outstanding responses.
- (e) Additional UEB Away Day: A date in August was being sought for an additional half Away Day.