



**The  
University  
Of  
Sheffield.**

Office UEB/2018/xxxx/0x  
Of  
The President &  
Vice-Chancellor.

## **Notes**

## **University Executive Board**

**Date:** 25 September 2018

**Present:** Professor G Valentine (GV) (in the Chair),  
Professor John Derrick (JD), Mrs H J Dingle (HJD), Mr A Dodman (AD),  
Professor S Fitzmaurice (SF), Professor W Morgan (WM),  
Professor Dame Pamela J Shaw (PJS), Mr R Sykes (RS),  
Professor Craig Watkins (CW)

**In attendance:** Dr T Strike (TS), Mr K Lilley (item 2), Mrs J Campbell (item 3), Mrs J Knapp-Wood (item 4).

**Apologies:** Professor Sir Keith Burnett (KB), Professor M J Hounslow (MJH), Professor D Petley (DP),

**Secretary:** Mr M Borland (MB)

### **1. Notes of UEB held on 14 August 2018**

(UEB/2018/2509/01)

- 1.1 The Notes of UEB held on 14 August 2018 were approved as an accurate record.

### **2. Prioritising Capital Expenditure**

(UEB/2018/2509/02)

(Keith Lilley in attendance for this item)

- 2.1 UEB considered a paper which set out a prioritisation model to assist decision making regarding capital expenditure. A sample Capital Expenditure Business Case Summary front sheet was included as an appendix. Attention was drawn to the fact that the model highlighted key metrics but was not a decision making process in itself, rather it could help inform discussion. The model included information from the REF 2014 and the TEF. Inclusion of NSS and KEF information was not believed to be appropriate at this point in time.
- 2.2 The following points were made during discussion:
- It was clarified that the current condition of a building would remain a part of a business case.
  - Business cases can be complex and it was not the intention that the Summary Front Sheet would replace the detail of a business case.
  - An assessment of the risks in not supporting a business case would be helpful.
  - The metrics regarding income would benefit from further reflection.
  - Identifying the most appropriate academic measures was challenging.
  - The ability to benchmark the measures was important and where rankings were used this should also include the total number of comparators that had been ranked.

- 2.3 UEB endorsed use of the model, which would continue to be reviewed and improved over time in order that it could provide supporting evidence when reviewing and approving capital investment proposals.

**Action:**

- 2.4 To look at the most appropriate metrics that could be used in relation to income.

**3. BAME University Strategy and Action Plan**

(UEB/2018/2509/03)

(Julie Campbell in attendance for this item)

- 3.1 UEB considered a paper, which set out a proposed University BAME Strategy and Action Plan. Attention was drawn to the need to address under-representation amongst staff and students, and the differential attainment gap for students. The BAME Strategy would draw on existing good practice and take a holistic approach. The Strategy was in mid-consultation and the Students' Union officers and the staff network had been supportive.

- 3.2 Comments made during discussion included:

- Capturing information on the good practice within the institution, without creating a bureaucratic exercise, could be challenging.
- The proposed holistic approach was the appropriate one to take.
- Inclusion of a target to define what success looked like was helpful.
- The student attainment gap need to be viewed in the broader context of the student experience, with smarter use, and sharing, of evidence.
- The Raising Awareness, Raising Aspiration (RARA) project scheduled to complete in March 2019 could provide additional evidence regarding interventions to address the attainment gap.
- The action to ensure there was an inclusive curriculum could be undertaken in a positive way so that all students could 'see people like me' in the curriculum.
- The Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) would take forward the educational elements and the BAME attainment gap actions. This would include working with Faculty Directors of Learning and Teaching (FDLTs). The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (ED&IC) would work on the other elements of the action plan.
- To ensure a joined up approach Faculty Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committees should work with their FDLT.

- 3.3 UEB:

- Agreed to progress the work identified in the action plan, subject to approval by the relevant stakeholders.
- Requested a report back to UEB, with any substantial changes from the consultation identified.
- Noted that communications would be through LTC and EDIC.

- 3.4 The Strategy would be presented to ED&IC on 1 October and then to Council on 22 October.

**4. Key Performance Indicators Review – consultation responses**

(UEB/2018/2509/04)

(Jennifer Knapp-Wood in attendance for this item)

- 4.1 UEB considered a paper which proposed amendments to the 2018 Key Performance Indicator assessment methodology and sought UEB's view on future changes both to the reporting timeframe and the removal or inclusion of specific indicators

- 4.2 During discussion the following comments were made:
- The focus of KPIs should be on impact rather than process.
  - The REF Stocktake involved departments assessing themselves and the role of UEB and Faculty Directors of Research and Innovation was to ensure that the stocktake process was robust.
  - Access and attainment were different parts of the student experience.
  - The approach to KPIs next year could take a 'blank sheet' approach.
- 4.3 UEB agreed changes to the indicators within the themes.
- 4.4 UEB further agreed to propose to Council that individual KPI assessments would be reported to the Council meeting which immediately followed the publication of the related data, as part of the President and Vice-Chancellor's report and Council would receive a summative report on the KPI assessments at two points during the year. One of the summative reports could be broadly based on education and the other broadly based on research.
- 4.5 In terms of next steps, the KPI assessments would be presented to UEB on 9 October 2018 with Theme and Faculty Owner comments. Subject to UEB agreement the KPI report would then be presented for discussion to Council on 22 October 2018.

**Action:**

- 4.6 The University Secretary and the Director of Planning & Insight explore how to improve the alignment between the KPIs and the planning process.

## **5. Closed Minute and Paper**

### **6. 'No Deal' Brexit – implications for the University** (UEB/2018/2509/06)

- 6.1 UEB considered a paper which set out identifiable material risks and implications of a 'no deal' Brexit for the University. Attention was drawn to the large number of implications for the UK of a 'no deal' Brexit, however, the scope of the paper was limited to those issues that the University was responsible for and that were tractable.
- 6.2 During discussion it was noted that the UK Government's underwrite of Horizon 2020 funding was not necessarily anticipated to cover all project costs. Where the University was the project lead the underwrite was not expected to cover the costs of EU partners.
- 6.3 UEB agreed to:
- (a) add the three following new risks, with owners, to be assessed for likelihood, impact and proposed mitigation in addition to those listed in the paper:
    - (i) Goods and supply of materials from the EU to the University. Specifically, whether the supply to the Faculty of Science, the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health could be disrupted and whether advance purchasing could be required.
    - (ii) Contracts and breach of contracts. Specifically research contracts between the University of Sheffield and EU based partners and any contractual impediments or validation issues which might arise e.g. supply of data to a non-EU partner.
    - (iii) Exchange rates. Specifically, the most appropriate mitigation in relation to any fluctuations in the value of sterling.
  - (b) Risk Owners listed in the Brexit No Deal Risk Register give further consideration to their risk/s.

- (c) Request further work takes place, including one to one meetings involving the University Secretary's Office and relevant Directors across the University, with a second report to UEB in November on the impact and likelihood of each risk, existing and recommended action, and the residual risk.

## **7. Round Table**

- (a) UEB Awayday: GV outlined the programme for the forthcoming UEB Awayday on 2 October
- (b) Institutes: TS reported on the legal requirements to use the name 'Institute', including the requirement to apply to Companies House.
- (c) LISM: WM updated on next steps for the Learning Infrastructure and Space Management Group (LISM).
- (d) Rankings: WM updated UEB on recent publication of the Sunday Times Good University Guide.
- (e) Events: AD reported that:
  - (i) The Festival of the Mind was taking place until 30 September.
  - (ii) The Off the Shelf Festival of Word would run from 6-27 October.
- (f) Staff: CW updated on Faculty of Social Sciences appointments and posts that had been advertised.