UET meeting

Tue 18 July 2023, 10:00 - 13:00 Committee Room

Attendees

Board members

John Vinney, Jim Andrews, Keith Phalp, Karen Parker, Susie Reynell (Finance Director), Julie Kerr

Meeting minutes

1. Minutes and Matters arising from the previous meeting

Apologies: Jane

Action list: https://livebournemouthac.sharepoint.com/sites/UETPrivate/Lists/UET%20Actions/AllItems.aspx

The minutes of 11th July 2023 were agreed as being an accurate record of the meeting. There was a typo to correct and redactions to make before publication.

There were no matters arising.

The action log was noted.

DET action list after 11th July meeting.pdf

Minutes_UET meeting_110723.pdf

2. Leadership, culture and staff experience

Colleen joined the meeting and began by reminding UET of the previously agreed principles around being conscious of how we want to be around others. The principles to be applied wherever possible during the course of the meeting.

It was agreed that visitors to the UET meetings should leave feeling supported, valued, confident, challenged and enabled and they should have realistic expectations of the outcomes.

As time in meetings is usually short, in order to get the most out of the meetings, contributors to be asked to concentrate on outcomes and actions rather than on the often detailed work carried out - as that is normally available in the papers provided.

3. Finance discussion

3.1. Cash flow update

SR reported that cash flow continues to be positive and is following the same trend

Approval

Chair

Discussion

Colleen Harding

Susie Reynell

UET Management Accounts June 2023.pdf UET - Weekly Cashflow Forecast Narrative w-e 14th July 2023.pdf

3.2. Bids for approval

There were 2 Bids for consideration and both were approved

RED ID: 13037 – "An Institutional Logics based review of post covid stakeholder expectations in the 'workplace'.", ESRC – PI Debbie Sadd

RED ID: 13594 – "MODELLING BIODIVERSITY RECOVERY TIPPING POINTS IN TROPICAL ECOSYSTEMS", NERC – Amanda Korstjens

➢ Narrative for UET meeting 18.07.23.pdf

3.3. Risk

Ahead of a discussion later in August with RP.

Points for further discussion:

- 1. Monitoring risk register how it is updated and managed
- 2. Risk Appetite the policy with regard to risk has already been defined. Now need a transparent and clear workflow and approval hierarchy which can be tracked via a RACI process. This will require clarity on who is empowered to do what and when and where the red flags are. A balance between accountability, intervention and empowerment is necessary.

SR suggested that RKE pilot the project as work is already being undertaken in this area.

Currently at embryonic stage and will need to go through ARG, Legal and RKE stakeholders before the final policies and procedures are confirmed and rolled out.

Theme: RKE

4. Workstreams

Lee, Ian, Ann, Tim and Brian joined the meeting. Tim sent his apologies.

RKE workstreams possible next steps.pdf

4.1. Process reviews

This is a work in progress and no further support from UET is required at this stage. It will be an incremental process over a period of time.

- RDS enquiry management in negotiation to remove RDS from the approvals process. RDS have agreed to release some of their resources back into the Faculties. Expenses and travel will be looked at next.
- Training roll-out of budget management, red system, Sharepoint training imminent.
- RDS currently have 4 separate Sharepoint sites and now everything will be brought together so that information is in a single location and is easily accessible. PRIME are also carrying out a similar exercise.
- The launch date is currently set as 27th July.

Approval

Susie Reynell

Discussion

Susie Reynell

Discussion

Jim And Susie

Comms is critical and will need to be continuous as 27 July is peak holiday period.

[this workstream is on the agenda for a follow up on 12th September]

A Bidding and approvals_process_policy_practice and post award - plan 2.pdf Priority Workstream Scorecard and Sway Link 140723.pdf

4.2. KE policy and practice

Lee and lan presented the ongoing work of the Workstream on Knowledge Exchange (KE).

This included the presentation setting out the scope of the work being undertaken, alongside submission of 8 initial KE Action Plans for UET consideration and comment.

Some of the findings were highlighted:

KE under-resourced in terms of Faculty level academic support and professional services. Currently remains mostly focussed on selective KTP grant capture and varying levels of CPD development.

Staff have reported that they have little support to expand their portfolios and have become disengaged towards pursuing KE.

A new KE focussed culture is required. Other universities reward KE quite well but BU doesn't have the same set-up or priorities.

Need to refine culture and training of KE:

- Include within induction
- Re-engage staff
- Introduce KE champions
- Draw up a manual for KE
- · Instil and legitimise KE across the organisation
- Improve KE awareness
- Improve KE skill set

Consultancy

The indicators are that BU is behind the rest of the sector when it comes to income generation and levels of activity in relation to contract research and consultancy activities. Need to clarify what constitutes contract research and/or consultancy. There is a common perception that consultancy is not encouraged as a supported activity.

Demand for consultancy is enormous and there is a business case to suggest that more needs to be offered and carried out. Some staff will be better at this than others.

Need to recognise what is happening in the market place.

<u>CPD</u>

There is a great deal of potential to deliver further income generation both from UK and internationally through better CPD.

Staff are frustrated that there is a lack of coherent guidance towards CPD.

Need to enhance BU's commercialisation policies, provisions, toolkits and training.

KEF and HEBKI optimisation

The process for compiling KEF are ad hoc and time pressured and too cumbersome which leads to underreporting of KEF activity

Leadership and Governance

Despite a long-term commitment to KE, BU is not meeting the expectations for KE derived income and KEF performance. KE portfolio is deemed low priority leading to reduced effectiveness.

Lack of clarity as to how KE governance was undertaken at BU and the prominence/performance/role of the respective KE Working Group

Lee Miles And Ian Jones

The levels of information available from BU on KE related matters are well below that of our HEI comparators.

BU is behind the sector regarding income generation as the forms can be difficult to complete which restricts BU's ability to secure external KE income.

Lack of capacity and being slow and unresponsive to advancements by external stakeholders.

Regional development: very important to build relationships in local area. Opportunities are large but needs a coordinated and formalised approach.

ACTIONS:

- the arranging of a further UET discussion on the prioritisation/consolidation of the KE Action Plans [lan and Lee are on the agenda for a follow up on 12th September]
- areas for further progressive coordination/meeting with the workstream on research processes,
- · further scheduling of the KE's workstream task and finish activities
- · some limited reflections on future resourcing
- UET to deliberate findings and next steps and will table for a further meeting when some of the other workstreams are further down the line.
- In the meantime, Ian and Lee to provide clarification on what the gains would be if additional resources are provided.
- KE Policies Processes and Procedures (Faculty KE Support and Capacity-Building (v2)).pdf

B Workstream KE (Slides) v7(IJLM).pdf

- 🕒 KE Policies Processes and Procedures plan (Contract research and consultancy policy) (v2).pdf
- ☑ KE Policies Processes and Procedures (CPD Plan) (v2).pdf
- 🕒 KE Policies Processes and Procedures (KE Commercialisation Plan) (v2).pdf
- 🔀 KE Policies Processes and Procedures plan (KEF and HE-BCI Optimisation Plan (v2)).pdf
- B KE Policies Processes and Procedures plan (Leadership and Governance) v2.pdf
- KE Policies Processes and Procedures (KE Communications) (v2).pdf
- [] (KE) Policies, Processes and Procedures (KE Approvals and Agile Response).pdf

4.3. Research culture and engagement

Key findings:

Staff motivated to increase research.

The culture has already started to shift since the discussions commenced.

Overall, education is deemed to be valued more than research - the perception varies across Faculties and can also vary within Faculties. For the record JA pointed out that the opposite has also been heard. In reality, both Research and education are valued and valuable.

Processes are too bureaucratic and too onerous or can be missing

Not confident in bidding or in the process

Feel that profitability is the focus (SR acknowledged but challenged that value for money and sustainability are more important - and value can take various forms).

Don't feel trusted to run or complete projects.

Role-modelling going to be very important for successful outcomes.

Staff feel they are being policed rather than supported.

Fusion is great for students but needs to be more flexible for staff.

Need a group which is able to take feedback and problem solve, tweaking as it evolves.

Professional staff and academics need to work together - share data and avoid working in silos.

Staff keen to grow a positive culture and get involved.

RKE should be embedded within the culture including career framework, appraisals, training, induction and be integrated across BU.

Competition is huge - other organisations are investing in Bid Writers and have administrative support, particularly for large bids and are therefore more equipped for a successful outcome. Staff need opportunity

Discussion

Tim Rees And Ann Hemingway and time to be more successful.

RKE landscape is changing all the time and BU needs to be agile.

Lots of opportunities to work with other institutions and funders.

Would like UET to empower a cultural dynamic and initiate a cultural change programme as a symbolic gesture. So far culture has been influenced by external factors - need to flip it round.

UET to reflect on findings.

On a separate note, Lee thanked UET for the updates sent out by Jane each week - they are very useful of well received.

[no update currently planned - to be discussed]

230714 TR+AH UET Culture Report.pdf inc res ke bu AHTR JuLY.pdf

5. Items for note or approval

5.1. Dora update

Julie and Shelly joined the meeting in person.

The purpose of the agenda item was to request approval to publish the Dora statement on the internet and this was agreed in principle subject to a couple of tweaks.

ACTIONS:

- KPa to approve final version once tweaks made prior to final approval from JCNC and to publication.
- It was agreed that Shelly Anne should scope the benefits of membership of CoAra and UET will review once scope complete.

🕒 UET DORA Paper July 2023.pdf

5.2. RKE recovery dates targets

The question was raised - are we setting the right targets? Do we need to challenge the targets? When benchmarked against other institutions, some recovery rates are excellent and others struggle.

72% of projects meet the recovery rate and, overall, most of the activity areas are achieving the recovery rates with the exception of education conferences and commissioned research.

It is proposed that the recovery rate for UKRI be lowered for where there is a net gain.

Where work is tendered and legally binding, the extra costs of due diligence and insurance should be added to the margins to discourage risky work.

ACTIONS:

- Julie N to ensure that inflation is taken into account when calculating the recovery rates.
- SR to follow up on the proposals and the subject to be discussed again in September/October.
- [added to the agenda for 12th September]

12. RPMC paper_fec_percentage_22_23.pdf
Recovery dates context.pdf

5.3. REF Steering Group ToR

ToR for approval.

Plus question "whether UET would wish the next RSG meeting to 'review, discuss and endorse next year's investment plan for QR and then present the plan to UET for provisional approval'.

ACTION:

• The ToR to be reviewed and any further comments to go to JF. PVC to chair the REF steering group.

Discussion Julie Northam And Shelly

lulie Northam And Shelly Stringer

Discussion

Susie Reynell/Julie Northam

Discussion

No Presentation

• [next on the agenda on 21th September when KW will be at the meeting]

E REf Steering Group terms of reference proposal KW_June23.pdf

5.4. Bus contract

For approval before out of cycle board approval and signing

To be discussed at a later date.

5.5. Academic Reporting Dashboard Summary

For information only

2023-07 ARD Summary.pdf

5.6. Career Pathways

To be brought forward to the UET meeting on 25 July.

2023-07-13 Post renegotiation meeting amends14july.pdf
2023-07-13 UET paper outlining UCU proposals14july.pdf

6. Apprenticeships

All joined online.



Decision

Jim Andrews

Information

Naomi Holloway And Elaine Sheridan On Teams

Discussion

Phil, Jacky, Anand, Sara And Deborah (On Teams) •

Retrospective Commitment Statements and Apprenticeship Agreement Statements.pdf
Apprenticeship Update for Salisbury - July 2023.pdf

7. Standing item: reportable events

Reportable events update			
		I	

8. Future Meetings

To be brought forward to the meeting on 25th July.

- 🕒 UET 15th August 23.pdf
- 🕒 UET 1st August 23.pdf
- B staff engagement sessions 2024.pdf
- DET 25th July 23.pdf

Upcoming UET meetings as at 12th July.pdf

9. AOB

The Universities UK Annual Conference 2023 (6-7 September)

JA to attend. KPh can also attend.

9.1. Student Barometer

Approval for £16K spend for external student questionnaire which will benchmark BU against other universities.

Approved.

10. Leadership wrap-up

CH asked UET to reflect on the meeting in terms of the collaborative dynamic.

Thoughts included:

- It was open and transparent
- Participants were confident in raising negative feedback.
- We were very nice
- We were kind, nurturing and respectful
- Time pressures meant that some of the discussions were not as in-depth as they could have been
- There was positive reinforcement
- Although the RKE update reinforced what was already known, it wasn't a disappointment to have the affirmation as the workstreams had been deliberately given a wide brief.

CH reported that some members of ULT have suggested that the UET agenda should be co-created with ULT as they felt they are being 'done to' and not consulted. UET to reflect on this feedback.

Discussion

Discussion

Chair

Note

Chair

Chair

Jim Andrews

Colleen