



St Mary's
University
Twickenham
London

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Minutes of a meeting of the Board of Governors held on Thursday 14 April 2016
in the Waldegrave Drawing Room, St Mary's University, Twickenham.

Present:

Rt Rev Richard Moth (Chair)
Professor Edward Acton
Cllr Tony Arbour
Sir Anthony Bailey
Mr Francis Campbell (Vice-Chancellor)
Mr John Dixon
Fr Richard Finn
Mr Mike Foster
Mrs Helen Frostick
Dr Maureen Glackin
Mrs Sue Handley-Jones
Mr David Hartnett
Mr Stuart Kemp
Dr David Livesey
Ms June Mulroy
Mr Simon Uttley
Mr Jonathan Walsh

In attendance:

Rt Hon Ruth Kelly (Pro Vice-Chancellor)
Dr Claire Taylor (Pro Vice-Chancellor)
Mrs Jo Blunden (Senior Director of People)
Mr Terry Noys (Chief Operating Officer)

Mr Graham Fice (Clerk to the Governors)
Mr Patrick Makoni (Assistant Clerk)

Mr Owen Carey-Jones (Winckworths) (for M8 only)
Mr Ed McCann and Ms Catherine Ramsden (Architects) (for M6 only)

Apologies: Mr Jeffrey Cottle, Mr Zander Lavall (President of SMSU), Mr Peter Thomas, Professor Anne Moran (Pro Vice-Chancellor).

Professor Acton was welcomed to his first Board meeting.

The meeting commenced with a prayer led by the Chair.

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1.1 There were no declarations of interest.

2 CHAIR'S BUSINESS

Appointment of a Pro-Chancellor of the University

2.1 The Chair announced that Margaret Mizen would be installed as a Pro-Chancellor of the University during the Awards Ceremony to be held in Westminster Cathedral on the afternoon of 14 July. Margaret Mizen and her husband would join Board members for supper after the Board meeting to be held on 30 June.

Membership of the Board

2.2 The Chair announced:

- The appointment of Professor Edward Acton as a member of the Board (M20 below refers)
- The resignation of Maureen John as a Staff Governor following her retirement from the University on 31 March 2016
- The re-election of Zander Lavall as President of SMSU, and a Board member, for one further year 2016/17

2.3 The Chair drew attention to the significant number of challenges and tasks that would require the Board's attention over the coming year, and require the involvement, skills and expertise of all. Accordingly the Chair had asked Mr Jonathan Walsh to remain as a Governor for one further year; Mr Walsh's term of office was coming to an end after having served for nine years.

2.4 An extension of service was possible, nine years being defined as the 'normal' limit in the Articles. The Board **agreed:**

- (i) **That Mr Jonathan Walsh remain as a Governor until the end of 2016/17.**

Senior staff

2.5 The Board noted the following with effect from the end of 2015/16:

- The resignation of Dr Claire Taylor (Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Strategy) on her appointment as Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Glyndwr University
- The retirement of Graham Fice, Clerk to the Board and Company Secretary

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2015 were approved subject to correction of members present to delete the name of Jonathan Walsh who had presented apologies for absence which were correctly recorded.

4 MATTERS ARISING

4.1 There were no matters arising not occurring as substantive items on the agenda.

5 CORPORATE PLAN

M6 refers

- 5.1 The Board's Awayday held on 17 March had considered a draft (high level or public) version of the Corporate Plan along with presentations by the Heads of Schools and a number of supporting strategies, and the draft was noted by the Board (paper 1).
- 5.2 At the Board's Awayday, the Chair had asked Mr Dave Hartnett to look at the scale of investment required to support the draft Corporate Plan, the ways in which the challenge might be approached and in what time frame.
- 5.3 Dave Hartnett set out his proposed approach:
- Detailed examination of supporting papers already produced together with the published Corporate Plans of other universities
 - Meetings with key individuals within the University and as necessary externally (including for example the Chancellor)
 - Production of a draft Plan which would be subject to detailed scrutiny by a group which he planned to bring together, including people with necessary skills and expertise from outside the University
- 5.4 The draft would rework some elements of the current Plan considered at the Awayday with the aim of producing a Plan that was:
- Relatively short and focused at a high level
 - Colourful, lively and ambitious for use by a range of stakeholders
 - Could function as the means by which the Board held the Executive to account and could be reviewed by the Board periodically to check progress on delivery
- 5.5 The Plan would address the meaning of a Catholic university and how this was presented: the 'felt' values and ethics. Likely contents would include:
- A short introduction
 - The University's intended contribution to the public square and the reputation of the University
 - Education strategy
 - Students including postgraduates and Post-Doctoral students
 - Academic strategy
 - Research and enterprise
 - Internationalisation
 - Estates strategy

It would be necessary to focus at an appropriate point in the Plan on the provision of student residential accommodation. Dave Hartnett would also review and assess how realistic and achievable some of the University's key growth aims were.

- 5.6 The Vice-Chancellor and Dave Hartnett underlined the substantial amount of work required, the necessary prioritisation of spend and the areas of underinvestment that required attention. The University was starting from a relatively low base and the Board had not been previously asked to contemplate such major spend; significant sources of finance would have to be identified.

- 5.7 The Board expressed its thanks to Dave Hartnett for taking on the work. The draft Plan would be produced around the end of May/beginning of June 2016 with the aim of putting a polished draft before the Board at its meeting to be held on 30 June 2016

6 ESTATES MASTER PLAN: UPDATE

- 6.1 The Board received a presentation from representatives of the Architects. The architects were focusing on a 'live and learn' campus based on revised brief figures which assumed a reduced non-residential requirement because of improved space utilisation. Teddington Lock was now more central to the planning exercise.

- 6.2 The draft Corporate Plan included a statement on place:

St Mary's will modernise our beautiful and historic campus in Twickenham, London. We will provide a platform for the discussion of meaningful global issues. Our Catholic ethos will continue to guide our contributions to public policy debates.

- 6.3 The Board saw examples of how other universities had approached campus development (typologies and trends) against a detailed analysis of the existing estate. This led to a proposed development approach and the options for expansion. There was a fresh focus on reviewing and challenging constraints including the scale of the current designation of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). This in turn led to a proposal to:

- Retain, protect and enhance the MOL with most value
- Improve through redistribution
- Consolidate the University's sports facilities

- 6.4 The Board saw focus areas for estate development and the proposed strategic approach to building the case for a 'live and learn' campus. Early discussions would be held with LBRUT, and members underlined the need to outline plans to the local community. Work by the Architects would mesh with that of Dave Hartnett on the Corporate Plan. The first set of developments were likely to be around the University Reception and opening up the campus generally for the public to 'look in' on the campus and its important buildings.

- 6.5 In the course of a brief discussion, members questioned:

- The likely timescale and scale of the ultimate investment required to deliver the Estates Master Plan
- Interdependencies and how to develop the estate while maintaining 'business as usual'
- Car parking and travel planning

7 REVIEW OF GOVERNANCE

M4.1/M7.8 refers

- 7.1 The Board received the report of the Task Group established to review governance, chaired by Stuart Kemp (Chair of the Audit Committee) (paper 2).

- 7.2 The Vice-Chancellor had asked consultant Eddie Newcomb to review the Academic Board and the management committees and there had been liaison as the two

reviews progressed. Eddie Newcomb had commented on a draft of the Task Group's report while the Chairs' Committee had considered both reports at its meeting held on 1 March 2016. The report before the Board represented the discussion and conclusions of the Task Group and the Chairs' Committee.

- 7.3 The Task Group had looked at governance across the HE sector and beyond, and recommendations made by Newcomb in his 2013 review of governance prior to University Title. The Chairs' Committee had measured recommendations against the Catholic mission and ethos of the University, and the Board noted that all recommendations preserved the current proportionality of membership of the Board including Westminster and CES interests.
- 7.4 The general thrust of the recommendations were to develop a more agile and flexible model of governance and operation in the increasingly competitive HE market:
- A smaller and more involved Board meeting more frequently
 - Fewer committees
 - A more strategic focus to discussion, moving away from what had become a 'paper-heavy', process-focused operation

Later discussion on the revised HEFCE operating model for quality assurance (M13 below) would underline the growing responsibilities of governing bodies across the sector.

- 7.5 The report of the Task Group presented some illustrations of possible Board size and composition, maintaining current proportionality. It was emphasised that there would be a transition period towards what could be the ultimate Board size of 16 and change would be achieved over a period of time; the Nominations Committee would take a lead in directing and managing change. The Board **agreed** that the aim should be a Board of 16 members.
- 7.6 Revision of the University's governing *Articles* (M8 below) would provide the necessary legal framework for the Board itself to determine its size rather than Board size and composition being 'hard-wired' in the *Articles* as at present. The Board would consider a revised set of Standing Orders (regulations) at its next meeting; processes which were set out in the current *Articles* would be for the Board itself to determine.
- 7.7 Attention focused on the number of Staff Governors. While a Board of 20 would maintain the current number of three Staff Governors, a Board of 16 would proportionately have two Staff Governors. The process for the appointment of Staff (and Student) Governors would be amongst those to be considered by the Board as part of the revised Standing Orders (regulations) at its next meeting.
- 7.8 The Board **agreed** the recommendations of the Task Group as follows:

The size and composition of the Board

- 1 To move towards a Board of 16 (33% reduction in size) maintaining the current proportionality of membership.

- 2 The current place reserved for a Deputy or Pro Vice-Chancellor (who does not have responsibility for resources) and which has not been filled recently should be removed.
- 3 A Student Observer (without voting rights) be permitted to attend Board meetings along with the President of SMSU who is a full Governor with voting rights. This Observer should be able to reflect postgraduate (research) interests.
- 4 In any revision of the Articles, the opportunity should be taken to follow the model of other universities where the governing instrument allows a Board to determine its size (within limits) and membership more flexibly through a Standing Order which is under internal rather than Privy Council control.

The Board's committees

- 5 The Nominations Committee be re-titled 'Nominations and Governance Committee' and take responsibility for the efficiency and effectiveness of governance generally, including commissioning reviews of governance and conducting skills audits as well as continuing to make recommendations to the Board on the appointment of Governors, and on the chairing and membership of committees.
- 6 The Academic Strategy Committee should continue to meet but with sharply-focused Terms of Reference and revised membership which could include student representation. Co-option of appropriately skilled external members could be considered as currently permitted for Audit, Finance and Staffing, and Estates. The operation and future of the Committee should be kept under review.
- 7 The Chairs' Committee can cease to meet. The responsibility of the Chairs' Committee for the nomination of the chairs and membership of committees could pass to the (retitled) Nominations and Governance Committee.
- 8 The Estates and Health and Safety Committee can cease to meet. Use can be made of Task and Finish Groups, either chaired by a Governor or involving Governors with the necessary skills, on major Estates matters if appropriate.
- 9 The Finance and Staffing Committee should continue with a broader strategic remit and be re-titled 'Finance and Resources Committee'.
- 10 The Honorary Awards Committee can cease to meet. Any necessary business can be managed by the Vice-Chancellor as Chair of the Committee through consultation. The situation should be reviewed when the University achieves RDAP.
- 11 The Student Experience Committee can cease to meet.

The Board's operations

- 12 A revised pattern of five meetings plus Awaydays:

Time of year	Current pattern	Recommended pattern
Autumn	September (late)	September (late)
Winter	November (late)	November (late) (half Awayday/half 'AGM' business)
	-	January (late)
Spring	March (mid) (<i>Awayday</i>)	March (mid) (<i>Awayday</i>)
	April (mid-late)	April (mid-late)
Summer	June (late)/July (early)	June (late)/July (early)

7.9 Thanks were expressed to all the members of the Task Group. In addition to consideration of revised Standing Orders (regulations), the next meeting of the Board would consider a revised *Scheme of Delegation* and *Board Handbook* to reflect the changes agreed. In the light of work being done by the Vice-Chancellor and Senior Management Team to take the recommendations of the Newcomb review of the Academic Board forward, Governors would also be asked to formally approve a new Academic Board committee structure.

8 REVISED GOVERNING ARTICLES

M2 refers

8.1 Mr Owen Carey-Jones of Winckworth Sherwood LLP attended to present revised governing *Articles* for the University (paper 3). The Board received:

- Draft 2.2 of the *Articles*
- A copy showing tracked changes from the current *Articles*

8.2 No changes to the *Articles* could be made without the approval of the Privy Council and of the CES. The Director of the CES had been closely involved in drawing up the draft *Articles* and copies had been sent to the Privy Council, the Charity Commission and BIS for their comment or informal approval. No comments had been made by the Privy Council or the Charity Commission; a response from BIS was awaited.

8.2 Mr Carey-Jones set out the constitutional position. Since incorporation in 2007 the University had been conducted by a Company limited by guarantee and therefore it had Members not shareholders; in effect, the Members 'owned' the company. The current Members were those Governors who represented or were appointed by either the Archbishop or the CES (sometimes called Foundation Governors). The Directors of the company were all the current Governors.

8.3 The company was also a registered charity and therefore the Directors/Governors were charity Trustees. The constitution of the University was its *Articles of Association*, as required by the Companies Acts, which also incorporated the *Instrument of Government and the Articles of Government* which were required by the Education Reform Act 1988.

- 8.4 Some minor changes had been made to the Articles prior to University Title in 2013/14 but there had been no significant review since 2007. There were a number of drivers for change now which included:
- When the title of University was granted in 2014 the Privy Council suggested some changes to the *Articles* which were not implemented at the time but remained relevant
 - The 2015 HE Green Paper advised that greater flexibility should be introduced into the constitutional arrangements of HEIs to facilitate changes to the way in which HEIs operated where adaption to new circumstances may be necessary to remain competitive
 - Compliance with the CUC *Code of Governance*
 - A need to reflect certain internal changes to the way in which the University had developed
- 8.5 The significant structural change was to alter the Membership of the Company from the current Foundation Governors to a smaller and more distinct Membership consisting of the Archbishop, the Director of CES and up to two persons nominated by the Archbishop and two by CES, who may, but do not need to, be Governors.
- 8.6 This was not a fundamental change because the current Foundation Governors (who were the current Members) were all appointees of the Archbishop or of CES. The purpose of the change was to remove the divisiveness implicit in the current arrangement where more than half of the current Governors were Members, meaning that the other Governors, including Staff and Student Governors, were excluded from potentially significant decision making relating to the University.
- 8.7 Only Members could deal with Restricted Business:
- The sale or lease of land endowed by the Church
 - Approval of the *Articles*
- Only the Members could deal with dissolution of the institution.
- 8.8 Under the proposed new arrangement, all of the Board would be able to discuss such matters as one body and advise Members accordingly; the Members would operate according to procedures set out by the Governors. The proposed new Membership reverted in effect to the pre-2007 position where the Trustees of the University were the CES Trustees. CES strongly supported this change.
- 8.9 The powers of the University Company had been reviewed and simplified. Current practice for all Companies Act companies was to have a general power and then only to include any specific powers which were necessary in the light of the nature of the individual company. Article 5 of the proposed new Articles included a general power 'to undertake all activities within the law which are in pursuit of the Objects' and then certain specific powers to reflect the nature of the company as a HEI and as a charity.
- 8.10 Attention focused on the composition of the Board, the method of appointment and removal of Governors and terms of office. Two important changes were to introduce a mechanism to alter the size of the Board and to clarify the necessary majority of Independent Governors (defined as Governors who were not members of the staff or student body of the University) to reflect contemporary governance requirements.

Any reduction in size would retain the same balance of Governors appointed by the Archbishop, by CES and co-opted by the Board.

- 8.11 Whatever the size of the Board, the Staff/Student representation would remain the same although this was reduced from six currently (including the Vice-Chancellor, a vacant place for a Deputy or Pro Vice-Chancellor, and one Student Governor) to four (including the Vice-Chancellor and one Student Governor). Any reduction in the size and composition of the Board would be a Board decision and would be achieved over time with the Nominations Committee taking this forward.
- 8.12 The Board noted that the appointment of all Governors would continue to be for the Board itself, on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee. The process for appointment had to be open and transparent and the Vice-Chancellor had met with the CES to discuss; the process would be set out in a Standing Order (regulation) to be discussed at the Board's next meeting.
- 8.13 Provisions relating to the withdrawal of Staff and Student Governors from meetings had been reformulated but largely replicated the current arrangements. Staff and Student Governors were full Directors of the company and should only rarely be excluded from Board where there was a clear reason.
- 8.14 The powers and duties of Governors, the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board had been reviewed and clarified to accord with current practice within the sector and the University. The Board clarified that requirements relating to the Students Union (21.4) were determined by the Education Act 1994; while the Green Paper had raised some questions over Student Unions, legislative requirements remained in place which had to be reflected in the *Articles*.
- 8.15 Two amendments to the draft before the Board were identified:
- To make the quorum for meetings of the Members at least four (11.3)
 - To reinstate the current responsibility of the Board for the appointment, grading, suspension, dismissal and determination of the pay and conditions of service of the Vice-Chancellor and the senior post holders (current *Articles* 19.1.1 (iv))
- 8.16 Subject to the amendments identified, and an amendment identified by the CES relating to the 'office' of Chancellor rather than an 'honorary title' (15.1.9), the Board **voted and agreed:**

- (i) **THAT subject to receipt by the University of approval from the Privy Council and from CES to the form of Articles annexed to this resolution and subject to such changes as the Privy Council or CES may require and which are agreed by the University's Members, new Articles of Association in the form annexed to this resolution (subject to any such changes) be approved as the Articles of Association of the University in substitution for and to the exclusion of the existing Articles of Association.**

Votes for: 17

Votes against: 0

Abstentions: 0

- 8.17 The Board asked that a revised copy of the *Articles* be circulated highlighting those changes agreed above. Under the *Articles* it would be for the current Members (the nominees of Westminster and CES) to give formal approval and this would be secured by email assent to a written resolution using the same wording as the resolution adopted by the whole Board as above.
- 8.18 The newly adopted Articles would then be lodged with the Privy Council Office, the Charity Commission, Companies House and CES. The new Articles would be effective from the date of the special resolution.

9 VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

- 9.1 The Board received the report of the Vice-Chancellor (paper 4). This covered:
- The White Paper on teaching (*Educational Excellence Everywhere*), changes to ITT and Government's proposals that all schools should become academies
 - An update on the University's readiness for Ofsted inspection
 - Student recruitment
 - NSS response rates
 - Success for the University in the *Higher* student experience survey (top London institution) and the Hotcourses WhatUni award (shortlisted in five categories)
 - Issues discussed by the Academic Board including the Newcomb report on the Academic Board and management committees, and the Academic Health report
- 9.2 Attention focused on recruitment in an increasingly competitive HE environment; pressures were characterised as 'commercial' in nature. Universities enjoying higher positions in the league tables were expanding and increasing use was being made of Unconditional offers. There was also a falling student demographic. It was essential for the University to focus on postgraduate and international student numbers while enhancing undergraduate recruitment processes and procedures; the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement) was chairing a new committee of the Academic Board covering those issues.
- 9.3 There was discussion of Unconditional offers. While such offers had become increasingly familiar across the sector, there were institutional risks including to reputation and to student support and retention. The Board was assured that appropriate scrutiny was given to individual applications and Unconditional offers made only where students could be predicted to succeed by St Mary's standards
- 9.4 Observations were also made on 'knock on' effects in schools, either on the prediction of results and referees' statements, or on individual students, including those who were not given Unconditional offers.
- 10 **'PREVENT' COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY: COMPLIANCE**
M4.3 refers

- 10.1 The Board received a summary from the Senior Director of People on actions taken to comply with Government and HEFCE requirements under the 'Prevent' counter-terrorism strategy (paper 5).
- 10.2 All HEIs had been required to upload detailed documentation to HEFCE on 1 April 2016 (following earlier submission of a Risk Assessment) and the Board would be required to provide assurance at its November 2016 meeting that appropriate and robust processes were in place and necessary actions taken; some data would also be required.
- 10.3 It had been necessary to develop a Prevent policy and to make minor amendments to the policy on Freedom of Speech approved by the Board in July 2015. The Board **agreed:**

(i) To approve the Prevent policy and the amended policy on Freedom of Speech.

11 ACADEMIC HEALTH REPORT 2014/15

- 11.1 The Board received the Academic Health report for 2014/15, approved by the Academic Board at its meeting held on 16 March 2016 (paper 6). Given the strategic drive to enhance provision that would run through the new Corporate Plan, the report adopted a brisker reporting format.
- 11.2 The Board was aware that it would be for Governors to provide annual assurance to HEFCE in future on the quality of academic provision, under HEFCE's revised Quality Assessment Operating Plan (M13 below). The Academic Health report was likely to continue to be one key mechanism by which the Board received assurance.
- 11.3 Discussion ranged across a number of areas including:
- The definition of 'flying Faculty' (staff who travelled to deliver teaching at another location)
 - The apparent decline in the application of conditions to programme validation (through measures such as provision of training for Chairs of validation panels)
 - Student retention rates and the need to enhance retention (to be a KPI in the Corporate Plan)
 - The high numbers of extenuating circumstances and academic misconduct cases (academic misconduct was being studied by a small group to better understand the reasons and both issues would be addressed through better provision of information and guidance for students)

- 11.2 The Board noted the assurance that:

Overall the report confirmed that the academic health of the University to be sound in relation to the setting and maintenance of the academic standards of awards and the quality of student learning opportunities with many good elements identified.

12 QAA HER ACTION PLAN M8 refers

- 12.1 The Board received an update on the QAA Higher Education Review Action Plan (paper 7). The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Strategy) reported that the University was approaching the end of the Action Plan which was being monitored weekly by the Senior Management Team and by the Academic Board.
- 12.2 The Pro Vice-Chancellor had discussed the Action Plan with the QAA Review Manager who had viewed documents online including six case studies on enhancement. While it would be for others to judge, the indications appeared to be positive. The University would receive a draft report from QAA in early June and this would be finalised by the end of June.
- 12.3 The Board commended progress on the Action Plan.

13 HEFCE: REVISED QUALITY ASSESSMENT OPERATING PLAN

- 13.1 The Board received a briefing paper from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Strategy) on the revised HEFCE Quality Assessment Operating Plan (paper 8). Attention was drawn to the Annual Provider Review which would be largely data driven and the role of governing bodies in providing assurance to HEFCE after:
- Receiving reports and challenging assurances from within the institution
 - Identifying and considering the full profile of academic risk

Students would form a key part of the process.

- 13.2 HEFCE stated that the effectiveness of governing bodies 'to continue to discharge responsibilities to maintain academic standards, and to improve the academic experience and associated outcomes' would be tested. HEFCE would feed back through the annual Risk Letter.
- 13.3 It was envisaged that, following the Board's earlier decision to retain a revised and refocused Academic Strategy Committee, ASC would provide an appropriate forum for scrutiny and challenge on quality assessment. It would be necessary to identify sources of support and training for governing bodies to discharge their responsibilities through a mix of national and local initiatives. The Pro Vice-Chancellor had made a presentation to the Audit Committee on programme development and such presentations, to the whole Board or to ASC, might form part of the assurance mechanism.
- 13.4 There was reference to the Teaching Excellence Framework and a technical consultation on TEF was expected.

14 STUDENTS' UNION REPORT

- 14.1 The Board received the report of the President of SMSU (paper 9). The Board noted:
- Governance
 - RAG week and events
 - SMSU campaigns
 - Sports clubs and societies

15 ACADEMIC STRATEGY COMMITTEE

- 15.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Strategy Committee held on 1 March 2016 (paper 10).

16 AUDIT COMMITTEE

- 16.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Audit Committee held on 14 March 2016 (paper 11).

17 CHAIRS' COMMITTEE

- 17.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Chairs' Committee held on 1 March 2016 (paper 12).

18 ESTATES AND HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

- 18.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Estates and Health and Safety Committee held on 7 March 2016 (paper 13).

19 FINANCE AND STAFFING COMMITTEE

- 19.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Finance and Staffing Committee held on 16 March 2016 (paper 14).

20 NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

- 20.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Nominations Committee held on 7 January and 17 March 2016 (paper 15).

21 STUDENT EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE

- 21.1 The Board received the minutes of the meeting of the Student Experience Committee held on 9 February 2016 (paper 16).

22 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Thursday 30 June (5pm)

SUMMER GRADUATION CEREMONIES

Wednesday 13 July

Morning: Arts and Humanities

Afternoon: School of Health and Applied Science

Thursday 14 July

Morning: School of Management and Social Sciences

Afternoon: School of Education Theology and Leadership (with the installation of Margaret Mizen as Pro-Chancellor)