



St Mary's
University
Twickenham
London

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Minutes of a meeting of the Board of Governors held on Thursday 15 February 2018 at 3:15pm in
The Exchange, Twickenham.

Present

Professor Edward Acton
Mr Conal Baxter (SU President)
Professor Francis Campbell (Vice Chancellor)
Ms Noreen Doyle
Fr Richard Finn
Mr Dave Hartnett
Ms Claire McDonnell
Professor Anne Moran
Rt Rev. Richard Moth (Chair)
Mrs Kristen Pilbrow (Staff Governor)
Dr Anthony Towey (Staff Governor)

In Attendance

Mrs Jo Blunden – Senior Director of People
Prof John Brewer – Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement)
Mr Andrew Browning – Clerk to the Board (Minute Taker)
Rt Hon. Ruth Kelly – Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Enterprise)
Mr John Unsworth – Chief Operating Officer

MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING

1 WELCOMES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies for absence from Jeff Cottle, Sue Handley-Jones, and Edward Acton.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of 1 February 2018 were approved by the Board.

4 MATTERS ARISING

It was agreed that as the previous Board meeting had only taken place two weeks previously any matters arising from the meeting would be held over until the next Board meeting.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION OR APPROVAL

5 TIMESCALES FOR FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

Paper 1 refers

5.1 This had been prepared by the Head of Corporate Planning and was presented by the Senior Director of People. She told the Board that the paper set out the milestones for Financial Improvement Programme. These included an additional Board meeting that would take place on 21 March to approve the proposals for the academic restructure.

5.2 The Board **noted** the timescales contained within the paper.

6 PROPOSALS FOR ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC STRUCTURES

Paper 2 refers

6.1 This was presented by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Strategy). The paper set out three potential models for academic structures within the University. These had been developed after discussions at SMT with academic staff being consulted widely. The PVC (AS) said that meetings had taken place with the Schools and their views had been taken into account.

6.2 The PVC (AS) said that there was a need to make savings while bearing in mind the needs of the students. It was felt that the three models within the paper would bring the advantage of economies of scale. The three models in the paper were:-

- i) A three faculty model which would bring savings of around £1.1m.
- ii) A two faculty plus two institute (Theology and Education being institutes) model with Education being a freestanding institute without an enterprise function which would bring savings of just under £1.3m.

- iii) A two faculty plus two institute (Theology and Education being institutes) model with Education being embedded into a faculty and containing an enterprise function which would bring savings of just under £1.4m.
- 6.3 The Board asked why there was not an option for Theology to be a department within a faculty. The Vice Chancellor said that the Goulding Report had stated that for Theology to move towards being an ecclesiastical faculty it should be a separate body. It was also the case if the ecclesiastical faculty comes to St Mary's having the institute reporting directly into the Vice Chancellor would limit the impact of the need of reserved posts within the Faculty. The Board asked if it would be more costly to have a standalone institute. The Pro Vice Chancellor (AS) said that a business case was being prepared for Theology and will need to take its share of the cost savings.
- 6.4 It was asked by the Board what the difference would be between an institute with an enterprise function and one without such a function. The Board understood that there was a need for Education to be more commercially focussed. The PVC (Research & Enterprise) said that if the enterprise function was not part of an institute the University's central Enterprise Unit would work with Education and the academic staff would be required to do the enterprise work. If the enterprise function was part of Education there would be a dedicated enterprise lead within Education working with the Central Enterprise Unit.
- 6.5 The Board reiterated the view that had been put forward at previous meetings that the reports that had been written by Anne Moran and Dave Hartnett into Education had called for reform and this needed to take place. The Vice Chancellor said that Education has to change so that the University can provide schools with the services they want and need. In relation to the role of Enterprise in Education there is a need to ask what Education does and then the decision can be made as to where Enterprise will sit within Education. The Pro Vice Chancellor (Research & Enterprise) said that under any model academics would still have to get involved in Enterprise the difference with the third option is that there would be a person from Enterprise embedded in Education.
- 6.6 The Board noted that the proposed models were very dependent on the relationship between the Vice Chancellor and the PVC (Academic Strategy) and that perhaps consideration could be considered to the Deans reporting directly to the Vice Chancellor rather than the PVC (Academic Strategy).
- 6.7 Board members raised concerns that if Education were to be part of a faculty it may suffer a loss of status from the perspective of potential students. It was however also noted by other Board members that the word "Education" would be within the faculty title and other top performing Schools of Education within the sector were not freestanding. There was a general agreement within the Board that Education has to be marketed as a key offering from the University.
- 6.8 The Board was of the view that nature of education and teacher training had changed. The University needed to work with more schools and develop more and deeper relationships with the assistance of Enterprise.
- 6.9 The Vice Chancellor informed the Board that Anne Moran would be meeting with the Head of SETL and other members of staff on 1 March 2018 to discuss potential structures for Education. It was expected that the proposed structure would be brought back to the Board for discussion and approval when it next met on 21 March 2018.

- 6.10 The SU President said that students tend to identify with their programme rather than a school or faculty. He said that in relation to any restructure, students would also be most concerned about preserving tutors on the front line and receiving the maximum teaching time.
- 6.11 The PVC (Academic Strategy) told the Board that the third model should deliver the savings that were required. He said that a majority of these savings had been identified within middle management rather than front line teaching staff. He said that there would be significant changes to the administrative structure with the faculties having an administrative hub.
- 6.12 The Board asked what title the Head of Education would have. The PVC (AS) said that this had not been confirmed yet but it was thought that the role would be at around Associate Dean level. The Vice Chancellor said that work still had to be done on salary weightings for the role and other roles within the new structure.
- 6.13 The Vice Chancellor said that during the feedback from Academic Board regarding the proposed changes there was no question against the rationale for the changes more about how they should be made. The Senior Director of People said that most staff within the University accepted the need to change, it was more of a case as to how to go about making these changes. The main discussion centred around how and it was not possible to get an absolute consensus from staff about this.
- 6.14 The Board was concerned about the effect that any restructure would have on student experience. This was particularly in relation to the potential loss of Programme Directors. The Pro Vice Chancellor (GE) said that the University needed to be mindful that the right message regarding the University was given to prospective students. The Pro Vice Chancellor (AS) said that consideration could be given to retaining Programme Directors for a further year if the savings could be found elsewhere.
- 6.15 The Board asked if they could see the job descriptions of the Deans. It was asked whether the Dean of the faculty containing an Institute of Education would require experience in Education. The Senior Director of People said that a process put in place to fill the post and members of staff at risk may wish to apply and there was a need to be flexible in terms of considering who could fill the position.
- 6.16 The Vice Chancellor said that the points made by the Board would be fed back to Academic Board when it meets next to discuss the proposals. Academic Board would not be voting on these but its views would be passed on to the Board when It next met on 21 March 2018.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 7.1 The Vice Chancellor told the Board that the University had been continuing to look at adding an ecclesiastical dimension to its theology offering. There was currently an Ecclesiastical Institute based at Heythrop and the Vatican had agreed that this could be transferred to the University.

- 7.2 The Board were informed that the University would remain as a civil university with a separate ecclesiastical institute that would report directly into the Vice Chancellor. Students within the incident would have the opportunity to study on programmes that would either give them qualifications that were recognised by the UK education authorities or the Holy See or both. It was hoped that this would improve the theology offering at the University and the department of Theology would be part of the institute.

8 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

21 March 2018
26 April 2018
21 June 2018

10 DATES OF GRADUATIONS

24 February 2018
25 February 2018
18 July 2018
19 July 2018

END