21/22 A meeting of the Appointments and Governance Committee was held via Teams on Monday 18 October 2021 at 1.30 pm.

Present: -

The President, Dr P.R. Preston (in the Chair, recused for Minute 21/31)

The Vice-President, Mrs H. Gordon

The Vice-President, Mrs K. Owen (in the Chair for Minute 21/31)

Member of the Council, Mrs S. Maple

The Vice-Chancellor

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (recused for Minute 21/33) - - - The University Secretary

Head of Governance (Secretary)

21/23 **Minutes of the last meeting**

The Committee received and approved the Minutes of its meeting held on 8 Ju

21/24 **Matters arising**

It was noted that the Council had approved the establishment of the Group fo Chancellor. The Group had met on several occasions and a role description ha consultation on the desired characteristics for a Chancellor was currently ongo

Matters for Report

21/25 **Membership and Terms of Reference (Item 2)**

The Committee received and noted its membership and terms of reference. The Committee were reminded that there was one vacancy to be filled following John Taylor's resignation (see Minute 21/30)

21/26 **Disclosures of Interests and Risk Register (Item 3)**

The Committee received and noted a paper from the University Secretary in regard to Disclosures of Interests.

The Committee noted the Risk Register for 2021/22.

21/27 **Reports of Committees of Selection (Item 4)**

The Committee received a report of a Committee of Selection for a Pro-Vice-Chancellor [illegible]

[The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Yaqoob was recused for Minute 21/33]

21/33 **Appointment of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (additional item)**

The Committee noted that the term of office for Deputy Vice-Chancellor would end on 31 December 2021. The Vice-Chancellor proposed that Professor Yaqoob be reappointed as Deputy Vice-Chancellor for a further period of two years from 1 January 2022.

The Committee approved the proposal for recommendation to the C.5 (.1 (d)6.6 (r re) (ary)- (c)-1.9 (e)-3 il

- Develop individuals – providing knowledge to Council on topics of interest, buddying between Council members, induction programmes for new members, as well as providing buddying/mentoring between staff and Council members.
- Ambassadorial – check the provision of information to Council members to enable them to speak up for the University; brief the Council on significant changes and the messaging around these.

The aim of this work would help to: release capacity and skills to focus on specific issues; help Council members feel supported, developed, and able to better apply their skills. It would also help to avoid: Council members 'getting in the way', increased bureaucracy, complexity, 'royal visits' of lay members to Schools/Functions without real purpose.

The Committee were asked the following questions:

- What would be most helpful for the University?
-

It was noted that on 28 September 2021, the OfS had published the revised 'Prevent monitoring: guidance for accountability and data return (ADR) 2021'. This related to activity in the 2020-21 academic year. A summary of the changes OfS had made the following changes to the 2021 return included:

1. OfS had removed the requirement for providers to submit an accountability statement, but had retained the declarations that should be signed off by the chair of the governing body;

2. OfS had removed the requirement for providers to submit data about the total number of even

When an applicant's case was rejected, the reason would be given against one or more of the criteria which an applicant had to meet. In 2020-21, 84 applications were submitted to the University Committee, 60 of which were successful. Last year there were 96 applications with 60 successful. The percentage success rate of 71% was higher than last year's of 62%. Unsuccessful candidates were given 3 weeks to appeal against the decision.

An Appeals Committee chaired by an independent member ([redacted, section 40], former lay member of Council) heard eligible appeals. The Chair considered the eligibility of each appeal submitted. His decision as to eligibility was communicated to each applicant, with reasons. On occasion he determined that some but not all of the grounds were eligible. On this occasion he determined that the appeal was not eligible. No procedural changes had been identified at appeals stage.

It was noted that [redacted, section 40] had indicated that he wished to step down from his role with School stage appeals. [redacted, section 40] had also indicated that he might step down before next year, but if not, then soon after. These were important roles to fill, and it was