

# Board of Governors

## Minutes

Of the Board of Governors meeting held on Monday 10, and Tuesday, 11 February 2020 from 5pm at The lensbury, Broom Road, Twickenham TW11 9NU

---

**Present:**

Ms Jennifer Bernard (Independent Governor) (Chair of the Board)  
Mr Dermot Blastland (Independent Governor)  
Ms Sandra Botterell (Independent Governor)  
Ms Shirley Cameron (Independent Governor)  
Mr Mark Cammies (Independent Governor)  
Mr Steve Fowler (Independent Governor)  
Mr Geoff Fuller (Independent Governor)  
Dr Suresh Gamlath (Staff Representative)  
Mr Derek Hicks (Co-opted Governor)  
Professor Peter John (Vice-Chancellor)  
Mr Jonathan Lawrence (Independent Governor)  
Professor Heather Loveday (Professoriate Representative)  
Dr Christopher McLaverty (Independent Governor)  
Ms Kerry O'Callaghan (Independent Governor)  
Ms Helena Peacock (Independent Governor)  
Mr Jacob Pepper (SU President)  
Ms Sara Raybould (Academic Board Representative)  
Mr Paul Sahota (Co-opted Governor)  
Mr Patrick Younge (Independent Governor)

**In attendance:**

Mr Graeme Atherton (Head of Access HE, London Higher – agenda item 2-4, Tuesday, 11 February)  
Mr Adrian Ellison (Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor and Chief Information Officer)  
Ms Janine Braithwaite (UWLSU VP Education for agenda items 2-4 on Tuesday, 11 February)  
Professor Joelle Fanghanel (Pro Vice-Chancellor, Academic)  
Mr Chris Fenner (Director of Property Services)  
Mr Patrick Fuller (Chief Financial Officer)  
Ms Ancha Joof (UWLSU VP Activities and Participation)(for agenda items 2-4 on Tuesday, 11 February)  
Ms Marion Lowe (University Secretary and Chief Compliance Officer)

---

Mr Jo Luzmore (Head of Communications and Events)(for agenda item 6 on Tuesday, 11 February)  
Ms Tracy McAuliffe (Head of Student Services – Monday, 10 February)  
Ms Coral Mason (Assistant Clerk to the Board)  
Ms Andrea Moran (Head of Marketing and Communications)(for agenda item 6 on Tuesday, 11 February)  
Dr Kostas Tzortzis (Director of Strategic Planning)  
Professor Anthony Woodman (Deputy Vice-Chancellor)

**Apologies:** Mr Kris Murali (Independent Governor)

## **1 Apologies for absence, announcements and declarations of interest**

- 1.1 Apologies were noted as above.
- 1.2 There were no declarations of interest.

### **Welcome and aims of the day**

- 1.3 The Chair of the Board opened the Away Day by providing an outline of the presentations and discussions on the agenda. The Vice-Chancellor would provide highlights of the previous year and the presentations would provide a number of scenarios for future growth.

## **2. Health and wellbeing Framework (BG 1920 06)**

- 2.1 The Head of Student Services reflected on the previous presentation to the Board of Governors in 2018 which had provided an outline on the growth of mental health services in the University and how the University, working with the Students' Union, had developed services to provide a bespoke offering to students, catering for their individual needs based on disclosure.
- 2.2 The Head of Student Services remit covered the student journey from the Open Day to Graduation and sometimes beyond. Areas of activity include Wellbeing, Student Welfare, Placements and Employment and Volunteering.
- 2.3 Over the last five years, there has been an increase of 233% in students declaring a mental health condition at the University. The Framework was the outcome of discussions with staff and students to provide a way to support students who required additional help to complete their studies. The Framework provided a pathway to ensure students received the appropriate support and met with the appropriate team that would support them. The University had created a new Welfare Team to provide general support for students with mental health issues in addition to the specialist Wellbeing support. In addition, external workshops had been provided for staff to identify the correct level of support for a student. This included training by an organisation called Rethink, who provided peer to peer mentor training. This allowed the organisation to employ students who had been trained to work with other students and support them through difficult times.

- 2.4 The Students' Union had conducted a survey of UWL students and mapped it to a Wonke national survey to see whether day-to-day concerns expressed by students nationally reflected UWL student concerns. UWL students mostly raised concerns about financial issues although this ranked 5<sup>th</sup> nationally. This reflected the different student demographic at UWL.
- 2.5 The results of the UWL survey indicated that students were less lonely and had more friends than the national average; this may be due to a high number of UWL students commuting from home but it also indicated UWL students had a sense of belonging and felt they were a part of the UWL family. Students indicated they wanted more on-campus student support services, affordable food options and activities to help them secure employment. The Framework was based on these needs.
- 2.6 The Framework clearly articulated the University's mental health support services. Many students self-declared a disability on arrival at University with some students declaring more than one disability. It was noted that many students who may be experiencing mental health issues do not declare an illness and staff were being trained to identify students who may be exhibiting challenging behaviour. This includes training Personal Tutors to identify students experiencing stress due to academic difficulties.
- 2.7 Students seeking support were triaged according to their needs. The Counselling Service had seen a 21% increase in referrals compared to 2017-18. There had been a 12.5% increase in sessions offered compared to 2017-18. Feedback indicated 71% of students confirmed the counselling sessions had helped them to stay at UWL and 98% felt it had improved their general wellbeing.
- 2.8 The Head of Student Services confirmed the focus on mental health referrals had dropped because the Welfare Team had been intervening sooner. This was due to enhanced staff training and awareness.
- 2.9 UWL was committed to the Framework by providing an environment to support wellbeing which included the opening of an on-campus Sports Centre. Recalibrating support services for students included the employment of male Councillors to encourage more male students to talk about their problems.
- 2.10 The University aimed to give students the tools to support their own wellbeing by helping them to identify and work on stress hot spots. It also aimed to ensure that staff were looking after their own mental health to ensure that they were able to support students.
- 2.11 Subject to approval by the Board of Governors, the Framework would be launched, and the University would be applying for the University Mental Health Charter in 2020.
- 2.12 The Framework was tied to the University Strategic Plan, Ambition 2023, and practices in the Framework would be monitored to ensure the Framework was working appropriately.
- 2.13 Members thanked the Head of Student Services for the informative presentation and discussed how students could be encouraged to disclose their mental health issues.

It was agreed providing positive role models and success stories, particularly by alumni, would allow students to see how people in their situation had worked through adversity and had been successful.

- 2.14 It was agreed the Framework would not solve student problems, but it would give them the tools to help themselves and allow them to find help and support when they needed it.
- 2.15 It was noted that staff had received training on mental health awareness and key staff had received enhanced training. In the same way first aid staff received an allowance for the service they provided, it was hoped the University would consider paying staff for their service for mental health providers.
- 2.16 Members agreed mental health should be seen in the same context of physical wellbeing and those who have mental health issues should not feel stigmatised.
- 2.17 The Board of Governors **APPROVED** the Health and Wellbeing Framework and **APPROVED** the accreditation process.

### **3. Learning Analytics: a student perspective**

- 3.1 The Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor and Chief Information Officer opened up the next presentation by providing a recap on the UWL student profile which provided a picture of why the University entered into a working partnership with Civitas Learning to look at ways of improving retention and completion rates.
- 3.2 The School of Computing and Engineering were initially selected to pilot the initiative. Whilst Civitas data identified vulnerable students it was the interventions that made the difference. To date, over 330 UWL staff had received training and there had been over 120,000 interventions made. Training had been provided for academic and support staff. This was of particular importance for Personal Tutors and Lead Personal Tutors who had received enhanced training as these staff worked with the most vulnerable students.
- 3.3 The partnership with Civitas helped to identify how vulnerable students could be supported before they withdrew from their course. Civitas worked on data analysis predictions which meant the partnership was a long-term project, but the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor and Chief Information Officer believed that the project was now bearing fruit.
- 3.4 The work was GDPR compliant as students were notified of the project when they enrolled. To date there have only been a small number of queries about the project from students seeking clarification, but students were happy for their data to be used in this way when they saw how the data gathering improved levels of support.
- 3.5 The project was supported by a dedicated Student Experience Team who provided student-based activities and outreach. They evaluated feedback, contacted and mentored students. At risk students were also contacted by the Student Retention Team. These activities are monitored by the Student Experience Group led by the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Student Experience).

- 3.6 Based on the data received, the University Strategic Planning Office created a Student Dashboard which provided a snapshot showing the engagement of students' metrics which provided an understanding of student behaviour and engagement.
- 3.7 Data was based on 123 predictors, the UWL student population and historical data.
- 3.8 It was noted that the predictive nature of the exercise was not a perfect system but year on year as more data gathered it would lead to clearer interventions and outcomes.
- 3.9 The Student Dashboard covered attendance, blackboard usage and swiping to come onto campus. The data was broken down into filters and then provided information on individual student engagement.
- 3.10 Members noted the University KPIs showed an improvement for continuation and completion data since the University had partnered with Civitas.
- 3.11 The Civitas data did not include student contact with the SU or student services but staff could refer to student records and see whether the data stored had identified them as an 'at risk' student. All interventions were recorded.
- 3.12 Staff involved in the intervention process had been trained to provide the best possible outcomes for students identified as being at risk of dropping out but the whole support process was now a part of all staff remits.
- 3.13 Looking forward, the University aimed to continue the work with Civitas looking at ways to enhance the predictive tools and looking at ways to engage with students further.
- 3.14 Members were informed that whilst students were aware that data was being gathered the data was not fed back to the students. It was agreed that an at risk student could view the data gathered in a negative way. A Personal Tutor could provide information to students in a more meaningful way.
- 3.15 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the presentation

**Tuesday, 11 February 2020**

### **Opening comments by the Chair of the Board of Governors**

The Chair of the Board of Governors opened the day informing members that the next presentation by the Vice-Chancellor would look at the possible future for the University and whether the University wanted to expand in an uncertain market. If the University committed to expansion, what this would look like and how could the University estate accommodate an increase in student numbers.

## **1. University of West London – Accessible, Affordable, Accountable**

- 1.1 The Vice-Chancellor reflected on the presentations to the Board which had focused on student support and achievement.

- 1.2 The Vice-Chancellor opened his presentation by reflecting on a conversation with a retired member of the Board of Governors who wanted to encourage the University to look beyond planning safely for the future and think about bold expansion and how this could be achieved. It was noted that many of the risks facing the University were external and beyond the control of the University but due to prudent financial planning the University was in a good position to look at expanding student numbers. **Some references in this section have been redacted.**
- 1.3 The University faced a number of internal pressures which included replacing the student records system and how to future proof the portfolio. Academic quality could not be compromised by an expansion in student numbers and the reputation of the University needed to be maintained.
- 1.4 A survey of 70 Vice-Chancellor's looking at sector risks identified financial uncertainty and funding as the top risk in the sector. This was taking into account that approximately 40% of institutions were planning for deficits. Further risks identified included public opinion and perception, political uncertainty, Brexit, declining applications, staff drain and international competition.
- 1.5 The Vice-Chancellor survey had identified approximately 10 areas where it was suggested the OfS would focus their attention. These included degree inflation, value for money, fee changes and student protection plans. Whilst all these areas were of concern, the focus for UWL students was employment once they had graduated. UWL planning scenarios had attempted to take into account the changing job market and the areas of growth were the areas UWL had focused on developing its portfolio.
- 1.6 One institution had fallen into administration in London and it was highly likely another one would follow before the summer of 2020. As part of the Student Protection Plans UWL had taken approximately 270 students from the first institution and might take a number of students from the second institution. Both institutions were in London and it was likely no institution in the north would close due to the fact that universities were often the major employer in their region. It was considered that it was unsettling for students forced to move institutions and could impact on their studies.
- 1.7 UWL competitors were growing and increasing their income. It appeared, even in a very competitive market institutions continued to grow income. If UWL wanted to remain competitive then it would need to grow its income as well. UWL's income had grown incrementally through a prudent growth in student numbers and enterprise activity. UWL's current surplus was between 7-8% which allowed for reinvestment into the student experience and allowed UWL to take advantage of business opportunities.
- 1.8 Members queried whether the University should expand its competitor comparisons and look at Russell Group institutions. The Vice-Chancellor stated this would prove difficult because their income was so far in excess of UWL's because of high research income although it was noted they were not immune to the financial difficulties facing post-92 institutions.
- 1.9 In terms of growth the Vice-Chancellor reported a growth in overseas student recruitment which had doubled to 760 students, the School of Biomedical Sciences had received over 120 applications for three courses for entry in September 2020,

the Drama School London had been incorporated into UWL, apprenticeship numbers had grown to approximately 800 and completion rates continued to improve.

- 1.10 In addition to this activity, UWL was expanding new partnerships and developing current partnerships. These partnerships include home and overseas partners.
- 1.11 Members queried what the risks would be if UWL were to expand with an aim of reaching £150M by 2022-23. Student numbers would need to grow by approximately 1200. Surplus would be maintained at 8-10%. The Director of Property Services would be presenting on the campus space later on the agenda, but space utilisation would need to be more focused to ensure space was able to accommodate the increase in numbers. The University held a lot of single use space, like wet labs, which restricted usage, but it was estimated teaching rooms were only occupied for 30% of working hours which was not out of line with the sector. Timetabling of rooms presented a big challenge and would require staff reviewing their needs, not just at the start of term but throughout the year.
- 1.12 The University would retain its character as the ethos of the University was why students were attracted to the University.
- 1.13 The Vice-Chancellor informed members that the only way the University could continue to deliver its mission was through growth. If the University wanted to employ more research active staff, then it would need to grow and expand into new areas like Biomedical Sciences. On-campus facilities would have to be used in a smarter way to accommodate growth and focus would fall on changing the current teaching model, which was outdated and, in many ways, no longer fit for purpose.
- 1.14 Whilst many institutions were cutting back on their cost base, UWL continued to grow with an aim to provide a firm platform for growth.
- 1.15 The University continued to invest in its research activity with over 85 submissions at 3\* and 4\* for the REF. If the University ranked within the top 100 research institutions it would lead to a world ranking and raise the university's international profile. The higher ranking would also increase UKRI funding for research for seven years.
- 1.16 The Vice-Chancellor reminded members of the 2019 KPIs, noting that a number of them had already been achieved. Members were informed that OfS grants for teaching continued to fall and would reduce by 6-8% in 2020-21 but would be offset by healthy growth in other areas.
- 1.17 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the presentation.

## **2. Higher Education in London, Demographic Change and Hyper diversity**

- 2.1 The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the Head of AccessHE, London Higher whose presentation looked at the impact of demographics on London students, what higher education looked like in London and possible future demand in London.
- 2.2 AccessHE was in a prime position to review the current picture in London and the future of higher education in London due to the networks and research being undertaken by the organisation.

- 2.3 More students went into higher education in London than anywhere else in the country and the increase in 18-year olds would lead to an increase of 30% of 18 years, living in London, going to University by 2030.
- 2.4 The report by AccessHE, *Preparing for Hyper-Diversity: London's Student Population in 2030* concluded that the increase in student numbers was from the non-white population, mainly from African backgrounds and other, mixed groups. Universities would need to plan and prepare for a more diverse student population.
- 2.5 Most London students tended to stay in London for higher education, noting London had the lowest student retention with 7.73% not completing.
- 2.6 Future risks included a change in the rental market which could push families out of London. It was estimated by 2024-25 there would be a fall in secondary school place demand, and this would eventually impact on higher education numbers. Institutions would need change their approach to student support to accommodate the changes in the student population and would need to think about cultural mixes. Institutions should also consider how they approached the attainment gaps between the higher achiever groups and those who had traditionally struggled to progress or complete.
- 2.7 Although a higher percentage of 18-year olds went into higher education, the London labour market was highly competitive and social mobility in London for the indigenous population did not reflect into employment opportunities and there tended to be downward mobility. There still appeared to be a progression ceiling for students from non-white backgrounds.
- 2.8 Looking forward, institutions in London need to consider how they would accommodate an increase in student numbers and a more diverse student population. The London demographic may shift the pattern of HE demand and institutions need to review their continuation and progression gaps being mindful of the ethnic changes in the student population. Finally, institutions needed to identify and address unequal opportunities in the job market in London.
- 2.9 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the presentation.

### **3. Higher Education in London and Commuter Students**

- 3.1 The Head of AccessHE moved to a second presentation on the impact of commuting on students.
- 3.2 The presentation set out the different type of commuting student, the national picture, work undertaken by London Higher and how the sector could support commuting students.
- 3.3 Commuting students fell into four categories: the 'typical' residential student who lived close to their place of study and had low travel disruption with high social engagement, the 'social' commuter student who lived a distance from their place of study but had high social engagement, the 'home' commuter student who had medium to low social engagement and lived close to their place of study and 'higher-risk' commuter student who had low social engagement and lived a long distance



from their place of study. The work undertaken by AccessHE provided an outline of the typical student type that fell into each category which showed that the 'home' commuter student tended to be the first from their family to go to university, were mainly Asian and were in the most deprived social groups, POLAR 1-2.

- 3.4 There tended to be fewer students who fell into the 'higher risk', full commuter student but these students were usually mature students, first in their family to go to University and lived in the London region.
- 3.5 Members were aware that students travelling in London had a different experience to those students who travelled in cities and towns in other parts of the country.
- 3.6 Further research conducted by AccessHE provided information on the number of students who lived in their own residence. The data was gathered from 20 universities including UWL. The data indicated that 37.6% of UWL students lived in their own residence.
- 3.7 A pilot, including UWL, on the effects of commuting on London students had been conducted in 2015-16 and showed that most students travelled between 10-20 minutes and the median travel times varied between 40-60 minutes.
- 3.8 Students were questioned on the impact of travelling on their studies and at three of the six institutions, the students did not think commuting impacted on their studies. However, UWL students believed commuting did have an impact on their studies. There were a number of issues identified with commuting which included, lack of time for breakfast, cost restricted the time they travelled to campus, the time it took students to get to campus meant students were selecting the modules they attended, lack of facilities including lockers, affordable food and parking meant students were reluctant to commute to campus, students were not participating in social events because of travel and commuting students felt travel times impacted on their mental health and well-being.
- 3.9 The positive aspects of commuting meant those students who wanted to stay at home felt comfortable in their environment, were less lonely and enjoyed staying in their own community.
- 3.10 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the presentation.

#### **4. The Implications for UWL**

- 4.1 The Director of Strategic Planning addressed the implications of change in demographics for UWL and where the future may lie.
- 4.2 There would continue to be a dip in the number of 18-year olds entering university and numbers will only really start to increase by 2024. There would be a drop in the white population and a drop in the number of mature students applying to UWL. It was estimated 70% of applicants would come from traditional 18-year olds which will be an increase of 10% for UWL. Even though there had been a fall in 18-year olds entering University, UWL numbers continued to increase.

- 4.3 The change in the student population to a younger demographic meant the University will have to adapt how it provided academic and pastoral services. Students would require different levels of support and would likely spend more time on campus. This may place a strain on campus management as space would need to be utilised better.
- 4.4 Academic staff would have to consider how they supported young and mature students equally.
- 4.5 UWL had been working to grow student numbers beyond traditional UCAS applications which included transnational, partnership and apprenticeship applications.
- 4.6 UWL faced sector problems with uncertainty around the OfS and the possible shifts in government funding.
- 4.7 The Director of Strategic Planning referred members to the previous presentation on commuting students which identified UWL as one of the six institutions in the pilot survey conducted by AccessHE. The survey indicated that 1/3 of UWL students commuting time was up to 30 minutes, 1/3 commuted up to 60 minutes and the remaining 1/3 commuted over 60 minutes. The majority of UWL students were mature, BAME, their income was below £25k and they spent a long time commuting.
- 4.8 UWL Student Services were aware that they would have to provide additional support to commuting students and, although blended learning helped, technology could not replace face to face teaching and support. The University had looked at ways to adapt the teaching blocks to reduce the amount of time students needed to be on campus, but it was difficult to please everyone.
- 4.9 Crossrail had been factored into the University's predicted student number forecast.
- 4.10 London was a high participation area and the OfS had requested the University expand its recruitment area, but it was difficult as there were very few areas of low participation in London. With HS2 the University could look to South Birmingham where there were no HEI's, but it was unclear whether students would be prepared to commute.
- 4.11 UWL continued to engage with the local community and the outreach team had been engaging with schools and trying to engage younger students.
- 4.12 The University was aware of and was preparing for a change in the student population and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) was working with the SU and the Head of Student Services to monitor the changes in the student population to gather additional information on their requirements.
- 4.13 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the presentation.

## 5. **Estates and Environmental Stability: Plan for Platinum**

- 5.1 The Director of Property Services informed members that a growth in student numbers would have implications for the University estate. T

- 5.2 The University's estate strategy had traditionally been driven by ensuring the student population had the right space, the environment was user friendly and provided value for money.
- 5.3 In addition to ensuring the space met the needs of the increased and varied student population, the University was committed to reducing its carbon emissions to zero by 2030.
- 5.4 The University would need to consider whether it wanted to consolidate its current estate or expand by looking at other sites. The University would need to think and respond quickly to anticipate the change in demographics and the student cohort.
- 5.5 The lease on Fountain House was due for renewal in 2021 and the University would need to consider whether the building was fit for purpose and had the ability to accommodate an increase in student numbers. The University had occupied Villiers House in Ealing for 6-7 years and would need to consider whether it wished to continue leasing the building. If it did, then the University might need to invest in the building as it was showing signs of fatigue.
- 5.6 The University had invested in transport services for students and had been considering whether to expand the bus services whilst looking at possibly adding to the student accommodation UWL offered to students. Currently Paragon House was oversubscribed. The University also offered places at the Student Village and The Cube but if student numbers expanded then the University would have to look at providing additional facilities. The University also supported student who wished to rent privately.
- 5.7 The University would look at alternative accommodation offerings and could consider offering hotel style accommodation for commuting students. This would allow commuting students to take advantage of social activities and feel part of the University family.
- 5.8 The catering contract with Elixor would expire August 2024 and the facilities contract with Bouygues would expire November 2024. The University would need to review whether to bring services back into the University, tender for the contracts again or renew with the current providers.
- 5.9 The revenue cost of the estate had remained stable for the last four years. For 2018-19 the cost was over £8m which was 7.6% of University income.
- 5.10 Emerging themes in the Estates Strategy included:
- The strategy would cover the period 2020-2025,
  - Be carbon neutral by 2030,
  - Support student accommodation and travel needs,
  - Grow student accommodation provision,
  - Maintain revenue cost,
  - Monitor and utilise the estate space, and
  - Review the catering and facilities management contracts.

- 5.11 Members queried the plans for the Drama School London. It was noted that this was under consideration but DSL students could be integrated more onto the SMR campus and the building could be utilised in a different way.
- 5.12 The timetabling of space would need to be reviewed to ensure space utilisation was maximised. The timetabling team would have to be more flexible and utilise space when it became available at short notice. In addition, academic staff needed to be aware that if their class sizes reduced during term time they should contact the timetabling team to move to a smaller room. It was also noted that a large part of the estate was limited to single use and did not lend itself to being flexible.
- 5.13 The University had a small estates team and employed consultants on a need to basis.
- 5.14 Members requested arrangements be made to visit parts of the University estate including Paragon student accommodation, Gunnersbury Sports Centre, Fountain House and DSL.

**Action: University Secretary**

- 5.15 The SU President informed members that the next SU election campaign would be focussed on green and sustainable spaces on campus. It was noted that the new Estates Strategy would need to include much more emphasis on the environment and environmental sustainability and this could be part of it.

**Action: UWLSU**

- 5.16 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the presentation

## **6. Communications Strategy**

- 6.1 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor introduced the Head of Marketing and Communications and the Head of Events and Communications who would present the new Communications Strategy.
- 6.2 The Communications Strategy aimed to 'inspire students to become innovative and creative professionals, connecting them to exciting and rewarding careers' and this could be achieved by successfully marketing UWL on a variety of platforms whilst protecting the reputation of the University.
- 6.3 The Strategy was based on the success of staff and students and the team highlighting stories that would transform and encourage students to succeed.
- 6.4 The Communications Team publicised enterprise activity and supported staff expertise by promoting events.
- 6.5 VCE and SMG were encouraged to send good news stories to the Communications Team, and these would be reviewed and publicised on a number of media platforms.
- 6.6 The Head of Events and Communications met and interviewed honorary graduands and the interviews were shared with professional networks and local media.

- 6.7 The Team had increased the number of people it reached over a number of media platforms.
- 6.8 The Team had planned a number of high-profile external events which had raised the profile of the University and staff expertise.
- 6.9 Members thanked the Head of Marketing and Communications and the Head of Communications and Events and requested further consideration be given to how the Communications Strategy was measured to show success and how could they know the work undertaken improved the reputation of the University. The Head of Marketing confirmed the media platforms were monitored and comments were reviewed.
- 6.10 The Members queried how the institution's story was shared as there were so many positive aspects which were not highlighted. The Head of Marketing confirmed good news stories were publicised but were part of a series of good news stories which were pulled together to promote the University. The Team were looking at ways to promote the University brand as part of the wider university level story and at a local level were looking at ways to promote the University by engaging with the local community. The relationship with Hounslow Council was very positive but less so with Ealing Council as they did not appear to have a positive image of the University. Members agreed to revisit the Oxford Economics Report published in May 2013 which provided details of the economic benefits to Ealing of having a University based in its community.

**Action: University Secretary**

- 6.11 Members requested the Deputy Vice-Chancellor provide a follow up on the current presentation to provide details of what happens when things do not go to plan and how the University responds to a failure to communicate effectively.

**Action: Deputy Vice-Chancellor**

- 6.12 The Board of Governors **NOTED** the Communications Strategy.

## **7. Summing up and Conclusions**

- 7.1 The Vice-Chancellor and the Chair of the Board provided a summary of the Away Day and agreed that the University should aim to look at a stretched financial target for 2019-20 through to 2021-22 which would exceed current budget predictions.
- 7.2 The University aim would be to feed the surplus back into the student experience and to look at business opportunities that would further enhance growth.

## **8. Any Other Business**

- 8.1 The Chair of the Board of Governors congratulated the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Board, on his CBE. It was considered that it was tribute to the way that he had led the University over the last 10 years.

## **9. Date of next meeting**

9.1 The next meeting of the Board of Governors will take place on Tuesday, 17 March 2020 at 10.30am in the Directorate Boardroom, St Mary's Road, Ealing, W5 5RF

**Signed by Ms Jennifer Bernard**  
**Chair of the Board of Governors**

Date

**Author:** Ms Marion Lowe  
**Title:** University Secretary and Chief Compliance Officer  
**Date:** February 2020