
**Minutes of the 82nd meeting and Strategy Day
of the Board of Governors
held on Thursday 5 May 2016 (12:00 – 18:00)**

Governors present:

Mr Clive Jones (Chair)
Ms Rolande Anderson (for part)
Dr Kathy Castle
Ms Pauline Curtis (for part)
Mr Rob Hull, Vice Chair
Mr Adrian Kamellard (for part)
Ms Ann Minogue, Vice Chair
Mr Michael Murphy
Mr Obie Opara
Prof. John Raftery, Vice Chancellor
Ms Cathy Sullivan

In attendance:

[REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive
Ms Sian Browne (E&Y) (for part)
Mr Paul Bowler (Deputy Chief Executive)
Ms Lynn Burke (Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness)
Ms Fiona Duggan (FiD) (for part)
Mr Iain Franklin (OCIOC Programme Manager)
Mr Peter Garrod (University Secretary)
Mr Ian Ingram (Gardiner & Theobald) (for part)
Ms Caroline Jackson (Director of Estates) (for part)
[REDACTED] s.40(2) FOIA - personal information
Ms Demetria Maratheftis (Head of Marketing) (for part)
Prof. Peter McCaffery (Deputy Vice Chancellor)
Ms Pam Nelson (Director of Finance)
Ms Siobhan O'Donoghue (Assistant University Secretary) (minutes)
Ms Florence Onwumere (SU President-elect)
Mr John Ridgett (Design Engine)
Mr Oliver Moore (Design Engine)
Ms Lily Stock (E&Y) (for part)

Welcome, Apologies and Announcements

Oral

1. The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting:
 - a. Jacqui Brasted, an observer from HEFCE; Iain Franklin, the One Campus | One Community Programme Manager; Caroline Jackson, Director of Estates; [REDACTED] s.40(2) FOIA - personal information and Florence Onwumere, the SU President Elect.
 - b. Fiona Duggan (FiD), John Ridgett and Oliver Moore (Design Engine) and Ian Ingram (Gardiner and Theobald) would attend for Item 4, Estates Masterplan proposals; Sian Browne and Lily Stock (Ernst & Young) would attend for Item 5, Organisational Staffing and Structure; and Demetria Maratheftis, Head of Marketing, would attend for Item 6, Revenue Development.
2. Apologies had been received from Independent Governors Tony Millns and Dianne Willcocks. Governors Rolande Anderson, Pauline Curtis and Adrian Kamellard would need to leave the meeting before the scheduled end time.
3. The Chair thanked those Governors who had volunteered to preside over July and December 2016 graduation ceremonies. All Governors were warmly encouraged to participate, where they had availability.

Declarations of Interest

Oral

4. Item 6, Revenue Development: Governor Michael Murphy declared an interest due to his association with Lodestone PR, who had been engaged to provide PR advice to the University. It was not deemed necessary for Governor Murphy to leave the room or refrain from the discussion of the item.

5. **The Board noted the declaration of interest.**

Minutes and Matters Arising

BG 82/1.1

6. The Board received the minutes of the last Board meeting, held on 17 March 2016, and approved them as a correct record. There were no matters arising.

7. **The Board of Governors:**

- a. **approved the minutes of the last Board meeting held on 17 March 2016 as a correct record; and**
- b. **noted the table of updates on actions arising that were not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.**

Vice Chancellor's Quarterly Report to HEFCE and the Board

BG 82/2.1

8. The Vice Chancellor's 24th Quarterly Report to HEFCE and the Board had been circulated via email on 21 April 2016. The following updates were noted:
9. Student numbers: [REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
10. Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE): Building on the good practice measures put in place and results achieved last year (relating to 2013/14 graduates); informal analysis showed that this year's survey results, for both employment rates and students in graduate level jobs, had improved yet again. Response rates had also increased, exceeding the required 80 per cent.

11. **The Board of Governors noted:**

- a. **the Vice Chancellor's Quarterly Report to HEFCE and the Board; and**
- b. **HEFCE's revised Letter of Institutional Risk, dated 14 April 2016, attached as an Appendix to the report.**

One Campus | One Community: overview and summary

BG 82/3.1

12. In advance of consideration of the more detailed papers and presentations covering the Estates masterplan, Organisational Restructure and Productivity and Reward One Campus | One Community (OC | OC) workstreams, elsewhere on the agenda; the Board received a general overview and progress update on the OC | OC programme and associated programme risks.
13. Further detailed work on all workstreams was ongoing; what was sought from the Board at this stage was approval of the general direction of travel:
 - a. The OC | OC programme had now reached a significant milestone with the culmination of the three major workstreams established to design a spatially and organisationally sustainable university. Other underpinning programmes, including technology and communications, continued to progress to schedule.
 - b. The detailed reports and presentations elsewhere on the agenda were the result of significant development and discussion with the OC | OC Programme Board, the Senior Management Team and other staff. The Vice Chancellor thanked the two Vice Chairs, who sat on the Governor Oversight Group, for their challenge and guidance, and key staff members and their teams for the work to date.
 - c. If approved in principle by the Board, the Masterplan proposals and key elements of the Organisational Restructure and Productivity and Reward workstreams would be shared with staff on 6 May 2016; and a series of internal and external communications had been prepared.
 - d. The Finance and Resources Committee would be asked to approve a s188 consultation, once detailed proposals (based on the Productivity and Reward and Organisational Restructure conclusions) had been developed further.
 - e. There remained significant risks. The overall OC | OC programme risk was high and the risk register was actively maintained. Mitigation measures continued to be actioned to address key risks and programme staff were actively managing business-critical change projects.
 - f. The OC | OC Programme Manager clarified that the March 2016 baseline FTE staff figure was 1,160 (not 1,660 as included in the report), and that this figure included Hourly Paid Lecturers.

- | |
|---|
| <p>14. The Board of Governors noted the overview and summary of the One Campus One Community programme.</p> |
|---|

One Campus | One Community: review and contingency proposals

BG 82/3.2

15. In line with the conditions of the Board's approval of the One Campus | One Community (OC | OC) programme in October 2015, the Finance Director presented proposals for reviewing the OC | OC programme, including a proposed 'gateway' review in summer

2016, prior to entering into major capital commitments and before entering Clearing. The Board had also previously requested that appropriate contingency plans and fall-back positions be developed, should it decide not to proceed with the OC | OC programme, and an outline approach to contingency planning was presented. This would be developed further, subject to the Board's approval.

16. The review and contingency proposals were in line with recent Charity Commission guidance and also the 2015 Higher Education Green paper, [REDACTED]

s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive

17. The University's current financial review arrangements involved senior management and the Board reviewing financial forecasts in June and January. [REDACTED]

s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive

In addition to these two review points, it was proposed that there should be further checkpoints in August (before Clearing) and March. There would thus be a rolling annual review process for OC | OC linked to the financial and admissions cycles. Failure to achieve agreed criteria at any of the review points would trigger implementation of the University's contingency plan.

18. Given the significant investment [REDACTED] the University proposed to commission an external review by KPMG, based on the Office of Government Commerce's *Gateway Review 2: delivery strategy* guidance, which would provide assurances that the programme as forecast would deliver the needed improvement in financial sustainability, before major contracts were committed to, or borrowing approval was sought. The Finance Director would share the Terms of Reference of the KPMG review with Governor Adrian Kamellard, chair of the Audit Committee.

s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive

19. Subject to the Board's approval of the direction of travel of the three OC | OC workstreams elsewhere on the agenda, financial forecasts to 2020/21 would be developed for the Board's consideration at its 30 June 2016 meeting, alongside the findings of KPMG's review. On the basis that the Board agreed to proceed, the August 2016 checkpoint would then be used to check whether enrolments and other assumptions had deteriorated to an extent that the outcome of the June 2016 decision would need to be revisited.

20. Given that it was vital that Governors be provided with ample information and space to consider the proposals and supporting evidence fully at the 30 June 2016 Board meeting, it was agreed that the timing of that meeting should be extended to four hours.

[REDACTED]
. [REDACTED]

s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive

21. **The Board of Governors approved the proposed approach to a review of OC|OC; and the outline approach to contingency planning.**

Estate Masterplan proposals

BG 82/4.1

22. The Masterplan consultant team (comprising representatives from Design Engine, FiD and Gardiner and Theobald) were welcomed to the meeting. The Masterplan proposals had been circulated to the Board in advance of the meeting and the consultation team now provided further background, context and detail as part of its presentation.
23. The Masterplan proposals were based on both the University's requirements and the consultants' knowledge of the sector; but had also been informed to a large extent by the extensive programme of consultations with over 350 individuals at over 30 events. The Masterplan proposed a pragmatic approach to the existing estate; removing some structures to open up the campus, but re-using and adapting the majority of existing buildings, making these spaces work harder. Overall space per student would reduce, but the way the space was used would be reorganised more effectively. The Masterplan was intended not only to be a short-term development, but also provide a 'future-proofed' site, which would allow for additional projects and campus expansion to respond to future growth.
24. Amongst other proposals, the Masterplan included the following key elements:
 - a. A relatively modest amount of new space, and the refurbishment of existing buildings to provide a better quality of space, and a more coherent, functional and flexible campus.
 - b. The key underpinning principles of 'reaching out, inviting in' (an encouragement of a wider sense of community); maximising opportunities of being on a single site; and embracing new ways of learning.
 - c. An opening up of the campus, focused around a central plaza accessible from all sides, which would also increase the University's 'shop window'. Key 'feature spaces' (such as studios) would be no longer be deep within the campus, but brought to the front around the courtyard to be at the heart of the campus.
 - d. Teaching and learning spaces would not be arranged by Faculty; but would comprise general and specialist space and 'study commons'.
 - e. An equal emphasis on learning and social spaces, giving students the opportunity to study in their preferred way. A move away from formal lecture theatre environments, with more emphasis on diverse, multi-use and flexible space with moveable and permeable boundaries.
 - f. An increase in Library space, to be spread out across the campus. Circulation areas would also be enhanced in order to support multiple activities and to make areas more visible.
 - g. Central functions space would meet the needs of all – staff, students and visitors alike – and facilitate greater use.
25. The Board thanks the Masterplan consultants for their work, particularly given the relatively short timeframe in which the proposals had been developed. Governors and

staff then reflected on the presentation, noting risks, challenges and opportunities. The following points were raised as part of the subsequent wide-ranging discussion.

- a. The flexible nature of spaces was welcomed, but this had to be achieved without compromising the needs of staff and students – for example soundproof partitions, and the ability to designate ‘quiet zone’ areas for exam and revision use. In developing the campus, it was also essential that spaces remained accessible and provided for the needs of disabled students.
- b. Specialist subject-specific facilities would still be provided, but would be done in less traditional ways. It was the intention that these specialist spaces would be central to the campus, and be used to help ‘celebrate’ and showcase the University’s offering. The appropriate balance of provision would be determined in the next detailed stages of the planning and consultation process.
- c. Elements of the masterplan as proposed would require planning approval. [REDACTED]

s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive

[REDACTED] An independent planning consultant has reviewed the masterplan proposals, and there had also been an informal consultation with planning officers at LB Islington. Nevertheless, it was recommended that planning permission be sought at the earliest opportunity.

- d. Given the plan to open up the campus, security was an important factor and the Masterplan development work had included a security review. It was important that staff and students felt they had ownership of their space and felt safe in it. The extent of the campus ‘openness’ and security arrangements had to remain under the University’s control. There would be layers of ‘soft’ security (for example repositioning reception areas) but also lock-down options. Security arrangements would be one of the elements considered by local authority planners when reviewing the proposals.
 - e. The space per student ratio was efficient and would need to be actively managed. It was, however, in alignment with the University’s London peers, and London Met had previous experience of operating at this ratio (when student numbers had been higher). It was also an advantage that the campus had been designed specifically to operate effectively at this ratio, although the Masterplan proposals allowed for future growth in line with improved student numbers.
26. In terms of phasing, three construction scenarios had been identified and prepared. The recommendation of the Masterplan team – and the preferred option of the Senior Management Team and Estates department – was ‘Option 1’, which involved completion of the Tower and the J Block proposals first. An advantage to this approach was the impact it would have on University’s external profile, given that these would be highly visible changes to the campus. Option 1 also retained the largest quantum of teaching and staff space during initial construction phases, which would help with interim decant and capacity considerations.

27.

s.43(2) FOIA -
commercially sensitive

[REDACTED] . An element of 'value engineering' had already been undertaken to remove elements that were not essential, but the proposals were being reviewed further to bring costs closer to budget. The timing and sequencing of some work could be reviewed, with some elements of the plan deferred until the University's financial position improved. There was, however, a 'core' of the masterplan that was considered by the consultants to be essential in terms of delivering a sustainable University. Proposed timescales for all phasing options envisaged completion of construction and consolidation by autumn 2021. Limited 'enabling works' would need to start in October 2016, with the first phase of major construction works commencing on-site in June 2017.

28. Although the rationale for starting with the most visible and substantial elements of the Masterplan was understood and appreciated, the Board felt it was not able to make a decision on phasing without first considering further detail on the feasibility of all the potential phasing options, including a breakdown of whole-life costs, risk analysis, timescales for sequencing, and assessments of the impact on students and services at all current sites.
29. It was agreed that this detailed information should be reviewed initially by the two Vice Chairs who sat on the Governor Oversight Group and [REDACTED] who was s.40(2) FOIA - personal information providing informal expert advice to the University on the OC | OC programme on a *pro bono* basis. The Senior Management team would then circulate its recommendation to the Board. [REDACTED] who was in attendance, encouraged a cautious approach, suggesting that it was not necessary or advisable to commit to significant and costly elements of the Masterplan at this stage. The proposals were complex and there were a number of live risks that could impact on them. s.40(2) FOIA - personal information

30. The Board of Governors:

- a. approved the general direction of the Masterplan proposals; and
- b. requested that detailed information on phasing and costing of other options be reviewed.

Organisational Design: conclusions

BG 82/5.1

31. The Board considered proposals for a new organisational structure and operating model, prepared and presented by Ernst and Young (EY) as part of the One Campus One Community (OC | OC) Organisational Design workstream. The proposals built on initial work carried out as part of Project Oak Tree, which had recommended achieving efficiencies through a more centralised, function-led, operating model for delivering support services.
- a. As with the campus Masterplan proposals, the proposed organisational structure had been designed to enable the financial and academic sustainability of London Met; to support London Met's students, with a focus on a linked up student journey,

academic and employment outcomes; and to be resilient, flexible and able to withstand market pressures.

- b. Organisational design principles had been established to inform the redesigned structure. These included a top down, function-led, strategic approach, with a focus on increasing productivity and activities that added value. A 'digital first' approach facilitated a technology enabled organisation.
- c. Other principles included the standardisation of core administrative activities, using 'off-the-shelf' best practice systems where possible. Hand-offs between departments would be reduced as a result of streamlined transparent processes and delegated responsibilities, with decisions made at the lowest possible level, consistent with expertise and accountability.
- d. The resulting 'end state' structure was much reduced, both in terms of layers but also headcount. [REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. Some reductions were attributable to reduced workloads as a result of declining enrolments, but the majority of efficiencies were linked to a fundamental transformation in ways of working.
- e. The organisational restructure affected all levels of staff. It would be implemented in stages, starting with the current review of the management structure. There would be a smaller and reshaped Senior Management Team, reduced by one third. The majority of the organisational restructure would occur over an 18-month time period, and continue until the campus consolidation was complete.
- f. Changes included a move from the Faculty model and the deletion of the Dean post. Instead, there would be six Schools, each led by a Head of School, with academic areas established in the School most relevant to them. This approach also increased opportunities for collaborative working.
- g. Academic administration would be reduced and reallocated, with all PSD and current Faculty administration managed centrally, with operational teams acting as business partners to the schools. Centralisation also had the benefit of enhancing creates career pathways across and up the organisation.

- 32. The Board was reminded that only in-principle approval of the direction of travel was sought at this stage and that, as the work was developed and implemented, certain changes were to be expected. Subject to the Board's approval, key elements of the Organisational Restructure would be shared with staff and the proposed changes to the top level management structure would be implemented on 6 May 2016.
- 33. The following points were noted as part of the Board's discussion:
 - a. The Board endorsed the proposed direction of travel, in particular the de-layering of management. It was reiterated that the restructure affected all levels of the organisation, and that the initial proposals included an immediate reduction in the

Senior Management Team by a third. There was a commitment to a reduction across all levels on a fair, equitable and proportionate basis.

- b. [REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive
- The scale and timescale for the headcount reduction was challenging, however, with a majority of efficiencies being achieved over an 18-month time period, commencing immediately after the Board meeting.
- c. It was important at this stage that the proposals retained an element of flexibility, and that there was scope to make adjustments as the structure was implemented. There would also need to be a pragmatic and practical approach to timings – for example it was possible that some departments (such as Human Resources and those areas involved with admissions and enrolments) would need to increase resources temporarily to minimise disruption to key services.
- d. The Board welcomed the intention to communicate the high-level organisational structure proposals with staff as early as possible. It was appreciated that not all details were finalised and that it would not be possible to address every staff concern; but it was important to be as transparent as possible, and also to provide assurances that disruptions to the student experience would be minimised.

34. The Board of Governor approved the direction of travel of the Organisational Design proposals.

Productivity and Reward: conclusions

BG 82/5.2

35. The key objective of the Productivity and Reward workstream was to establish a workforce that was the right size, engaged and productive, and focused on activity that added value to the University, through excellent teaching and positive student experience and outcomes. The OC|OC Programme Manager now presented the findings of an analysis of productivity levels; and proposals for headcount reductions, which had been developed with the Faculty Deans in response.
36. Modelling work, which had looked at both Academic Work Allocation Models (AWAMs) and contact hours (i.e., teaching supply and demand), had identified a significant under-productivity within the academic workforce in terms of the core role of teaching. [REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive
37. Deans had been asked to develop models in response to this analysis for a cost effective, productive and agile workforce that met current demands, but that was also able to meet future need. [REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA - commercially sensitive

38. The Productivity and Reward analysis had been an extremely complicated exercise and there were significant risks. The ambitious targets would need to be achieved over an extended timeframe and would not be complete until the end of 2016/17. Outcomes would not be certain until consultation had taken place.
39. The Board was asked to approve the general direction of travel of the proposals, which would be developed into formal consultation proposals and the approval of a s.188 by the Finance and Resources Committee.
40. The following points were raised during the Board's subsequent discussion:
 - a. It was clarified that the headline proposals developed by the Deans protected revenue lines and did not involve course portfolio changes. It was also noted that the proposed changes to the academic workforce model would not jeopardise the University's professionally accredited courses. There would also be sufficient qualified technical personnel in labs, etc.
 - b. One of the key challenges would be ensuring that the best staff were retained for the benefit of students. There were, however, strict operating guidelines and policies that the University would need to follow. Attractive professional development opportunities and support would help to retain key staff.

c.

s.43(2) FOIA -
commercially
sensitive



d.

s.43(2) FOIA -
commercially
sensitive



41. Regarding current and forthcoming s188 exercises, the Chair made clear that the Board would not involve itself with industrial relations and that the relevant HR procedures must be followed.
42. The Staff Governor did not support or approve the direction of travel of the Productivity and Reward recommendations and asked that this be noted.

43. The Board of Governors approved the direction of travel of the Productivity and Reward proposals.

Revenue Generation: marketing

BG 82/6.1

44. The Deputy Chief Executive and Head of Marketing presented proposals aimed at increasing student fee income, by focusing on the four main drivers of short-term revenue – product, reputation, marketing and relationships:
- a. Over the last 18 months, the University had embarked on a programme of institutional renewal and change, beginning with the Strategic Plan 2015-2020, followed by the development of OC | OC and PISO to address financial sustainability, the student experience and graduate outcomes. Strategic and leadership attention now needed to be focused on improving revenue in the short term, by raising applications and acceptances, and by reducing the number of applicants that withdrew before enrolment.
 - b. The longer term objective was to raise the profile of the University and put it on a footing for sustainably better revenues in future.
 - c. Building on evidence from previous strategies, campaigns had now shifted from a ‘mission’ and ‘evidence-claim’ focus, to a more emotive approach and promotion of the 5-star student promise, which was paying dividends. This was coupled with a move away from costly and hard to track off-line and press ads, and an increased focus on less visible, but more trackable, online, search and re-targeted ads.
 - d. Campaigns had also been brought forward across more recruitment cycles and across more audience ranges, targeting BTEC students and ‘happy wanderers’ (students who applied outside the normal UCAS process), both with some success.
 - e. Beyond advertising, there had also been a shift away from relatively straight-forward course promotion, to a more nuanced conversation and relationship-based approach.
 - f. There had also been investment in a new web content management system; a new CRM tool to enable more frequent and direct contact with prospects and offer holders; a student-staffed outbound call centre; paid student casual staff contributing to social media; a wider variety of on-campus events; and more people ‘on the road’ in schools and colleges.
 - g. As well as promotional activity, the University needed to work on, and invest in, its public reputation and build on the relationships with feeder schools and colleges. It was important to try and raise revenue with the reputation the University had (with conversations around ‘re-brand’ at a later stage).
 - h. The revenue investment would be given the same level of support, leadership attention and scrutiny as had been applied to PISO and OC | OC. It was proposed that a governance structure and project board be established, with resourced project management and a project timeline, based on the three critical revenue points. The programme would initially be resourced from existing marketing and contingency budgets; any further allocation would be subject to approval by the Finance and Resources Committee.

45. The Board welcomed the proposals to increase revenue, and discussed the following points:
- a. Word of mouth was powerful. There also needed to be more student advocates and a focus on human interest stories. There could be greater use of alumni to champion the University, with testimonials and visits to schools and colleges by former students.
 - b. It was also important to improve retention, and a joined up approach to internal and external communications would be useful. There also needed to be an improved social media presence.
 - c. Currently, 57 per cent of students were mature; had families; came with non-traditional qualifications, and were recruited through Clearing. It was important to try and reach these students earlier, offering increase contract and providing better preparation, assistance and encouragement. There needed to be a better understanding of why these groups 'organically' chose London Met. This could be done through research directed at current students.
 - d. It was equally important to reach out to schools and colleges for the 18yr old market. The University had to provide a range of offerings.
 - e. There needed to be a strategic shift in London Met's visibility with 'middle England', with a focus on the 'value added'. The University needed to put some distance between where it was now and the negative past.
 - f. As with PISO and OC | OC governance arrangements, the Board agreed that ongoing Governor involvement and oversight would be helpful. Governor Michael Murphy agreed to provide this support and input to the marketing project.

46. **The Board of Governors approved the direction of travel for the revenue investment project.**

London Met in 2020 – after OCOC and PSIO

Oral

47. The Vice Chancellor and Deputy Vice Chancellor briefly outlined the long-term vision that OC | OC and PISO were intended to achieve. The objective was to have a University that met the needs of its time and was adapted to the demographic of its students. This would involve creating a much more permeable campus at Islington which was more open to the local community; a significant emphasis on asynchronous and 'blended' learning, combining face to face support from tutors with online delivery and access to services at times that suited students' lifestyles; a more agile and flexible organisational structure; stronger links to feeder institutions; and more flexible provision and a customised portfolio. The aim was to get to the point where the University's problems would be those faced by a successful and growing institution. There were signs that OC | OC and PISO were gaining traction and would deliver on their

objectives; the immediate challenge, which would be focus of senior management effort, was improving student numbers and revenue.

48. The Board of Governors noted the summary from the Vice Chancellor and Deputy Vice Chancellor.

Conclusion

Oral

49. The Vice Chancellor expressed his thanks to those staff and Governors who had led on the extensive and intensive work to date, which had culminated in the presentations and recommendations made to the Board earlier in the meeting.
- a. A direction of travel had now been established for three significant elements of the OC | OC programme. The vision for the Islington campus, changes to the organisational and staffing structure, and the rationale behind these, had all been agreed in principle.
 - b. The need for substantial savings by way of reducing the payroll in the near future was clearly understood, and work would begin immediately, with changes to the top-level management structure.
 - c. Work would also continue in advance of the June 2016 Board meeting to ensure that the Masterplan proposals were brought back within budget.
 - d. For the June 2016 Board meeting, the Executive would need be fully advanced in its thinking and be in a position to make a clear recommendation to the Board around whether to continue with OC | OC. It was a complex matter, with both a 'go' and a 'no-go' decision having far-reaching consequences, but the interests of students and the University as a charity would be at the forefront of any recommendation. A decision not to proceed with OC | OC, even with a robust contingency plan, would have far reaching ramifications; equally, a decision to continue would have to include clearly understood checkpoints and an understanding and mitigations of residual risks.
- [REDACTED] s.43(2) FOIA
[REDACTED] commercially sensitive
[REDACTED]
- e. The OC | OC and PISO programmes were progressing successfully and to schedule, and would continue. These programmes in themselves were not sufficient, however; the University's operating environment was tightening and increasingly challenging. London Met needed to outperform against its competitors, stem the fall in student numbers and increase its revenue through enrolments and retention.
 - f. The refocussed marketing proposals, approved in principle by the Board, aimed to improve lines of revenue generation, but would also require the support and energy of the University leadership and the wider staff community.

50. The issues outlined above would guide the Executive's priorities and the allocation of time and effort over the coming months.

51. The Chair then summarised the outcomes of the Board's discussions:

 - a. The general direction of travel of the Estates masterplan had been approved. The campus design concept was exciting and inspiring, but the Board needed more detail, including risk assessments and whole-life costings, for all phasing options before committing to a specific phasing option. There would be further work on the phasing options, which would be discussed in the Oversight Group before a recommended option was circulated to the Board.
 - b. The Board had also approved the direction of travel of the Organisational Design and the Productivity and Reward workstreams, noting that a proposed s188 would be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee in due course.
 - c. The first OC | OC 'gateway' review was scheduled for the Board meeting on 30 June 2016. The Board would review extended financial forecasts to 2020/21, developed in light of the proposals considered earlier in the meeting, and also the findings of KPMG's external review. [REDACTED]
 - d. The Board had endorsed the proposed approach to boosting and tailoring marketing and PR activity to increase revenue from recruitment and retention, and had welcomed the involvement of Governor, Michael Murphy. Any additional resourcing requirements would also be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee.

s.43(2) FOIA -
commercially
sensitive

52. The Board of Governors noted the Vice Chancellor's and the Chair's summary of decisions.

Any Other Business

Oral

53. There were no further items of business.

Siobhan O'Donoghue

May 2016

Item	Para / Action	For action by who	To be actioned by when	Update on action (as at 17.05.16)
BG 82/3.2 OCOC review and contingency plans	Para. 18) KPMG review terms of reference to be shared with Audit Committee chair.	Finance Director	Once review terms of review are established	<i>KPMG review Terms of Reference discussed with Audit Committee chair 17/05</i>
BG 82/3.2 OCOC review and contingency plans	Para. 20) 30 June 2016 meeting timings to be extended.	University Secretary	Following the meeting	<i>30 June 2016 meeting timings extended to 16:00-20:00</i>
BG 82/4.1 Estates Masterplan	Para 29) Masterplan phasing options to be reviewed by Governor Oversight Group and [REDACTED] *to provide a recommendation to the Board <small>*s.40(2) FOIA - personal information</small>	Deputy Chief Executive / OCOC Programme Manager	Following the meeting	<i>Revised proposals developed in light of feedback from Governor Oversight Group and presented elsewhere on the Board agenda</i>
BG 82/5.1 Organisational Design	Para 32) Key elements of the organisational restructure (and masterplan) to be shared with staff	Vice Chancellor	6 May 2016	<i>Masterplan and organisational structure proposals circulated to staff on 6 May 2016</i>
BG 82/6.1 Revenue Generation	Para 45f) Governor Michael Murphy to provide Governor oversight and input to revenue workstream	Director of External Relations	Ongoing	<i>Michael Murphy liaising with Director of External Relations on revenue development marketing activities</i>