



## **Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education**

### **Meeting of the Board of Directors**

**Spitalfields room, Fetter Lane London and by Video Conference, 11:00 – 16:00**

**Minutes of the meeting on 9 March 2022**

#### **Present**

##### **Board Members:**

Professor Simon Gaskell (Chair)  
Ms Eve Alcock  
Professor Nic Beech  
Dr Vanessa Davies  
Ms Sara Drake  
Ms Linda Duncan  
Ms Hillary Gyebi-Ababio  
Professor Maria Hinfelaar  
Professor Rachid Hourizi  
Professor David Jones  
Ms Angela Joyce  
Professor Craig Mahoney  
Professor Sue Rigby  
Professor John Sawkins  
Professor Oliver Turnbull  
Mr Craig Watkins  
Professor Philip Wilson

#### **In attendance**

##### **Officers:**

Ms Vicki Stott (Chief Executive)  
Mr Alastair Delaney (Executive Director of Operations (Deputy CEO))  
Mr Tom Yates (Director of Corporate Affairs)  
Ms Caroline Blackburn (Finance Director)  
Ms Rachel Hill-Kelly (Assistant Company Secretary)

### **Welcome, apologies and Chair's opening remarks (Item 1)**

1. The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and welcomed Professor Rachid Hourizi to the Board.
2. Nic Beech and Vanessa Davies would miss part of the meeting.

### **Quorum and Interests (Item 2)**

3. The meeting was declared quorate. No interests were declared beyond those previously notified and included in the Register of Interests.

### **Minutes of the Board meeting held on 15 December 2021, actions and matters arising (Item 3, BD-21/22-29)**

4. The Board **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2021.
5. Actions arising in the minutes:

15/12/18: Vicki Stott had engaged with Vice Chancellors to discuss the Post-16 Skills Bill and the Lifelong Learning Entitlement. Philip Augar had sent an email to VS with an invitation to join discussions around establishing a further education thinktank.

15/12/36: Millie Crook would provide a general recruitment update at the next Board meeting on 15 June.

15/12/47: MC would include a paragraph on reviewers in her update.
6. All other actions from the previous meeting were noted as complete, and the Board noted the updates provided.

### **Consultative Board Update (Item 4, oral item)**

#### Meeting held on 24 January 2022

7. Notes from the meeting were available on the Board site for members. The Chair reflected that the Consultative Board offered an opportunity to engage with a wide range of stakeholders and continued to be useful for all concerned.
8. The two areas of focus at the meeting had been the Triennial review and the ENQA gap analysis, and significant feedback had been received from attendees. Several members of the Consultative Board had conveyed concerns that the Designated Quality Body (DQB) function in England should remain independent and not be taken in-house by the Office for Students (OfS). The Association of Colleges, which historically been somewhat critical of QAA, had found QAA responsive to its feedback, and confidence among its members had increased. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) officer had asked if the proposed changes to the DQB governance would affect relations between outside organisations and QAA, and been assured that close attention would be paid to such a risk.

## Chief Executive's Report (Item 5, BD-21/22-30)

*Tom Yates left the meeting*

9. VS presented her report. It was proposed that Tom Yates be made a full member of the Executive team. The Nomination and Remuneration Committee had endorsed the recommendation. The Board unanimously **approved** the appointment.

*Tom Yates returned to the meeting*

10. VS presented a mind-map detailing a summary of the QAA position in relation to European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) registration and the triennial review of the DQB function in England. These were QAA's two top risks, and they had coincided; the Senior Leadership Team had considered them, at 3 away-days, and the mind-map summarised the possible scenarios, the possible mitigations, and the correlations between the two risks. Each scenario was being reinforced by a communications strategy.
11. VS outlined the background to the EQAR registration risk. The Bologna process, which was fundamental to higher education quality assurance, had produced the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) and facilitated portability of credit and qualifications across the European Higher Education Area. EQAR was a registered list of agencies in substantial compliance with the ESG; QAA had been registered since 2013, and the UK government and (separately) Scotland had long been members.
12. EQAR viewed compliance in binary terms. Since 2018 the OfS had changed the regulatory environment and in 2020 QAA's substantial change report to EQAR had identified the two areas of non-compliance in England currently being considered by EQAR: inclusion of students on all review panels and teams, and publication of reviews.
13. EQAR had provided QAA until December 2021 to address these two areas of non-compliance and had now formally written to QAA to say it was in a period of "extraordinary revision" which could lead to suspension or even removal from the register pending the next European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) review.
14. Removal from the register would have a significant impact on the QAA regulatory function in Wales: EQAR registration was a statutory requirement for the quality body. Scotland would likely require a division in QAA's operations.
15. QAA needed to respond by the end of April 2022. At its June meeting EQAR could decide that the QAA had substantially complied, it could suspend QAA from the register, or it could remove QAA from the register, which would leave QAA having to reapply in 2023.
16. The ESG also required cyclical review, and there was no prospect of this being reintroduced in England.
17. VS outlined the background to the triennial review risk, which had been fast-moving. OfS had two concerns: conflict of interest, and competence. OfS had yet to provide substantive evidence of the conflict it perceived (the OfS Director of Regulation had cited three instances, none of which was credible), and QAA believed its internal

firewall was working well. The sector largely understood well the distinction between QAA as DQB and QAA as a membership function, though some smaller providers might remain unsure and QAA was working to address this.

18. On competence, QAA had identified an issue within the QAE team responsible for delivering the DQB function in the autumn of 2021. A new interim director, Rob Stroud, had identified some further issues. Formerly of OfS, RS had worked hard to audit the team's understanding of OfS expectations and to review its ability to deliver. Early indications were that outputs and the relationship were improving.
19. The initial submission for the new method specification had not been suitable; OfS had issued a direction instructing QAA not to use it. QAA had resubmitted material to meet the specification and additional requirements. At the Q3 meeting it was acknowledged that communication and quality had improved, but the OfS QAC, due to meet the following day, seemed unlikely to move away from its 'limited confidence' judgement.
20. In considering this complex situation, QAA had borne in mind its three strategic priorities and the vision VS had outlined in October to be the settled authority on quality and standards. The DQB was a mechanism for quality control, and a delivery mechanism for OfS; in practice it did not give the sector the value that QAA had originally hoped it would – but it did allow to present itself as an all-round and complete agency.
21. Simon Gaskell thanked VS for the summary of the QAA position. SG reported on a recent conversation with Vivienne Stern of Universities UK International (UUKi) and Charlotte Snelling of Universities UK (UUK). The effect of EQAR deregistration on the ability of universities to recruit overseas students and undertake transnational education had been discussed. The impact of lack of European accreditation was difficult to assess in advance, and gathering evidence to do so could be counterproductive. UUKi had noted that the HE minister had previously made a virtue of the UK's involvement in the European Higher Education Area. UUK saw the issue as primarily specific to England, but with potential knock-on effects in other UK nations. UUK understood the difficulties and had expressed strong support for QAA; GuildHE was in a similar position.

*Nic Beech joined the meeting*

22. Sue Rigby asked whether the Secretary of State for Education was aware of the position in relation to EQAR. VS replied that QAA had been in contact with various officials in the department, who had not seemed concerned, but not yet with the Secretary of State; Linda Duncan added that EQAR had formally written to DfE.
23. Maria Hinfelaar expressed concern that a worst case scenario for QAA was it was pulled apart trying to satisfy EQAR, ENQA, and the OfS and the result satisfied none. QAA had status in Wales and EQAR was essential for the Welsh sector for its next cycle of Quality Enhancement Review.
24. Hilary Gyebi-Ababio wondered whether discussions around the UKSCQA statement on UK-ness offered an opportunity to highlight the threat of divergence posed by non-compliance with the ESG

25. SG reflected on the genesis of the Higher Education and Research Act (HERA): the former minister Joe Johnson had recently made the point to SG that an intention in the drafting of the Bill had been for QAA to remain the quality body in England. By contrast, Lord Wharton had, in conversation with SG, indicated that de-designation was likely.
26. SR reminded the Board that sector attention was likely to be consumed in the autumn by the introduction of the new B conditions, and the Teaching Excellence Framework. Board members commented that there were few independent actors other than QAA able to take on the role of DQB, and OfS was unlikely to want to take the role in-house.

### **Risk Mitigation: EQAR registration and Triennial Review of Designated Quality Body Function (Item 6, oral item)**

27. VS presented the rest of the mind-map, which showed the potential outcomes to both risks, and the mitigations available.
28. With respect to EQAR, informal discussions with EQAR officers had indicated that it was for QAA to stipulate what was in and out of scope. The work for OfS in England was currently considered in scope only because QAA had stipulated as such.
29. It was clear that regulatory arrangements in England would not comply with ESG, whereas those in the devolved nations did and would continue to do so. The proposed governance separation would enable QAA's work as DQB in England to be stipulated as out of scope, and protect EQAR registration for QAA's other work. It was the only logical mitigation, but it would inevitably highlight the fact that the UK Government's obligations to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) were not being met.
30. With respect to the triennial review, VS invited the Board to consider in particular what outcomes would be unacceptable.
31. First, QAA could simply be confirmed as DQB in England for a further three year period. The governance separation and other proposed changes would be implemented subject to Board approval. Implementation would be swift in order to satisfy EQAR, with changes substantially in place by June 2022.
32. Second, QAA could be reconfirmed as DQB in England, but with conditions, such as needing to achieve the full confidence of the QAC, or subject to a further review in the short term. This would put significant pressure on the DQB team, and it would be difficult to recruit permanent staff. It would also be difficult to implement a new specification in those conditions.
33. Third, QAA could be reconfirmed as DQB in England, but for standards only. This was possible, because HERA required the OfS to use a DQB (if there was one) for standards, whereas there was no such requirement for quality. This outcome might be presented in such a way that it initially appeared like the first possible outcome, but in practice the DQB function could start to fall moribund. Standards reviews did not require expertise or relationships with providers; the diminution in the DQB's role would become visible before long, with an impact on QAA's reputation, which might in turn make staff retention difficult.

34. Fourth, the Secretary of State could de-designate QAA. This would follow a recommendation from OfS and a further consultation with the sector as required by HERA; the process would likely take six months to a year, and the shorter the transition period, the more challenging this would be for QAA. QAA would retain its intellectual property from its DQB work; OfS, or a new DQB, would bear the costs of staff redundancies or might have to take any QAA staff willing to transfer on a TUPE basis.
35. Finally, it would be possible for QAA to further separate DQB work by moving it into a subsidiary company; this would likely trigger a designation crisis similar to HESA's (as Designated Data Body) as a result of its merger with Jisc: the new subsidiary would need to re-apply for the DQB role. Moreover, for purposes of equity and parity of endeavour, QAA would need to consider separate subsidiaries for the devolved nations; some kind of federal structure would result, but this would raise the question as to whether QAA could meaningfully continue as a UK-wide body.
36. VS outlined the potential implications of QAA not being the DQB, whether as a result of losing the role or choosing to demit it. The sector in England generally favoured QAA retaining the role, so would respond negatively, but VS's recent conversations with vice-chancellors showed that many had greater concerns, for example the TEF, with which they saw that QAA could help if it were not DQB. The risk of QAA's standing in the devolved nations being undermined would have to be mitigated. The international perspective was less clear but more manageable.
37. The function accounted for approximately 30% of revenue. QAA was statutorily prevented from generating a profit from its DQB work, but the loss of that level of income would pose a challenge nonetheless; the five-year strategy update would outline how this could be addressed.
38. Without the DQB function there was a question as to whether QAA could still claim to be a rounded agency and the settled authority on quality and standards. There would be an impact on staff morale. TY commented that there were also opportunities in not having the DQB function, some of which would be explored in the 5-year plan update.
39. The Chair praised the comprehensive exposition of the scenarios, and noted the request for a steer on outcomes that would be unacceptable. He added that the outcome of the triennial review might well be less than clear-cut; it was therefore important to consider the implicit as well as explicit implications of different outcomes, and considering their impact on the sector.

*Rachid Hourizi left the meeting*

*Vanessa Davies joined the meeting*

40. The Board agreed that QAA should be proactive in its approach: with or without the DQB function, QAA needed to be confident that it was serving the sector well, consistent with its charitable objects and strategy.
41. Several Board members questioned whether retaining DQB was important, given the policy and regulatory approach in England, and the challenges for QAA staff in working with the regulator. Others stressed that any sense of a potential vacuum would bring anxiety to the sector, and so communication would be very important.

42. The Board noted that the DQB role prevented QAA from pursuing other opportunities – but a question remained as to how much stature the membership services gained by being part of the same organisation as the DQB. Some members sounded a note of caution: two years ago the Board would not have envisaged DQB not being part of QAA's core function and care should be taken when making decisions about no longer being so.
43. The Board discussed the consequences of retention with conditions. Remaining DQB but with substantial conditions attached, or restricted to standards work only might compromise QAA's independence, would not align with the Agency's strategy, and would impact staff morale; this would not be acceptable.
44. The Board agreed in summary that it was desirable for QAA to remain DQB, but that QAA could not agree to continue in the role if unreasonable conditions were attached; this would include a restriction of the DQB's remit to standards only, or a requirement that the function be moved into a separate company. The specifics of any proposed conditions would require careful consideration. An abrupt withdrawal was not desirable: there were risks to the sector, including in the devolved nations, and to QAA's own reputation. There might be a public-interest case for retaining the DQB role initially and then making a more graceful exit at a later date; indeed, QAA should keep the option of a later exit open in any event.

#### **Governance Arrangements for the DQB Function (and Update from the Working Group) (Item 7, BD-21/22-31)**

45. TY presented the final proposal, which the Working Group had now recommended for Board approval. The proposal included the nine principles agreed by the Working Group, and had been refined following further consideration of models from PSRBs dealing with such dual roles in other professions; a discussion with the Institute for Chartered Accountants in England and Wales had been particularly informative.
46. The proposal was to reconstitute the DQB team, and move all non-DQB activity to elsewhere within QAA. DQB would remain part of QAA and would benefit from the cost savings generated through sharing support functions, but would be subject to separate governance arrangements, with a new DQBE Board with largely independent composition replacing the existing DQB Committee.
47. A new managing director would be operationally accountable to the DQBE Board; QAA's Chief Executive would line-manage the post for routine matters, and ultimately could remove the managing director. QAA's Chief Executive would retain ultimate accountability for the DQB function.
48. Discussions had continued with sector bodies such as Universities UK and GuildHE, and with the Department for Education. These had all been consistently supportive of the approach.
49. Board members praised the proposal. The accountability of the managing director to the new DQBE Board was understood, but there was concern that the post-holder would need support in what could be a highly pressured and somewhat isolated role. TY agreed that this should be borne in mind in recruiting DQBE Board members.
50. The Chair noted that the arrangements had been carefully designed to give operational strength and avoid conflicts of interest. It would be important for the DQB

to remain a body that is expert in quality and standards in UK universities (as required by HERA); this meant that the managing director and others would need to remain fully informed of developments in the sector, and also that the chief executive of QAA should retain ultimate accountability for the function.

51. The Board **approved** the governance arrangements for the DQB function and the terms of reference, and noted the implementation plan.

### **Five- Year Strategy Update (Item 8, oral presentation)**

52. Alastair Delaney and Caroline Blackburn presented the five-year strategy update. At the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) away-days, consideration had been given to longer term growth and development opportunities.
53. SLT had considered opportunities that QAA could pursue consistent with its strategic aims and maintaining its financial sustainability in all scenarios. Careful consideration had been given to potential upfront investment for activity that would have income targets once established.
54. CB set out plans to develop QAA's existing business, QAA would continue to grow its International Quality Review (IQR) work, which was a successful and profitable service. QAA would increase resource in the team in order to be able to deliver the growing pipeline of orders. AD would assume oversight of the Access to HE function in order to enable Stephanie Sandford to focus on IQR. Work with Alternative Providers (AP) could expand into Scotland; the membership offering could be expanded to the 29 Scottish colleges.
55. A membership fee increase in line with inflation of around 3% was planned, following several years with no increase. The additional cost per provider would be small and unlikely to impact decisions on membership.
56. AD set out new strategic opportunities. QAA would actively pursue three such opportunities now: international programme accreditation, which other quality agencies offered and which could be developed quickly; an international Access to HE offer, which the Access Validation Agencies were keen to pursue; and a suite of training and development packages for members as paid services beyond the core membership fee.
57. Some options were dependent on the triennial outcome. These included DAPS consultancy, a range of services to support members responding to OfS service requirements, support for self-evaluation, voluntary enhancement reviews and TEF evaluation services.
58. Options for future consideration included a potential contract for the Nursing and Midwifery Council and other assurance work for PSRBs, affiliate membership offerings, and membership for international quality assurance agencies.
59. Business support would be optimised. The lease on Southgate House would expire in June 2023 and while QAA would still want a physical office space, approximately £500,000 per year could be saved. The Glasgow office could be sublet until the lease ran out in 2025. Arrangements for IT provision were under review.

60. The financial position had been carefully considered. The worst-case scenario entailed £2.8 million per year of lost DQB income. Variable delivery costs would also cease, and staff redundancy costs would be covered by OfS, but £1.2 million of indirect business support costs would be left unfunded. Projected income increases would close the gap by £900,000, but this would still leave £300,000 unfunded. This could be covered in the short term by reserves so as to retain staff and capacity to deliver the income contracts. The biggest challenge would come in 2022-23.
61. Income targets had been increased. The membership increase should provide £100,000 and a new training and development offering £140,000. The current pipeline of international work was very strong (£1.1m); speed of delivery was the challenge here. Passing on inflationary increases to APs and AVAs would bring in another £200,000. The scenario had accounted for a staff pay rise and inflation. Longer delivery pipelines and cost increases remained risks.
62. Some investment opportunities remained if DQB was retained.
63. The Board noted that the areas being targeted were ones where QAA was confident of demand and where the market was not crowded. Speed was important, however: demand might erode if QAA was perceived as not being able to deliver. The requisite commercial skills were available in the International team; capacity must be matched to the level of demand in order to deliver. LD suggested QAA have a development fund for speedy investment to secure delivery. CB agreed to investigate this. **CB to action.**
64. The Board thanked AD and CB for the presentation. SG asked that the slides be circulated to the Board. **TY to action.**

### **Report and Interactions with Funders and Regulators (Item 9, BD-21/22-32)**

65. The Board received the report and **agreed** to delegate the final approval of the DQB annual report to the DQB committee.

### **Annual Review of the Risk Tolerance Thresholds (Item 10, BD-21/22-33)**

66. The Board received the risk tolerance thresholds and noted that it had been reviewed by the Audit and Risk Committee. The Board **approved** the risk appetite and tolerance thresholds.

### **QAA Strategic Risk Register Review (Item 11, BD-21/22-34)**

67. TY presented the Strategic Risk Register, and reminded the Board that it was reviewed monthly by the Senior Leadership Team. The Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) had reviewed it at its January meeting. The two top risks had of course been extensively discussed in this meeting already.
68. Craig Mahoney suggested merging risks S3 and S4 as both covered government policy. The risk for both areas was not equal, however CW acknowledged that as QAA was a UK agency the risk register should reflect this and not focus on one nation more heavily. **Action: TY to propose a merged risk for ARC to consider.** The Board **approved** the Strategic Risk Register.

**ENQA Review 2023- SWOT Analysis and Project Plan (Item 12, BD-21/22-35)**

69. The Board received the project plan for the ENQA review and noted that the timescales necessitated Board approval of the final self-assessment review by correspondence. The Board **approved** the project plan.

**Quarter 2 Monitoring and Performance Report on Annual Plan and Finances (Item 13, BD-21/22-36)**

70. The Board received the report and noted the additional historic performance issues that had come to light within the DQB, but also that the mitigations put in place had been effective and the submissions to OfS in February demonstrated this.
71. The Board noted a forecast surplus driven by membership and international work. CB had spoken to the investment manager in relation to exposure of the portfolio to the war in Ukraine. Exposure via funds to businesses with operations in Russia was proportionally tiny, and reducing as funds divested. QAA had £4 million invested overall and was not vulnerable, though it would feel the impact of the stock market drop more generally. LD and CB met regularly with the investment manager and were comfortable with the approach to geopolitical developments.

**Report on Financial Matters (Item 14, BD-21/22-37)**

72. CB presented the report. The Board noted that at the annual investment review investments had performed above target.
73. The Treasury Management policy had no changes to note. The Board **approved** the policy.
74. The first two steps of the triennial review of investment management had been completed and alternatives for price and performance considered. CB proposed that instead of a formal tender Rathbones be benchmarked for value. The Board **approved** this approach.
75. CB proposed investing a further £1 million in two tranches into the fund, in March and June. The Board noted that with the stock market low this was a good point to invest. The Board **approved** the investment.
76. The Board noted the USS pension scheme update. CB had made allowance in reserves for the anticipated increased cost.

**Matters Reserved for the Board (Item 15, BD-21/22-38)**

77. The Board noted that the list of matters reserved to the Board was reviewed annually and no changes were proposed. SG noted paragraphs 36-41 were consistent with current practice, however the DQB governance separation may result in alterations being necessary. Vanessa Davies noted that revision may be required in relation to ACDAP. TY confirmed that he would review this document along with the full suite of governance documents; he would bring a revised version to the Board if required. **TY to action**. The Board **approved** the document at present and noted that the DQB separation might require changes in-year.

## **Review of the Scheme of Delegated Authority, Financial Regulations and Compliance Framework (Item 16, BD-21/22-39)**

78. The Board noted the minor changes proposed to the Scheme of Delegated Authority. In paragraph 29, the substantive change proposed was to raise the approval limit for income contracts and tenders from £5,000 to £20,000 and to replace Band 5 with Band 6 as authorisation level.
79. In paragraph 46 the proposal was to remove what had become a bottleneck at CEO level by replacing the current complex set of delegations for publications with a simpler rule allowing SLT and the Marketing Manager to approve publications, exercising their judgement as to when approval could be delegated further or should be escalated to Executive level. The approach had been trialled since September with the Chair's agreement, and was working well.
80. The Committee received the Financial Regulations and noted that the only proposed change was to paragraph 92 to reflect the change to section 29.1 of the Scheme of Delegated Authority, by referring to approval of tenders as well as signature of income contracts. The changes had been reviewed by the Audit and Risk Committee.
81. The Board **approved** the three documents and noted that the DQB separation might result in further changes in-year.

## **Board and Committee Business**

### **Appointments and Retirements to Board Committees (Item 17, BD-21/22-40)**

82. The Board received the report and **approved** the appointments to committees in paragraph one.
83. The Board noted the updates in paragraphs two to four. The Nomination and Remuneration Committee had considered the timing of student member appointments, and proposed that the independent student member's term run in accordance to the calendar year.
84. The change would stagger the starting dates of the student members who co-chair the Student Strategic Advisory Committee. HGA suggested staggering would be a good idea in principle, though it could be at the expense of the mutual support engendered by a simultaneous start. EA noted that the logistics of the induction would require consideration as currently this took place in the summer when workloads were historically quieter. PW noted that staggering would support institutional memory and handover.
85. The Board **approved** the changes subject to clarification of the term start date for the independent member.

### **Committee Reporting (Item 18, BD-21/22-41)**

86. The Board received and noted reports from the committees. The Board noted and **approved** the changes to the Access Recognition and Licencing Committee terms of reference. The Chair thanked Board members for their work over the year in these committees.

*Alastair Delaney left the meeting.*

### **Note on Appeals/Representations Routes (Item 19, BD-21/22-42)**

87. The Board received the report on appeal routes and noted that an NDAPS representation had been considered on 8 March, appealing an ACDAP recommendation of 'not ready'. The Board had delegated authority for hearing the appeal to a sub group.
88. The Panel had considered a large volume of paperwork and concluded that there had been no serious procedural irregularity; however, communication from ACDAP had not given equal weighting to the opportunity to submit both a revised NDAPs plan and an optional commentary.
89. To assure robustness in consideration of the NDAPs application, the Panel had therefore decided that the provider be offered the opportunity to submit a revised NDAPS to ACDAP as an extraordinary measure without creating a precedent.
90. The provider would have no further recourse to appeal. The provider and the OfS would be informed of the outcome. The Panel made two recommendations; one in relation to communication from ACDAP, and a second to recommend that future DAPS appeals include a timeline of the conduct of the review in the documentation.

*Nic Beech left the meeting*

### **Article: Definition of Quality, pre-publication version (Item 20, BD-21/22-43)**

91. The Board noted an unpublished version of VS's article on the definition of quality. It would be published by Higher Education Policy Institute on 14 March, and was a timely discussion on the meaning of quality.
92. There would be a series of events to mark 25 years of QAA. An evening event would follow the Board meeting on 15 June at Senate House in London.

### **Any Other Business (Item 21)**

93. The Board noted QAA had a memorandum of understanding with Ukraine and **delegated** to VS and SG the sending of an appropriate expression of support.
94. The Chair noted it was Craig Mahoney's last meeting as a Board member. The Board thanked CM for his valuable input during his term. Universities Scotland would nominate a new member.

### **Chair's closing remarks**

### **Date of the Next Meeting (Item 23)**

95. The Chair confirmed the next meeting would take place on **Wednesday 15 June 2022** at Senate House in London. The meeting was closed at 16.14.

<b>Board of Directors Action List</b>				
<b>Minute:</b>	<b>Action:</b>	<b>Owner:</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>	<b>Update:</b>
<b>21/22-29</b>	Millie Crook would provide a general recruitment update at the next Board meeting on 15 June	MC	15/6/2022	On Agenda for 15 June: Item 9
<b>21/22-63</b>	CB to investigate possible investment fund.	CB		
<b>21/22-64</b>	TY to circulate 5 year plan slides to Board	TY	18/3/2022	Complete.
<b>21/22-68</b>	Propose a merged risk for consideration	TY	26/5/2022	Complete; ARC decided not to merge the two risks.
<b>21/22-77</b>	Review the delegations and articles in light of DQB separation.	TY		Partially complete: update on agenda for 15 June (Item 8)
<b>21/22-93</b>	VS and SG to draft expression of support for Ukraine.	VS SG	21/3/2022	Complete.