

CONFIRMED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 FEBRUARY 2020

PRESENT:

Mr C Kenny, Acting Chair (Deputy Chair)	Ms K Finlayson
Ms V Brown	Mr J Warner

APOLOGIES:

Professor C Kinsella (Chair)	Ms J Allen
------------------------------	------------

IN ATTENDANCE:

AGENDA ITEM

Mr M Ackroyd, KPMG	All except 1 and 7.1
Mr A Bush, KPMG	All except 1 and 7.1
Ms M Boryslawskij, University Secretary and Clerk to the Board of Governors	All
Mr R Calvert, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations	All except 1
Ms K Doherty, Grant Thornton	All except 1 and 7.1
Ms D Harry, Chief Finance and Planning Officer	All except 1
Mr D Ladbury, Director of Estates and Facilities	9.3
Ms L Mason, Director of Strategy, Planning and Insight	8.1, 9.1, 10.1i
Mr N Macdonald, Chair of Finance and Employment Committee (Observer)	All
Mr M Redfern, Grant Thornton	All except 7.1
Ms A Temple, Governance Senior Advisor (Minute Secretary)	All

Agenda item 1	Private Meeting of Committee Members	Minute Ref A/20/05
---------------	---	--------------------

05.1 The Committee met privately prior to the arrival of the auditors, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations and the Chief Finance and Planning Officer. There were no substantive matters discussed.

Agenda item 7.1	External Auditor Performance and Re-appointment	Minute Ref A/20/06
Paper Ref A/2/20/7.1 confidential		

06.1 The Committee reviewed Grant Thornton's performance based on:

- A questionnaire completed by the Director of Finance, the Financial Accountants (job share) and the Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC).
- An assessment of Grant Thornton by the Director of Finance completed in consultation with Grant Thornton. This was based on a framework for an audit committee to carry out a formal review of the effectiveness and efficiency of their external auditors provided by KPMG in their document 'Shaping the UK audit committee agenda'.

06.2 At its meeting on 25 March 2015, the Board of Governors approved the appointment of Grant Thornton LLP as external auditors for the University from the audit of the financial statements year ended 31 July 2015 onwards for a minimum term of three years plus the option to renew for successive periods of two years, up to a maximum term of seven years (minute BG/15/39.1(ii) refers). At its meeting on 13 June 2018 the Board agreed to reappoint Grant Thornton LLP for a further two years (i.e. audit of financial statements for year ended 31 July 2018 and year ended 31 July 2019) subject to annual performance assessment by the Audit and Risk Committee (BG/18/65.1 refers).

06.3 It was noted that Grant Thornton had reviewed fees chargeable for the Group audit of the

financial statements for year ended 31 July 2020, taking into account the activities carried out by the external auditors and in the context of the changes to the audit environment, as had most other audit firms. The fee had increased by a significant amount. This was allowable under the terms and conditions of their contract. In discussion, it was noted that the University would not have sufficient time to complete a full EU tender prior to the audit for the year ended 31 July 2020.

06.4 The Committee noted that one assessor had reduced their score for effective liaison with internal audit from 4 to 3 although it was not known why this was the case. However, it was noted that the importance of liaison had declined somewhat since the external auditors were no longer able to rely formally on the work of internal audit; although it was likely that the external and internal auditors would still discuss matters such as risk and fraud.

06.5 The Chief Finance and Planning Officer joined the meeting. The Committee considered the recently issued and confidential findings of BUFDG's survey of external audit fees for the audit of the financial statements for year ended 31 July 2019 including the cost of the University's audit compared to similarly sized HEIs.

06.6 The Committee concluded that Grant Thornton's performance during the audit of the financial statements for year ended 31 July 2019 had been satisfactory.

06.7 The Committee discussed the following options in relation to the contract:

- extend the contract for a further one year period (i.e. for the audit of the financial statements for year ended 31 July 2020) in order to provide time to assess market position – with a view to possibly going out to tender for the audit of the financial statements for year ended 31 July 2021 onwards; or
- extend the contract for a further two years – subject to satisfactory performance assessment by Audit and Risk Committee following the audit of financial statements for year ended 31 July 2020.

In considering the options the Committee took into account the confidential findings of the BUFDG survey (A/20/06.5 refers) and the current market for external audit services.

06.8 The Committee agreed to recommend to the Board of Governors the re-appointment of Grant Thornton as external auditors for a further two years (i.e. for the audit of the financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2020 and year ended 31 July 2021), subject to annual assessment of performance by the Audit and Risk Committee. This recommendation was subject to the Chief Finance and Planning Officer obtaining Grant Thornton's agreement that any price increase for the audit of the financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2021 would be no greater than CPI. This was felt reasonable given the significant increase in fee for year ended 31 July 2020 and the likely stabilisation of audit requirements for the sector with no major regulatory changes expected.

06.9 **Post meeting note:** Subsequent to the meeting Grant Thornton confirmed that their fee proposal for 2019/20 would be £70k and for the financial year 2020/21 they would look to increase the fee by inflation, with reference to CPI, as long as there were no further significant changes in the regulatory environment affecting University or the external auditors. In view of this a recommendation would be made to the Board of Governors to re-appoint Grant Thornton as external auditors for a further two years (i.e. for the audit of the financial statements for the year ended 31 July 2020 and year ended 31 July 2021), subject to annual assessment of performance by the Audit and Risk Committee.

06.10 Representatives of KPMG and Grant Thornton joined the meeting following the conclusion of the discussion of A/2/20/7.2.

Chair's Opening Remarks

Minute Ref A/20/07

07.1 The Chair thanked Julie Morrissy for her contribution to the work of the Committee during her period of office from 25 March 2014 to 31 January 2020.

Agenda item 3	Declaration of Interests	Minute Ref A/20/08
08.1 There were no declarations of interests.		
Agenda item 4.1 Paper Ref and 4.2 A/4/19/M	Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2019	Minute Ref A/20/09
09.1 The minutes, including the confidential private meeting minute, were <u>approved</u> .		
Agenda item 4.3 Paper Ref A/19/16	Minutes of the Finance and Employment Committee and the Audit and Risk Committee held on 12 November 2019	Minute Ref A/20/10
10.1 The minutes had been considered and approved by the Finance and Employment Committee at its meeting on 26 February 2019.		
10.2 The minutes were <u>approved</u> .		
Agenda item 4.4 Paper Ref A/1/20M	Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2020	Minute Ref A/20/11
11.1 The minutes were <u>approved</u> .		
Agenda item 5 Paper Ref A/2/20/5	Matters Arising/Audit and Risk Committee Action Tracker, version 6 February 2020	Minute Ref A/20/12
12.1 A/19/69.3: REF Assurance: The Head of University Research Services had provided a report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations on the monitoring of the REF preparations by the University Leadership Team and the Creating Knowledge Board. The DVC was content that appropriate scrutiny was on-going and felt that an internal audit would not add value. Furthermore, the Board of Governors would be receiving a report on REF at its meeting on 17 March 2020. KPMG were content with the decision not to progress an internal audit at this stage. It was <u>agreed</u> that the ARC should further consider REF assurance following the report to the Board.		
12.2 FEC+A/19/5.2J: TPS: The Committee noted that investigatory work in relation to the potential liability issue with the TPS pension scheme was on-going. A minute confidential to the Committee was recorded. It was <u>agreed</u> to update the Committee between meetings if further significant developments occurred.		
12.3 A/19/70.3: KPMG Value Added Services: The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations and the Chief Finance and Planning Officer had considered what value-added services would be useful to the university. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor Strategy and Operations had discussed this with KPMG and had agreed several areas including work concerning operating and delivery models and ERP. In relation to ERP a draft proposal was being considered by the Chief Finance and Planning Officer and the Director of Finance.		
Agenda item 7.2 Paper Ref A/2/20/7.2	Additional work carried out by the external auditors	Minute Ref A/20/13
13.1 The Committee noted the report on additional work by the external auditors approved by the Chief Finance and Planning Officer since the last meeting.		
Agenda item 8.1 Paper Ref A/2/20/8.1	Assurance of Data Returns	Minute Ref A/20/14

14.1 The Committee received the report on the data returns made so far during the 2019/20 academic year and progress towards the key data returns that would be submitted during the year. It was noted that all reports had been submitted by the deadlines except the final sign-off of the HESA student return.

14.2 The HESA student return was returned to HESA ahead of the 22 September 2019 deadline, and sign-off was completed by 7 November 2019, one day later than the deadline. The University's data readiness was in line with previous years, however a new Office for Students (OfS) check was introduced late in the cycle. The check led to a request for the University to resubmit its data shortly before the deadline. Although the University did this immediately, the sign-off slip was not generated in time for the University to return it before the deadline. HESA and the OfS accepted the university's reasoning for this.

14.3 In relation to the HESA staff return it was noted that it was no longer mandatory to return details of professional services staff. The University had opted to continue to submit the data as it would receive benchmarking information.

14.4 All TEF awards had been extended as the exercise would not run in 2020. It was possible that the outcomes of the Pearce review would lead to the introduction of subject level TEF.

14.5 There had been a small number of queries from the OfS following the initial submission of the Financial Return. These concerned (i) where there had been a large variance between years (for example, as a result of the capital grant for the AWRC) (ii) the increase in TPS costs – which was a sector wide issue (iii) a small recategorisation between research grant headings.

14.6 There had been no significant issues raised as a result of the submission of the returns outlined in the report

14.7 The Committee commended staff for the thorough report and was assured that adequate and effective arrangements were in place for the management and quality assurance of data submitted to Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), the Student Loan Company, the OfS, Research England and other bodies. The information contained in the report would inform the Audit and Risk Committee's annual opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the University's arrangements for the management and quality assurance of which would be included in the Committee's Annual Report in November 2020.

Agenda item 10.1i
Paper Ref
A/2/20/10.1i

Internal audit report: Student HESA Governance

Minute Ref A/20/15

15.1 The Committee received KPMG's 2019/20 Student HESA Return – Governance audit report and noted that the findings were that there was significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities. The report included two medium priority recommendations concerning (i) documenting evidence of checks (ii) scrutiny of the return by the External Data Returns Board prior to sign-off of the return by the Vice-Chancellor.

Agenda item 8.2
Paper Ref
A/2/20/8.2

Transparent Approach to Costing for Teaching; TRAC (T)

Minute Ref A/20/16

16.1 The Committee received a report on the preparation of the TRAC (T) return. It noted that:

- the TRAC Oversight Group had reviewed the results, and benchmarking against sector and peer group data which confirmed that the results were within the range of expected outcomes;
- the recommendations in KPMG's TRAC audit report (A/1/20/5.1) relating to TRAC(T), including the recommendation to disaggregate department data, had been implemented within the TRAC (T) return;
- the Oversight Group recommended approval of the return.

16.2 The external auditor observed that several their clients were considering the costs per course per student and using the data to benchmark against other HEIs. It was noted that the TRAC Oversight Group did consider benchmark data against the sector as a whole and the University's peer group (minute A/20/02.6 refers). However, it was noted that the current workload allocation system for academic staff workload was not consistently applied across all faculties. As a result, workload planning was used only for workload management not to generate data for TRAC. The data for TRAC was generated using a sampling method to assess work over a three-week period. This sampling method was accepted within the TRAC guidance but did not provide useful data for internal use. (minute A/20/03.4 refers). It was suggested that the TRAC (T) data may be useful information to inform portfolio planning.

16.3 Based on the assurances in the report, the Committee confirmed compliance with the existing TRAC validation processes. The Committee approved the TRAC (T) return for submission to the OfS by the deadline of 28 February 2020.

Agenda item 9.1
Paper Ref
A/2/20/9.1

Risk Management

Minute Ref A/20/17

17.1 The Chief Finance and Planning Officer highlighted progress made on managing the University's corporate risks. In response to a question about why the Alliance Contract was not included as a risk under CR8 on estates it was noted that the Alliance Contract was seen as a risk mitigation rather than a risk and the University was starting to see the benefits of the contract in terms of cost control around the atrium roof replacement project.

17.2 Ofsted Risk:

- i. As reported on 14 March 2019 the University had received an Ofsted inspection in relation to its Foundation Degree and NVQ in Engineering and the Operations Departmental Manager (ODM) level 5 higher apprenticeship provision (A/19/08.1.15 refers). The finding of the assessment was 'requires improvement'. A comprehensive action plan had been put in place to address the issues raised by Ofsted.
 - ii. The University was due to receive a monitoring visit from Ofsted. The Committee noted that whilst evidence existed to show that the University had been making improvements to meet the Ofsted recommendations, there was a risk that the quality or quantity of this evidence may not be sufficient to demonstrate the impact of action taken. A statement of the emerging risk was presented to the Committee in appendix 1.
 - iii. The Committee noted that the Academic Assurance Committee (AAC) had received reports on action taken and that a member of AAC was the nominated Ofsted link governor. The Board of Governors would be receiving a report at its 17 March 2020 meeting. The Committee considered that this was the right mechanism for ensuring proper Board oversight of this risk.
 - iv. It was noted that KPMG were due to conduct a data audit assessing whether the University's data processes were sufficiently developed to support the delivery of its HE Apprenticeships.
-

17.3 Industrial action:

- i. The Committee received an update on the on-going industrial action which related to (i) a national dispute concerning pay and conditions and (ii) a local dispute concerning academic work planning and perceptions of work intensification. There had been positive engagement with UCU concerning the local dispute and the University had made a revised offer.
 - ii. The action had impacted on teaching and it was likely that it would have a negative impact on NSS scores in some areas (as some academic departments had been impacted more than others). It was noted that some of the University's high-profile competitors had not been affected by the action.
-

- iii. It was noted that the university had established a group to consider student complaints concerning the impact of the industrial action. It was noted that students had up to twelve months to submit a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator following completion of the internal complaints process.
- iv. It was agreed that the reporting of management of the industrial action should be via Finance and Employment Committee and the Board.

17.4 Covid-19 (coronavirus):

- i. The Committee received an update on the University's response to the Covid-19 (coronavirus) risk.
- ii. A dedicated Incident Group made up of key staff from across the University was meeting on a regular basis to assess the developing situation and plan the University's response. The University was following the guidance from Public Health England.
- iii. The initial focus had been on managing travel including the suspension of travel to, and transit through, key areas. The University was in contact with students from the affected areas.
- iv. The University was assessing the likely impact on international student income and had adjusted its 2019/20 forecasts and would do so for 2020/21.
- v. The University's contingency plans for disruption during the examination period in May/June 2020 would be reviewed.
- vi. Action was being taken to plan for the summer period including the possible need to provide accommodation for international students if they were unable to return home.
- vii. It was agreed to receive an update on Covid-19 at the next meeting.

Agenda item 13
Paper Ref
A/2/20/13

Report on waivers of the Financial Regulations

Minute Ref A/20/18

18.1 The Committee noted the waiver in relation to legal services for the Alliance contact. The University had run a procurement exercise for legal advice in support of the alliance and demonstrated that the chosen supplier had the most appropriate experience and provided best value for money. The final fee was estimated as the University allowed for some items in the waiver that may be delivered via alternative routes depending on requirements. A waiver was agreed in relation to the contact to extend the contract scope. The risk associated with conducting a further procurement exercise and the associated delay had been considered and it was concluded that the University should stay with the existing supplier.

18.2 In relation to the two fee waivers where the reason for the waivers was given in the report as 'no time to conduct procurement exercise' it was agreed that Finance should review the description of the reason as it was thought that this did not accurately reflect the reason and justification for the waiver.

Agenda item 9.2
Paper Ref
A/2/20/9.2
confidential

Assurance Framework

Minute Ref A/20/19

19.1 The Committee noted that the assurance map which mapped the corporate risks against the assurance needs of the Board, in particular, in relation to ensuring compliance with the ongoing conditions of registration with the OfS.

19.2 An OfS Conditions of Registration group had been convened by the University Secretary which would meet on a regular basis and bring together senior officers responsible for key areas of activity mapped against the OfS conditions including outreach and recruitment, student and academic support, governance, planning and research. Terms of Reference for the group were being developed. Work would include reviewing the process for reporting reportable events to the OfS, following new guidance issued by the OfS.

19.3 In response to a question the University Secretary confirmed that assurance map and the work of the group was raising awareness of the conditions of registration and how these mapped against the corporate risks.

Agenda item 9.3

Estates Risk

Minute Ref A/20/20

Paper Ref

A/2/20/9.3

20.1 The Director of Estates and Facilities joined the meeting for the estates risk item.

20.2 The Committee noted that KPMG had issued their report on 'estates campus plan – procurement'. This would be formally considered at the May 2020 Audit and Risk Committee meeting. The area had been given an assurance rating of 'significant assurance with minor improvements required'. Medium priority recommendations related to the need for better documentation in relation to the approval process and key performance indicators.

20.3 Contract negotiations for the Alliance Contract were expected to be completed during w/c 2 March 2020. Negotiations in relation to the Atrium roof work had been held in parallel with work due to start in April 2020.

20.4 The risks in relation to the Alliance delivery model and the risks concerning the estates plan had been identified and the Committee observed that risks and mitigations had been well mapped both strategically and operationally. It was noted that there was a need to ensure appropriate culture and behaviours of the alliance partners and to facilitate this an Alliance Charter had been developed. It was noted that the Finance and Employment Committee had received assurance in relation to the behaviours of the Alliance members. It was noted that the following initiatives were in place:

- i. employment and skills targets: through the provision, by Alliance partners, of sandwich placements, internships for recent graduates and students, apprenticeships, and creation of permanent graduate jobs in the city region;
- ii. the creation of the Research and Innovation Hub.

20.5 In response to a question concerning benefit realisation it was noted that an annual report against the strategic KPIs would be produced.

20.6 In response to a question concerning carbon neutral developments it was noted that Sheffield City Council had declared a climate change emergency but had not defined how they would address this issue. The University would respond to the challenge by aiming to minimise the carbon impact of new buildings.

20.7 In relation to the wider estates risks it noted that a significant risk was managing the condition of the aging estate. It was noted that a strategic review of estates plan would be undertaken in Summer 2020 using the PESTLE approach to ensure that all future plans beyond the new buildings already committed took account of financial environment and any changes in strategic priorities/emerging pressures.

20.8 It was suggested that the Board of Governors could consider estates at its October 2020 strategy event. Management agreed to include this on the list of items for consideration for inclusion as the programme was developed.

Agenda item 10.1

Internal Audit Progress Report

Minute Ref A/20/21

Paper Ref

A/2/20/10.1

21.1 The Committee noted the progress report and that the internal audit reports on 'cash

handling and treasury management’ and ‘income and debtors’ would be submitted to the May 2020 meeting.

Agenda item	10.2	Report on Implementation of Internal Audit	Minute Ref	A/20/22
Paper Ref	Recommendations			
A/2/20/10.2				
22.1	The Committee received a report on progress to implement some of the outstanding recommendations made by the internal auditors in 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2018/19.			
22.2	<p>It was noted that the following recommendations had been implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. recommendations 3 to 6 in the 2016/17 academic advisors report; ii. recommendation 6 in the 2017/18 international student recruitment report; iii. recommendation 1 of the 2017/18 estates planning – follow-up report; iv. recommendation 1 of the 2017/18 payment card data report; v. recommendations 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 in the 2017/18 student support services report; vi. all recommendations in the 2018/19 commercialisation of research report; vii. recommendation 1 of the 2018/19 health and safety report. 			
22.3	<p>The Committee <u>agreed</u> revised completion dates for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. recommendation 2 of the 2017/18 international student recruitment report; ii. recommendation 1 and 5 of the 2017/18 effectiveness of staff appraisal report; iii. recommendation 3 of the 2017/18 senior officer remuneration, expenses and other benefits report; iv. recommendation 2 of the 2017/18 privacy/GDPR report. <p>In relation to the international student recruitment action a member observed that the revised completion date was TBC and requested that TBC completion dates should be avoided where possible</p>			
22.4	The Committee observed that the action to respond to recommendation 2 of the 2017/18 cyber programme – tranche 2 had been completed as the action to review training materials was additional action to further enhance the existing process. The Committee <u>agreed</u> that the action could be signed off as complete for the purposes of reporting to the Committee.			
22.5	<p>In relation to the request to the Committee to sign-off recommendations in the 2016/17 academic advisors report as superseded the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. noted that management had reported that recommendation 1 (review the structure to determine who has sole accountability and responsibility for the provision of Academic Advisors across the University) had been superseded as this work has been incorporated into the Student Experience and Teaching Quality Step change programme and the Academic Organisation Project. It specifically reported that responsibility to co-ordinate the provision of academic advising within the newly established Colleges was part of the responsibilities of the Head of Teaching and Learning Enhancement. Post meeting note: The Clerk reviewed the paper and management comments and was able to confirm that, as responsibility for academic advising was part of the responsibility of the Head of Teaching and Learning Enhancement, the action had been completed. The Committee could therefore be assured that the action had been completed; ii. agreed to sign-off recommendation 8 (to implement a system to allow academic advisors to view engagement and progress of their students) as superseded. <p>In relation to superseded actions a member observed that there could be two reasons for an action being superseded (i) where the action was no longer relevant (ii) where the action had been superseded because it was being taken forward via an alternative route or through a wider programme of work which was being appropriately monitored..</p>			
22.6	The Committee <u>agreed</u> that recommendation 3 of the 2018/19 business readiness report could be signed off as complete.			
22.7	It was noted that following issue of the papers to the Committee the tracker had been updated in relation to recommendations 4, 6, 9, 10 and 11 of the 2017/18 Overseas			

Partnerships report. Recommendations 6, 10 and 11 had been completed, recommendation 4 had a revised completion date on July 2020 and recommendation 9 had a revised completion date of May 2020. Progress would be reported to the May 2020 Audit and Risk Committee meeting as part of the standing report on progress to implement internal audit recommendations.

- 22.8 It was agreed to review the approach to monitoring of outstanding internal audit recommendations to secure improved line management ownership of delivery, more precise classification of status and a less burdensome monitoring process.

Agenda item	10.3	Internal Audit Strategy and Operational Plan for 2019/20	Minute Ref	A/20/23
Paper Ref				
	A/2/20/10.3			

- 23.1 The Committee approved phase 3 and 4 of the internal audit operational plan 2019/20.

Agenda item	11	Briefing by Auditors on Audit Matters and Sector issues	Minute Ref	A/20/24
-------------	----	--	------------	---------

- 24.1 The external auditors highlighted the following issues affecting financial reporting in the HE sector:

- i. the Further and Higher Education SORP Board (the SORP Board) had published the Statement of Recommended Practice: Accounting for Further and Higher Education 2019 following the recent triennial review of FRS 102. The revised edition reflected the relevant changes to FRS 102 and clarified some other areas of the previous SORP;
- ii. the Office for Students had published Regulatory advice 9: Accounts Direction, Guidance on preparing and publishing financial statements for accounting periods beginning on or after 1 August 2019. This included an extension of the reporting deadline to five months after financial year end. This would allow scope to change the timing of the November 2020 Board meeting to give more time to finalise the financial statements, if required;
- iii. in April 2020, the legislation for Off Payroll Workers or contractors, commonly known as IR35, would apply for the first time to all large and medium-sized organisations in the private sector, building on implementation of the new rules in the public sector in 2017. From April 2020 the responsibility for determining whether or not a contractor was an employee would sit with the employer. It was understood that this requirement had applied to Universities for twelve months and it was agreed to confirm this with the Chief People Officer.

- 24.2 The internal auditors highlighted the following issues affecting the HE sector:

- i. HE providers needed to ensure that they continued to enhance their approach to responding to the GDPR requirements following the initial work to prepare for the May 2018 implementation deadline;
- ii. The CUC was due to issue an illustrative practice note on Audit Committees;
- iii. The OfS had issued its Value for Money strategy in October 2019 and VfM in relation to students was a key agenda item/concern for the OfS;
- iv. The OfS registration process had highlighted the need for effective governance in relation to the on-going conditions of registration. KPMG welcomed the University's introduction of a Regulatory Compliance Group (A/20/19.2 refers). The Committee recognised the key role for the Clerk to the Board in managing the relationship with the OfS.

- 24.3 It was felt that the challenges highlighted in the presentation (page 7) and the questions for audit committee members (page 25) were key factors to consider when developing the internal audit plan and any 'deep dives'. These should be considered as part of a separate session on the plan scheduled for the May 2020 meeting.

Agenda item	12	Report on Review of Anti-Bribery Policy and Update on	Minute Ref	A/20/25
-------------	----	--	------------	---------

Paper Ref
A/2/20/12
confidential

Bribery Act Compliance Measures

- 25.1 The Committee noted the report on steps taken by the University to review and update measures to manage its bribery risks. The report included an updated version of the Adequate Procedures Log, which collated evidence to demonstrate that the University had "robust and effective anti-bribery systems" in place.