

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

COUNCIL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2018

Present: Mr Patrick Loughrey (in the Chair), Professor Michael Archer, Professor Vikki Bell, Professor Frank Bond, Dr Debbie Custance, Professor Jan De Fockert, Dr Jasna Dragovic Soso, Ms Sara Ewing, Dr Iris Garrelfs, Dr Stephen Graham, Professor Elisabeth Hill, Ms Wei Jin, Mr Kevin Jones, Mr Steve Keirl, Dr Rodger Kibble, Dr Pdraig Kirwan, Mr Gerald Lidstone, Dr Betty Liebovich, Ms Karen Matthewman, Ms Taylor McGraa, Professor Richard Noble, Professor David Oswell, Dr Rajyashree Pandey, Ms Maggie Pitfield, Dr John Price, Dr Christophe Rhodes, Dr Caroline Rix, Professor Emma Tarlo, Mr Joseph Tema, Dr Naomi Thompson, Dr Ragupathy Venkatachalam, Professor Mike Waller, Professor Joanna Zylinska.

Apologies: Mr Martin Conreen, Mr Adrian De La Court, Professor Mark d'Inverno, Dr Henrike Donner, Professor Anna Furse, Dr Henriette Gunkel, Ms Annie Guo, Mr Conrad Heyns, Professor Frank Krause, Professor Osita Okagbue, Professor Simon O'Sullivan, Professor Alan Pickering, Professor Marsha Rosengarten, Dr Anamik Saha, Mr Paul Stocks, Dr Erica Wald.

In attendance: Mr Leo Appleton, Mr Kieron Broadhead, Mr Matthew Brooks, Mr Timothy Chapman, Dr Jane Desmarais, Mr Ian Pleace, Dr Wood Robedeau, Ms Helen Watson, Mr Ben Wilson, Mrs Cathryn Thompson (Secretary).

OPEN BUSINESS

1 NEW MEMBERS

Professor Jan De Fockert from Psychology, Ms Sara Ewing from the Academic Skills Centre, Dr Iris Garrelfs from Music, Dr Stephen Graham from Music, Dr Henriette Gunkel from Visual Cultures, Professor Frank Krause from English and Comparative Literature, Dr Christophe Rhodes from Computing, Professor Emma Tarlo from Anthropology, Mr Joseph Tema from the Students' Union, Dr Naomi Thompson from Social, Therapeutic and Community Studies and Professor Mike Waller from Design

were welcomed as new members of the Board. Ms Taylor McGraa from the Students' Union was welcomed as a returning member of the Board.

2 STANDING ORDERS (AVAILABLE ONLINE)

Received:

The standing orders in force for all Goldsmiths Committees from 1 September 2018:
<http://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/committees/standing-orders/>.

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY (AVAILABLE ONLINE)

Received:

The declarations of member interests and the Conflicts of Interest Policy:
<http://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/policies/conflicts/>.

4 TERMS OF REFERENCE, CONSTITUTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF ACADEMIC BOARD

Received:

The terms of reference, constitution and membership of the Board for 2018-19 (18-10R).

Noted:

That no changes had been made to the terms of reference or composition of the Board and that all vacancies on the Board had been filled with the exception of two Student Members, which were to be elected by Student Assembly at its next meeting.

5 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

Noted:

The Chair reminded members that considerations of equality and diversity should inform the deliberation of all items of business.

6 MINUTES

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2018 be approved.

7 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Noted:

- (i) Agenda item 8 provided an update on the BAME project. The Students' Union noted that the then Welfare and Diversity Officer expressed reservations at the June meeting about the direction and momentum of the project, including the current challenge around academic involvement.
- (ii) Agenda item 10 (e: iv) on Research Degrees examination outcomes made reference to it being unclear in the document how many times further amendment could be given. It was clarified by the Dean of the Graduate School that the examination outcomes document did not propose a change to the current rules relating to the number of permitted attempts, which had been in operation since 2015, that no more than two attempts can be made. Students would not be permitted to represent the thesis for a third time, so a 'not pass with major amendments' would not be an allowable outcome the second time around as it requires a third attempt.

8 WARDEN'S REPORT

Noted:

- (i) An oral report from the Warden on issues of concern and interest to the College was received. The Warden noted that the 2018 recruitment cycle had been an unusual one for Goldsmiths, and a difficult one for the sector across the UK. The number of 18 year olds in the UK continued to reduce to its lowest level for many years and would bottom-out in the next year or two before a slow recovery. Fierce competition amongst London institutions had continued to influence our ability to recruit, and TEF, league tables and industrial action were also likely to have had an impact.
- (ii) At undergraduate level there had been a 3% national decline in placed UK domiciled students. Clearing was also smaller, with numbers placed through this route down 2%. Goldsmiths saw an increase in applications of ■■■, but the number of placed students at undergraduate level dropped. Despite a strong performance in clearing, the College remained ■■■ students below target for UK/EU undergraduate students. The Director of Finance noted that the deficit would need to be addressed throughout the year, specifically with the bottom up re-forecasting in December prioritising addressing this shortfall. It was noted that Psychology and Media had performed particularly well. Internationally, Goldsmiths' performance was strong, and we were close to meeting our non-EU undergraduate target, outperforming 2017 by some margin.
- (iii) In the Home/EU postgraduate taught market, the College struggled to make any headway on numbers against last year. It is expected to be more than ■■■ adrift on an increased target for 2018. Strong performances in Computing and Music were helping but there were shortfalls in most departments. Overseas was a positive story, however, with predicted enrolment figures to be ■■■-■■■ over target for this market. There were particular strengths in Computing, ICCE, Visual Cultures and Politics and

International Relations, but a number of departments were still looking at a shortfall against target.

- (iv) Looking ahead, this was clearly not a comfortable position, and would inevitably have some impact on budget reforecasting decisions later in the term. Once student numbers were known, the College would have to take a view on what cost management might be necessary in order to avoid a considerable deficit at the end of the year. Unfortunately, 2019 is expected to be equally as challenging as 2018. The recovery in demographics would not yet have begun, and we would continue to see aggressive marketing and growth strategies being undertaken by our competitors. Admissions Tutors would no doubt seek to rise to these challenges, alongside colleagues in Student Recruitment. The College would need to work hard to ensure processes were swift and applicant-focused, particularly with regard to our international applications.
- (v) The Warden drew the Board's attention to the College's recent press attention around the subject of the rights of trans people and comments made by a Students' Union Society. The Warden noted that he was proud of the diverse and inclusive community fostered at the College, and the fact so many colleagues and students feel deeply about trans rights. However, in an exchange on social media on Monday 10th September, a student society used language that was clearly inappropriate, in seeking to suppress the views of those with whom they disagreed. The Warden noted the responsibility we have as an academic institution for protecting academic freedom and freedom of speech, including accepting the rights of others to express views and make arguments within the law with which we do not agree. The Warden paid tribute to the Students' Union on its swift action and suspension of the Society pending an investigation. The College supported that decision, and would work with the Students' Union to ensure continued support and representation for LGBTQ+ students.
- (vi) On 1 September 2018, the Department of Media and Communications became the Department of Media, Communications and Cultural Studies. This important move reflected the importance of the field of cultural studies to Goldsmiths' heritage and its future. It began an exciting year for the department, which would celebrate its 40th anniversary with a series of events scheduled across the year.
- (vii) Goldsmiths Centre for Contemporary Art (CCA) had launched the previous week. The building and its first exhibition opened to rave reviews in both national and specialist press and it was a project of which the College could be truly proud. Part of the vision for the gallery was to help enhance both teaching and research across a range of disciplines. If Board members had any ideas for potential opportunities for how the CCA might unlock inter-disciplinary research and teaching on campus they were encouraged to contact Sarah McCrory directly. The Board congratulated and thanked Professor Richard Noble specifically for initiating the concept of the CCA and driving the work forward, including extensive fundraising. This great personal commitment was congratulated, and staff and students were encouraged to visit the Centre.

9 STUDENT SURVEYS 2018 – NSS AND DLHE

Received:

An analysis of the 2018 National Student Survey and Destinations of Leavers of Higher Education survey (DLHE) (18-15).

Noted:

- (i) The Warden noted that the further decline in NSS results in many areas was a critical issue, particularly with Subject Level TEF on the horizon. Whilst some departments had seen notable improvements, a ■■■ decline in overall satisfaction at College level and a ■■■ decline compared to the benchmark figure was highlighted. Student satisfaction with assessment and feedback had seen an improvement in the 2018 results, however, it remained a significant problem both for the College and nationally, along with the provision of academic support. College results also saw a large decline in satisfaction on student voice mechanisms and the College's response to this feedback. It was noted that discussions with the Students' Union in Student Voice workshops were taking place to address this. The impact and outcomes of recent Student Experience Projects would be seen within future results, including the GoldStart programme and the Students' Union reinventing itself, for example.
- (ii) The College had seen an improvement on graduate prospects, with the DLHE moving from a 6 month to a 15 month survey. However, how this would feed into TEF was unknown. The Board was directed to the Report from the Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar and its associated action plan. It was noted that the Institutional Strategy was clear in its desire for each graduate to be in a position to do whatever they wanted to do in life.
- (iii) Those departments performing well in the NSS, namely Art and Theatre and Performance, were asked to give advice to others as to how this was achieved. The Art Department informed the Board that they were open and honest with students and noted that the work Student Services had done had also helped, such as mental health concerns being dealt with in a much more efficient way. The Art Department representative confirmed the diagram constructed to assist students to understand how they were given feedback on their work within the department had had a positive impact for a predominantly visual department. They had also met with students, talked them through processes, and followed up with written communications in order for them to understand feedback.
- (iv) The Head of the Department of Art stated that some students had expressed uncertainty around the position of the Students' Union in the NSS, and that they were unsure whether to complete the Survey in the light of the Students' Union promoted boycott. The Education Officer explained that the Union was democratically mandated through Student Assembly to boycott the NSS, and that they were bound by any motions passed by the Assembly for 3 years. It was confirmed that it was not to sabotage the NSS but to boycott it. The Students' Union President added that the

way the Survey was promoted to students can be an issue and how they are asked to complete it in a timetabled session. The Registrar and Secretary referred to the College staff away day last January where a presentation from the Students' Union drew very heavily on NSS data, which was by them deemed to be unrepresentative. The Students' Union President confirmed that whilst the Union didn't agree with the Survey, they felt it had to be used as it understood decisions would be made by the College in the light of the data. Whilst the Director of the IMS also expressed dislike of the NSS he found lower response rates tended to provide more negative results, and his primary concern was for Goldsmiths' graduates and their ability to get on in their career. Heads of Departments found themselves in a quandary and whether they 'liked' or 'disliked' the Survey their priority was to ensure College rankings in league tables and other datasets did not negatively impact students' ability to find employment. Whilst other members of the Board would like to be in a position to applaud the Students' Union's boycott, it was deemed that it could only have the desired outcome if it had the critical mass of a nationally supported campaign.

- (v) The Students' Union Education Officer noted that NSS results identified areas of concern which had already been identified by student representatives. There was much recognition from the Senior Management Team, support services and fora like the TEF Strategy Group that there were other metrics to consider as well. The reality was Goldsmiths was part of an ever decreasing minority of institutions suffering from poor satisfaction levels and performance data, which was a grave concern given the current competitive environment.
- (vi) The Deputy Warden concluded whatever opinion surrounding the NSS was, the data would continue to feed into TEF, and that TEF was no longer optional but part of compulsory registration to the Office for Students. The upcoming Subject Level TEF would put these metrics and student experiences into department/discipline areas, so the College needed to continue its strong commitment to improving the student experience. It was confirmed that Goldsmiths would apply to participate in Subject Level TEF.

10 STUDENT RETENTION

Received:

A report on student retention (18-16).

Noted:

- (i) Whilst recognising the personal effort and commitment staff have towards their students, the report identified a significant issue with undergraduate student retention at the College. The Deputy Warden informed the Board that the data had been taken from the HESA return. The departmental breakdown circulated within the papers provided more granular information. The College was working on understanding the data and the characteristics of students at risk of dropping out. It was important to understand what the causes were and the appropriate interventions which might be taken to support Goldsmiths students to come and complete their studies. It was

noted that for some students leaving Goldsmiths partway through their studies was a necessary course of action, so there was no expectation that the College's non-continuation rate would ever be zero. Nevertheless, the data demonstrated a serious issue that required further investigation and action.

- (ii) Following a query from a member, the Registrar and Secretary informed the Board that the data stemmed from the College's annual return to HESA, and that non-continuation rates were produced from this. HESA looked at characteristics of students across the country and the percentage of students no longer in HE in each institution, which was then compared against an expected benchmark. They also identified students who have gone on to other HEIs.
- (iii) Research had shown a correlation between attendance and retention, resulting in the establishment of a common policy across departments to flag non-attendance at a particular point. The Registrar and Secretary noted the revised Attendance Policy in the Board's papers, but acknowledged compliance with the policy had been variable and that institutional support for it had been limited. However, technological support for this was currently being addressed.
- (iv) It was queried whether the data might confuse those students who exited at an earlier stage of the programme, such as a CertHE or DipHE. However, it was noted that this was not included in the data. It was often the case that students exiting a programme early would not be in a position to obtain an exit award due to carrying failed credit from their current or earlier year(s) of study.
- (v) The Students' Union welcomed the paper and the acknowledgement of its connection to the current BAME work. The Union reminded the Board about the academic communities budget and asked members to promote it within their academic areas. Funds were available for any student to apply for an event or trip to benefit their programme or department. This was now in its second year of operation and had been very popular so far.
- (vi) It was noted that there were a specific set of issues relating to integrated degrees and Level 0 programmes. There was an obvious tension between the purpose of integrated degrees and the relatively poor retention rates for students on these programmes. However, there was further discussion as to whether Goldsmiths' programmes were truly 'integrated' as opposed to a 1 year stand-alone programme permitting progression into year 1. The Director of Finance confirmed the considerable financial impact this was having on the College. Additionally, integrated degrees were governed by a different set of regulations to other taught undergraduate provision, which needed to be reviewed. The Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar noted that the foundation award was pre-HE level and that there were pros and cons to disaggregating versus integrating them. Students exiting after completing the first foundation year received a Goldsmiths Certificate. It was acknowledged that this was a complex area which would be investigated further and reported back to next meeting.
- (vii) The Deputy Warden stressed to academic departments of the importance of having

a full understanding of the experiences and methods and style of teaching that students arrive at the College with, and to make an assessment as to whether that continued to mesh with our curriculum, assessments and academic skills offer. It was essential to ensure we as a community understood how the pre-HE curriculum and teaching style might have changed, and in turn how this potentially affected HE. The Director of Student Experience noted that the GoldStart programme had a dedicated strand for BTEC students specifically, who come to University with a very different style of learning. Members were asked to consider identifying other categories of students within future intakes so that their specific requirements and/or skillset could be accommodated by the Academic Skills Centre (ASC). The Head of the ASC confirmed that information on their services had been disseminated to departments, however, it was agreed that this would also be circulated to members of the Board.

Resolved:

- (a) That the Head of Quality would provide the Warden and Deputy Warden with an overview of the structure of integrated programmes at Goldsmiths, in order for an assessment to be made as to whether a formal review might be required.
- (b) That the Head of the ASC would circulate to Board members the support and services available via the Centre.

11 STUDENT EXPERIENCE WORKSTREAMS

Received:

An update on the delivery phase of the Joint Degrees, Assessment and Feedback, and Employability project recommendations (18-17) and the revised Assessment Feedback Policy (18-18).

Noted:

- (i) An update on progress on projects stemming from the Student Experience Workstreams on Organisation and Management, Assessment and Feedback and Graduate Outcomes was received. The Director of Student Experience reported that the Graduate outcomes/employer and alumni community project, and the Student Enterprise Project in Careers and involving an academic member of staff in ICCE, were both going well and on track.
- (ii) The review of joint degree administration, identified as an Organisation and Management project, would be facilitated by the arrival of new School Administrators who would lead a review of the administrative processes identified as problematic. There was also some pedagogic underpinning to consider which would be out of scope of this review, however, this would need to go back for consideration in the academic community. In particular pedagogical understanding was needed as to whether joint degrees were being conceptualised appropriately as a coherent and integrated academic offer and experience, rather than a tool for recruitment, and then delivered as such to students.

- (iii) The Head of Quality drew the Board's attention to a recent commendation noted in the Periodic Review of the Department of History on the management of joint degree programmes, their coherent and integrated subject offer, and their integration within both departments of delivery. It was agreed that this would be shared with members of the Board.
- (iv) The revised Assessment and Feedback Policy had been updated since the last meeting of the Board following feedback received and further discussions which took place over summer. The Academic Director of the Teaching and Learning Innovation Centre (TaLIC) confirmed that nothing substantive in the main recommendations had changed since the last Academic Board meeting. Feedback from the inter-department workshop had been incorporated and the Policy emphasised the importance of engaging in dialogue with students on things like the intended learning outcomes and the marking criteria. It was noted that it was important not only the feedback delivered to students, but how they then engage with the feedback and respond to it. The Department of Art supported this statement and agreed that the assessment feedback process must be a conversation, and that identifying with the student when feedback was being provided was paramount. The Academic Director of TaLIC confirmed that it was a partnership with students, and that the College must work directly with its student body to improve student satisfaction in this area.
- (v) One of the representatives from Music noted the excellent workshop delivered last year on assessment and feedback and requested that it ran again. The Associate Director of TaLIC confirmed that the Centre was available to support academic colleagues and that another workshop would take place, with plans to follow through with specific focus groups within departments for those who wanted it. The Warden urged departments to take TaLIC up on this offer, noting that this was not only a College problem, but a national one and that the College might be in a position to inform part of a wider solution.

Resolved:

- (a) The revised Assessment Feedback Policy (18-18) was approved by the Board for immediate implementation for the 2018-19 academic year.
- (b) That the recent good practice identified in the History Department's recent Periodic Review would be shared with the Board by the Head of Quality, with a further detailed note from the Head of the History Department.

12 ANNUAL QUALITY REPORT 2017-18

Received:

The draft Annual Quality Report 2017-18 (18-19).

Noted:

- (i) The Report provided an overview of quality assurance and enhancement activities and enabled an evaluation of evidence on the management of quality and standards over the last year. The Report remained in draft form as it would be considered by Quality and Standards Sub Committee in October, prior to Audit and Risk Committee on 1 November. Audit and Risk Committee and ultimately Council would use the Report to sign off on the quality assurance statements in the Annual Accountability Return, submitted to the Office for Students. Last year Council felt the report continued to be light on data and efforts had been made to address this observation.
- (ii) A review by KPMG also informed the development of the report, with the positive findings of the KPMG Report providing further assurance of the College's quality and standards to Academic Board and Council.

Resolved:

That approval of the draft Annual Quality Report 2017-18 to be delegated to Quality and Standards Sub-Committee, prior to being received by Audit and Risk Committee and Council (18-19).

13 UPDATES TO COLLEGE POLICY

Received:

Updates to the:

Student Fees, Refund and Compensation Policy (18-20)
Academic Progress Committee (18-21)
Fitness to Study Policy (18-22)
Student Attendance Policy (18-23)
Extenuating Circumstances (18-24)

Noted:

- (i) The previously updated and approved **Student Fees, Refund and Compensation Policy** required a further amendment to one paragraph. The current wording of section 5.6 *College withdrawing students* needed to be amended to reflect the fact that in certain cases of withdrawal, students remain liable for their full tuition fees for the year of study. It was noted that the Policy was required as part of formal registration with the Office for Students (OfS). Therefore, the revised wording would need to be confirmed by the OfS, so Academic Board was asked to approve subject to OfS confirmation. The Students' Union, whilst acknowledging the case-by-case nature of student disciplinarys, queried whether there would be clear categorisation for decisions and possible outcomes. The Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar confirmed there was and that it was expected the OfS would also request this.

- (ii) In light of the recent review of attendance procedures and the Fitness to Study Policy, a review of the remit and functioning of the **Academic Progress Committee (APC)** was proposed. APC has responsibility for making decisions in relation to those students who make unsatisfactory academic progress or don't attend. Any member of the Board or their colleagues interested in being involved in the review should contact the Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar.
- (iii) The Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar identified three new important elements to the revised **Fitness to Study Policy**. Firstly, the element of a panel review stage within 14 days, for anyone suspended, to review the decision. Secondly, previously there had been no way of managing return to study for a student and a formal review process in this instance. Linked to this, the previous version of the Policy did not consider students being unable to continue for health reasons, however, the new policy now incorporated this. Thirdly, the three stages in the process were now much more clearly defined. The Head of the Department of History queried whether a statement in the previous version of the Policy might be usefully included in the revised Policy. He noted that fitness to study was complex and often stretched beyond purely medical considerations but also that of academic judgement, for example. The Head of Governance and Legal Services noted that the previous Policy merged academic judgement and medical fitness, so consideration would need to be given as to how the new policy could appropriately accommodate academic judgement in future revisions of the policy. The role of APC alongside the revised policy would also need further consideration in this light. The Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar agreed to consider these points further in future iterations, noting the annual review cycle of this policy, and report back to the Board. The Students' Union queried where students would be directed in the absence of external support. It was confirmed that at any point of exit, the College worked with a student to point them to the appropriate external support service, however, whether support was available would be dependent on the support service being prepared to take them on.
- (iv) One amendment had been made to the **Student Attendance Policy**, which was to remove the requirement to routinely record student attendance at lectures. No other changes or amendments had been made to the policy.
- (v) A review of the **Extenuating Circumstances process and policy** over the course of the Autumn term was proposed. It was noted that this was an area with high levels of student dissatisfaction. The Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar informed the Board of the need for a single process across all 18 academic departments. Variations in practice were particularly challenging for those on joint degrees, however, the need for a consistent, streamlined and fair process was paramount. Members of the Board agreed the need to review the process. The review would also consider the appropriate time to implement any changes, although it was felt that there might be some relatively minor changes which could be introduced in time for the next assessment round. The Director of the ICCE expressed an interest to be involved in the review, in order to ensure special circumstances when students undertook placements were considered.

Resolved:

That proposed amendments to College Policy and ongoing work in this area be approved:

- (a) Revised Student Fees, Refund and Compensation Policy (18-20) subject to OfS confirmation.
- (b) Academic Progress Committee process review (18-21).
- (c) Revised Fitness to Study Policy (18-22) with agreement to give consideration to the points identified relating to the role of academic judgement in paragraph (iii) above in future reviews of this strategy.
- (d) Revised Student Attendance Policy (18-23).
- (e) Review of Extenuating Circumstances process and policy (18-24).

14 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Resolved:

To appoint the following External Examiners:

Miss [REDACTED]
Senior Lecturer, [REDACTED] University
BA Arts Management
From 1st September 2018 to 31st August 2022

Dr [REDACTED]
Associate Professor, [REDACTED]
MA Migration and Mobility
From 1st September 2018 to 31st August 2022

Dr [REDACTED]
Senior Lecturer, University of [REDACTED]
MA Music (Historical Musicology / Contemporary Music Studies / Popular Music Research pathways)
From 1st September 2018 to 31st August 2022

Dr [REDACTED]
Senior Lecturer, [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
MA Anthropology and Museum Practice
From 1st September 2018 to 31st August 2022

Dr [REDACTED]
School of Humanities and Performing Arts, University of [REDACTED]
BA Drama and Theatre Arts
From 1st September 2018 to 31st August 2022

15 ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHAIR

Noted:

The action taken by the Chair (18-26).

16 ACADEMIC BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18

Received:

The Annual Report of the Board 2017-18, submitted to Council in June 2018 (18-27).

17 SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

Received:

The annual schedule of business for Academic Board (18-28).

18 ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMMES BY PROFESSIONAL, STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BODIES (PSRBs)

Received:

A summary of all PSRBs and an update to the accreditation or continued approval of programmes during 2017-18 (17-519R).

19 VISITING PROFESSORS AND FELLOWS

Noted:

The recent appointments of Visiting Professors and Fellows (18-29).

20 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

Received:

Minutes from the following committees:

Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee – 16 May 2018 (18-30)

Academic Development Committee – 10 May 2018 (18-31)

Research and Enterprise Committee – 23 May 2018 (18-32)

21 FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted:

The dates of meetings in 2018-19 as follows:

Wednesday 5 December 2018
Wednesday 20 March 2019
Wednesday 29 May 2019

All meetings will take place between 14.00-16.00 in the Professor Stuart Hall Building, Room 3.26.

22 DEPARTURE FROM THE BOARD

Noted:

That Kieron Broadhead, Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar, was leaving the College next month. The Board thanked him for his contribution to College business during his time at Goldsmiths and wished him well for the future.

