

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

COUNCIL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held 2-4pm on 19 September 2019

Present: Professor Frances Corner (in the Chair), Professor Michael Archer, Professor Michael Banissy, Dr Clea Bourne, Mr Timothy Chapman, Ms Lauren Corelli, Dr Debbie Custance, Mr Adrian De La Court, Dr Jasna Dragovic Soso, Ms Sara Ewing, Professor Anna Furse, Dr Iris Garrelfs, Professor Dimitrios Giannouloupoulos, Dr Stephen Graham, Ms Alison Griffiths, Ms Annie Guo, Dr Ayesha Hameed, Professor Elisabeth Hill, Mr Kevin Jones, Mr Steve Keirl, Dr Rodger Kibble, Professor Frank Krause, Mr Joseph Leam, Dr Ben Levitas, Mr Gerald Lidstone, Dr Jo Lloyd, Dr Dagmar Myslinska, Professor Daniel Neyland, Professor Richard Noble, Professor David Oswell, Dr Tara Page, Dr Rajyashree Pandey, Professor Alan Pickering, Ms Maggie Pitfield, Dr John Price, Dr Wood Roberdeau, Dr Martin Savransky, Dr Ragupathy Venkatachalam, Professor Mike Waller, Professor Joanna Zylinska.

Apologies: Professor Mark d'Inverno, Dr Henrike Donner, Mr Conrad Heyns, Ms Wei Jin, Dr Pdraig Kirwan, Dr Rebekah Lee, Mr Kierin Offlands, Professor Cris Shore, Professor Lauren Stewart, Dr Naomi Thompson, Professor Robert Zimmer.

In attendance: Mr Leo Appleton, Ms Jane Boggan (item 17 only), Mr Nirmal Borkhataria, Mr Matthew Brooks, Ms Amanda Cater, Mrs Rhian Douglas, Dr Jennifer George, Dr Elena Gonzalez-Polledo, Ms Louisa Green, Ms Vivienne Hurley, Ms Wendy McDonald, Mr Ian Pleace, Ms Sally Priddle, Ms Helen Watson, Mr Ben Wilson, Mrs Cathryn Thompson (Secretary).

OPEN BUSINESS

1 NEW MEMBERS

Noted:

- (i) The Warden Professor Frances Corner, Professor Dimitrios Giannouloupoulos from Law, Professor Michael Banissy from Psychology, Professor Daniel Neyland from Sociology, Dr Ben Levitas from Theatre and Performance, Dr Wood Roberdeau from

Visual Cultures, Dr Jo Lloyd from the Institute of Management Studies, Ms Alison Griffiths from Educational Studies, Dr Rebekah Lee from History, Dr Dagmar Myslinska from Law, Dr Clea Bourne from Media, Communications and Cultural Studies, Professor Lauren Stewart from Psychology, Dr Martin Savransky from Sociology, Dr Ayesha Hameed from Visual Cultures, Mr Timothy Chapman from the English Language Centre, and Dr Tara Page as Academic Director International Development and Academic Partnerships were welcomed as new staff members of the Board.

- (ii) Mr Joe Leam (SU President) and Ms Lauren Corelli (Education Officer) were welcomed as new student members, and Mr Kierin Offlands (Chair of Student Assembly) was welcomed as a returning member of the Board. It was noted that an officer of the Students' Union with a portfolio including postgraduate student matters, was yet to be elected by the Student Assembly as a final student member of Academic Board.

2 STANDING ORDERS

Received:

The standing orders in force for all Goldsmiths Committees from 1 September 2019: <http://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/committees/standing-orders/>.

3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY

Received:

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

4 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

Noted:

- (i) The Head of Secretariat informed the Board of a change of approach to matters of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) within committee business. Rather than a standard stand-alone EDI item on all agendas, the new cover sheet accompanying papers required the paper author to identify any EDI matters for the attention of committee members.
- (ii) The Governance team would review all committee terms of reference over the 2019-20 academic year to further embed EDI into business.

5 TERMS OF REFERENCE, CONSTITUTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF ACADEMIC BOARD

Received:

The terms of reference, constitution and revised membership of the Board for 2019-20 (18-517R).

Noted:

- (i) That no changes had been made to the powers, membership or composition of the Board.
- (ii) All vacancies on the Board had been filled with the exception of one student member, with a portfolio including postgraduate student matters, and the Head of the Academic Skills Centre.

6 MINUTES

Resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 May 2019 be approved.

7 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Noted:

- (i) An update on the outcomes of the Subject Level TEF Pilot (agenda item 7) was provided under Confidential Business.
- (ii) Agenda item 10 on the Student Experience Workstreams: The School Administrator (Arts and Humanities) met with the Students' Union Business Development Coordinator and had successfully identified suitable spaces in the SU building which could be used for joint degree students to meet both socially and for group meetings. These spaces would need to be booked (as regular or ad hoc activities) and would be free of charge. The Warden thanked the Students' Union for their assistance.
- (iii) Agenda item 24 on Retirements from the Board: Professor Jan de Fockert (Psychology), Ms Karen Matthewman (Academic Skills Centre) and Professor Frank Bond (Institute of Management Studies) had retired from the Board subsequent to the May meeting and were thanked for their contribution.

8 APPROVAL OF ITEMS FOR FORMAL DECISION

Resolved:

- (i) Terms of reference and membership of the committees of Academic Board for 2019-20 (19-41) were approved.
- (ii) The revised Tuition Fee Policy (19-42) was approved.
- (iii) The template for the Annual Quality Report 2018-19 was approved and a progress update on agreed action from the previous report noted (19-43).

9 WARDEN'S REPORT

Received:

A report from the Warden on issues of concern and interest to the College (19-44).

Noted:

- (i) That the report aimed to set out a number of important issues and frame the meeting's discussions, however, should members like a more detailed discussion on any items not otherwise covered on the agenda, then this could be explored for future Academic Board agendas. In addition, any items members would like included in future Warden Reports for the Board should be sent to the Chair and/or Secretary directly.
- (ii) The Warden thanked members for being so welcoming and supportive to her as the new Warden of Goldsmiths, and for demonstrating such passion throughout discussions and activities observed.
- (iii) The Warden was looking forward to working with colleagues and Academic Board specifically to shape Goldsmiths' direction of travel, our disciplines, student recruitment, student retention, a review of Governance arrangements, mental health issues and how we might develop research in this area, and opportunities for curriculum development, among other opportunities for change. How Goldsmiths presented itself to the world was a topic for discussion, with one element being the New Green Deal and carbon neutral pledge.
- (iv) The Students' Union Education Officer queried the institution's readiness for UCU strikes. The Warden noted that the ballot would close later in the Autumn term and that these conversations were taking place internally, with some strands linking with preparations for a potential no-deal Brexit. The College was currently considering implications of possible future strikes and how teaching could be protected wherever possible.

Resolved:

That the Warden would report on preparations for future UCU strikes at the next meeting of the Board.

10 BREXIT UPDATE**Received:**

A College update on its position in relation to Brexit (19-45) for consideration.

Noted:

- (i) Whether or not a no-deal Brexit materialised there were a number of contingency plans to be made. One of the main concerns related to Goldsmiths being an employer of 1,200 staff, so factors beyond the College's control were also to be anticipated, such as primary schools closing, which would have a real impact on staff and students who were parents and carers. This was likely to be where the College was most vulnerable. Whilst planning and curriculum delivery were the main priority, the risks were widespread, including the free movement of staff and students, and information and data.
- (ii) The College's risk planning exercise carried out back in January had been reviewed in the light of an October exit from the European Union. Goldsmiths had also been working through the clearer guidance published by UUK.
- (iii) Consideration would need to be given to any curriculum delivery that was dependent on staff based overseas and also those staff who might travel overseas during reading week and half term.
- (iv) Other risks included the possible collapse of sterling. Whilst this would negatively affect the 'value' in monetary terms of academics coming to the UK to teach, on a more positive note, it would be cheaper for students to come to the UK to study. Cheaper study for overseas students, coupled with recent Government visa changes, would make the UK an even more attractive destination for international students.
- (v) Additional travel and insurance costs should be taken into account, and whilst procurement needs had been planned for centrally, departments were encouraged to consider any local level requirements. The challenge was knowing what to stockpile and for how long. For example, the new Director of Estates and Facilities was reviewing student accommodation needs as a priority.
- (vi) The Senior Management Team would continue to monitor the situation and call department meetings where needed. Everyone, however, was asked to keep the protection of teaching in the forefront of their minds, coupled with good communication with students.

- (vii) It was understood that Goldsmiths' Brexit strategy should be clear whatever the outcome, with the primary focus being on cementing relationships with partners in the European Union, and remaining fully committed to European staff and students, as well as academic relationships and partnerships.
- (viii) The Dean of the Graduate School informed the Board of PhD student anxiety with regards to tuition fees and specifically whether they would be guaranteed at the rate at which they commenced their study. It was agreed that it would be helpful to update the website to direct students to further information. It was noted that this was being closely monitored by the College and that the UUK guidance was being followed. The College would do everything in good faith to support all students, but clearly remained bound by current and future law.

11 MAXIMISING STUDENT OUTCOMES: A FRAMEWORK

Received:

- A Framework for maximising student outcomes (19-18R)
- An analysis of the 2019 National Student Survey (19-46)
- An update on target setting to support the annual planning round (19-47)
- A revised process replacing Annual Programme Review (19-48)
- A revised approach to Module Evaluation (19-49)

Noted:

- (i) The **Framework for maximising student outcomes** proposed a new approach to ensuring students and their learning experience were placed at the heart of everything we do by taking a systematic approach to tackling College-wide challenges. The Framework was presented with proposals for revisions to existing processes, including NSS action planning, the annual planning round, Annual Programme Review, module evaluation and the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF).
- (ii) The Framework had been discussed and supported by Council members at its meeting last week. The Framework outlined an evidenced based, informed approach, which not only drew on available data and metrics, but all information relevant to a process. For example, retention data was more than the number of students leaving the College, but of particular importance was reasons for leaving and at what point in the year they chose to exit.
- (iii) Existing processes would continue to be utilised but could be amended to ensure best fit in supporting departments to identify and implement actions that would have the greatest impact. The College's governance structures would be utilised to oversee proposed actions and monitor impact, this included the newly approved Student Access, Participation and Outcomes Sub-Committee. Additionally, a repository would be built based on findings so that the College could confidently

outline what worked well for driving change at Goldsmiths and what didn't. The three College-wide challenges currently identified were student retention, degree attainment and career progression.

- (iv) The Board was asked to agree the principles outlined in the Framework. The Academic Director of TaLIC welcomed the Framework and noted it was an approach other HEIs had also taken to address concerns around student retention. A number of TaLIC staff had expressed interest in participating in these areas of work so details would be sent to the Academic Registrar and Director of Student Experience directly.
- (v) The Students' Union Education Officer and Student Voice Manager previously met with the Academic Registrar to discuss the draft Framework, who noted it was quite unclear from a student perspective and difficult to see how these experiences and actions would be measured. It was confirmed that the Framework provided the overall structure and if approved, would be translated into something more meaningful at an operational level for students and staff.
- (vi) The Registrar and Secretary introduced the revised approach to **target setting to support the annual planning round** and reminded academic departments that the centre would work with them in the setting of targets. Department level targets would provide a clear path to achieving institutional targets and commitments. Closer monitoring of progress would enable early appraisal should the College be at risk of not meeting them, for example, the Access and Participation Plan (APP) commitments.
- (vii) One academic Head of Department queried the term 'a reliable dataset' and how the focus should be on staff and students as people not numbers. Concern was expressed when looking across the papers underpinning the Framework, which included target identification, setting and monitoring, and specifically the additional workload this would cause. It was noted, however, that the revised approach to module evaluation and the introduction of a student response form, was not deemed additional work, as departments should be doing something of equivalence already to close the feedback loop to students. It was noted that setting targets was not intended to stifle innovation or staff passion in particular areas. However, if agreed institutional targets were to be met these would need to be mapped at department level to plan how they could be realised. Any departmental support needs would be overseen centrally.
- (viii) Another academic Head was of the opinion that the **Annual Programme Review (APR)** process had worked well and was an appropriate way to oversee academic delivery, which culminated in Periodic Review on a 6-year cycle. Moving towards Performance Improvement Planning (PIP) and linking to output from the annual planning round raised concerns that the quality assurance process was now purely being linked to targets rather than programme delivery. It was felt that the proposed working title, PIP, did not appropriately describe the revised process. Members of the Board were asked to send alternative suggestions to the Head of Quality.

- (ix) The Academic Registrar informed the Board that the College, along with the rest of the sector, was now operating in a radically different regulatory environment with, for example, a considerably different UK Quality Code. The previous Code had contained 19 expectations, which had now been reduced to 4. Furthermore, the underpinning information, advice and guidance was far less prescriptive about what QA processes an institution might need. Diminishing returns on APR were noticeable, so the revised approach looked to replace APR with something which would be supportive for departments in driving forward change.
- (x) The PIP process would take place at department level following the annual planning round in the Autumn term in order to take forward and respond to priority areas identified. The planning round and PIP would remain two distinct but complementary processes, and would focus on undergraduate provision only in the 2019-20 implementation year. Lessons learned during the year would be assessed and inform the roll out to all provision in 2020-21. Programme specific action would be incorporated as necessary or where departments might need to drill-down to more detailed programme information to inform planned action. The PIP would not be metrics based or target focused, as it followed from the annual planning process where targets would be set as usual. Rather, the PIP process would support departments in action planning and identifying ways in which the impact of actions taken could be measured appropriately. Guiding principles for target setting were outlined in the paper. Priority areas would differ by department, as not all departments would necessarily share the same issues. The main focus was for students to stay at Goldsmiths to successfully complete their studies to as high a level as possible and to progress into their desired career.
- (xi) The reality was that Goldsmiths was measured against these targets and was required to meet commitments contained in the Access and Participation Plan. The College was also being benchmarked against comparator groups.
- (xii) Periodic Review would continue at this point, although it was noted that all quality assurance processes would require review to ensure their efficiency and effectiveness, and continuing alignment with the UK Quality Code. The current External Examining Policy and Procedure would also continue going forward, and the PIP would not duplicate this process. The Office for Students had been clear that moving forward, quality assurance processes should be focussed on student outcomes rather than just having robust quality assurance processes in place. A concern was raised that it could stifle innovation in course development, which would need to be considered further as part of a new risk-based and outcomes-driven approach. The next meeting of the Board would commence these conversations, specifically on how the College might build on its existing portfolio.
- (xiii) The student experience remained at the heart of the proposed Framework, and it was expected that students would be involved in designing some of the action plans which responded to priority areas. The revised process would bring a number of information sources and datasets on the student experience together. It was acknowledged that departments were acting on feedback and concerns to address issues, but that the College needed to be better at measuring the impact of action

taken to ensure it was having the intended positive impact.

- (xiv) The Board was pleased to note the improved **National Student Survey** 2019 results and welcomed the content of the report provided. An increased response rate had been achieved in the 2019 survey and overall satisfaction had increased in 23 of the 27 questions. Goldsmiths was performing above benchmark in three areas, and particularly strong performance in arts and humanities was noted. However, the College continued to remain behind the sector across all scales, and specifically in Learning Community and Student Voice. It was noted that colleagues continued to work hard to address these and a change to the action planning process was agreed, which would now include action planning by Professional Services in addition to academic departments, as well as an enhanced role for the Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee in confirming and monitoring NSS action plans.
- (xv) A **Module Evaluation** Working Party comprising members from TaLIC, Student Engagement and the Quality Office was convened in February 2019 to discuss the development of a standardised approach to module evaluation, and a revised process which would enable central oversight whilst maintaining departmental responsibility and ownership. The Working Party researched common and good practice within Goldsmiths and the sector to inform the revised approach proposed.
- (xvi) The introduction of a new standard reporting requirement in the form of a Student Module Evaluation Response Form was proposed (SMERF). The acronym 'SMERF' was a working title open to discussion, with suggestions from members welcomed. It was noted that some Goldsmiths departments were already operating in this way with a department-specific response form. The Students' Union welcomed the standardised approach.
- (xvii) The proposal to expand the Working Party was discussed and supported by the Board, which would propose the standard questions to be included in all module evaluations, produce guidance and a good practice guide, and finalise the SMERF content and format for effectively closing the feedback loop to students. The Working Party were keen to hear from staff with expertise in this area and/or interest in being on the Working Party.

Resolved:

The Board approved the following:

- A Framework for maximising student outcomes (19-18R), which would now be translated into a more meaningful document for staff and students.
- A revised approach for responding to the 2019 National Student Survey results (19-46).
- A revised approach to target setting to support the annual planning round (19-47).
- A revised process replacing Annual Programme Review (19-48), which would now be developed into a draft policy and procedure.

- A revised approach to module evaluation, as well as the formation of an expanded Module Evaluation Working Party to develop a set of standard evaluation questions, the response form and guidance material.

12 UPDATES TO COLLEGE POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Received:

Updates to:

- Extenuating Circumstances (19-50)
- Goldsmiths Academic Manual (GAM) plan for 2019-20 and policy approval schedule, and to approve minor amendments to the GAM following publication (19-51)
- Digital Recording Policy (19-52)
- Revised Student Attendance Policy (19-53)

Noted:

- (i) The schedule of work on the **extenuating circumstances** process for 2019-20 was noted by the Board. It was confirmed Dr Stephen Graham would Chair the extenuating circumstances group, reporting to the Regulations Working Group.
- (ii) Minor amendments to the Goldsmiths Academic Manual (GAM) were considered, and the proposed schedule for policy consideration during 2019-20 accepted.
- (iii) The **Digital Recording Policy** item and accompanying paper (19-52) had been withdrawn due to an issue raised prior to the meeting. Discussion had therefore been postponed until the November meeting of the Board.
- (iv) That the proposed amendment to the **Student Attendance Policy** was a minor Policy change to accurately reflect practice.

Resolved:

- (i) Goldsmiths Academic Manual (GAM) plan for 2019-20 and policy approval schedule were noted, and minor amendments to the GAM following publication were approved (19-51).
- (ii) That the revised Student Attendance Policy (19-53) be approved.

13 STUDENT EXPERIENCE WORKSTREAMS

Received:

A set of recommendations agreed by the Joint Degrees Working Group relating to the organisation and management, and teaching and learning of joint degrees (19-54) and a report on Academic Lead for Careers and Employability activities (19-55)

Noted:

- (i) The **Joint Degrees Working Group** continued to work with programme convenors and students during 2018-19, with a number of recommendations for good practice and minimum expectations proposed. The paper provided confidence to Academic Board that work in this area remained ongoing and to note that many recommendations had started to be implemented due to joint degree Programme Convenors sitting on the Working Party. Departmental Learning and Teaching Committees were now asked to consider the paper and recommendations contained to ascertain what could and couldn't be introduced, and to identify additional support which may be needed in order to do so.
- (ii) The Joint Degrees Working Group would continue to convene to refine recommendations and review the implementation plan during 2019-20. The Students' Union thanked the Working Group and supported recommendations proposed, which had been considered by Student Experience Sub-Committee. The SU noted, however, that some should be an 'expectation' rather than a 'recommendation'.
- (iii) One Head of Department commented that the cover sheet accompanying the paper underplayed the financial implications of the recommendations proposed, some of which would require new additional roles and responsibilities within a department, rather than a redistribution of responsibilities across existing staff levels. It was confirmed that the next stage would be for the Working Group to identify financial implications. It was also noted that not all joint programmes would need to implement all recommendations. Financial implications were to be included in departmental action plans, which would be considered by the Senior Management Team.
- (iv) Any queries or points of clarification relating to the **Academic Lead for Careers and Employability** activity report should be made to Katy Gordon, Associate Director for Careers and Employability.

14 STUDENT COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS ANNUAL REPORT

Received:

The annual Student Complaints and Appeals update report (18-134R and 18-445).

Noted:

- (i) It was noted that this was the last time the Board would receive a summary report of this nature as regular in-year reporting would now take place on a termly basis to Quality and Standards Sub-Committee, with annual reporting on performance continuing to be provided to the Student Experience Sub-Committee and Academic Board. The importance of reporting on complaints and appeals and their resolution was noted, along with the opportunity presented by such reporting for enhancing systems, services and processes of the College more generally.
- (ii) The Students' Union were thanked for their assistance in developing the College's thinking in this area. Members of the Board who had assisted with the processing and consideration of academic appeals over the past few weeks were also thanked for their help and the speed at which queries and requests for further information had been responded to. The College was halfway through the academic appeals process and it was pleasing to note that fewer appeals had been received so far, compared to previous years at this point in the process, with 100% having been completed on time.

15 STUDENTS' UNION EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES 2019-20**Received:**

Goldsmiths Students' Union educational priorities for the 2019-20 academic session (19-56).

Noted:

- (i) The paper provided by the Students' Union Education Officer outlined her priorities for the year and prompted discussion for identifying opportunities for greater collaboration with members of the Goldsmiths community.
- (ii) Improving the personal tutoring system and pastoral care for students was identified as a priority, as well as support for student parents specifically. Departmental representatives' research on student parents and the specific barriers they faced would inform proposals in this area to make positive changes. The Education Officer noted that the Goldsmiths' campus was not child friendly. The nursery run by the Students' Union was currently only used by children of Goldsmiths staff rather than by students of the College. This was a concern which was queried by the Board and one member informed of their personal experience that the hours needed to be more flexible. For example, should students only need childcare on an ad hoc basis, for one term only or whilst they attended a lecture for a short period of time.
- (iii) The Board noted that many of the general principles discussed applied more broadly for all those with caring responsibilities, such as those who cared for younger siblings, not just those who were student parents. Again, as the nursery was only available to children up to the age of 4, it was queried what resource might be

available to those with caring responsibilities for someone over that age.

- (iv) The Board thanked the SU Education Officer for her paper and looked forward to discussing priorities in greater detail at future meetings.

16 GOLDSMITHS ANTI-RACIST ACTION (GARA)

Received:

An update on GARA and the associated action plan (19-57).

Noted:

- (i) The action plan and progress to date was noted by the Board. Dr [REDACTED] continued work in this area, including the recruitment of an additional staff member and the planning of a race justice audit. The audit would inform the development of a race justice strategy and delivery plan.
- (ii) All members of the Goldsmiths' community were stakeholders in this work. The implementation of the commitments would require the contribution and engagement from academics, professional services, students and the Students' Union.

17 RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK (REF)

Received:

An update on progress with the preparations for Goldsmiths submission to REF 2021 (19-58) and the revised Code of Practice for REF 2021 (late circulation).

Noted:

- (i) Departments were thanked for their work and contribution to the mock REF review. Impact case studies and environmental statements remained a priority. Five review days had now been planned, as opposed to three, with each review day focusing on specific department groupings. All involved externals within the process.
- (ii) The Code of Practice had been widely circulated for comment, with detailed consideration on revised wording taking place at the REF Strategy Group. Any further Board member comments should be made to the REF Manager and Pro Warden Research and Enterprise as soon as possible, in advance of submission by noon the following day, 20 September 2019. But, as they stand, the revisions to the Code of Practice were agreed by the Board.
- (iii) UCU had confirmed they were happy with the changes, one of which had been around redundancy and another on individual mitigating circumstances, and the Data Protection Officer was currently working with the REF team on the privacy notice for

data collection.

Resolved:

The Code of Practice for REF 2021 was approved.

18 RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE PRIORITIES

Received:

Priorities for Research and Enterprise (19-19R).

Noted:

- (i) That the draft priorities outlined would build on existing strengths and develop new ones. The Director of Research, Innovation and Knowledge Exchange stressed the importance of this area and the need to overcome any barriers identified.
- (ii) Some illustrations of ways in which each priority might be approached was outlined in the paper. The priorities identified spoke to department strategies and the College Strategic Plan. Work was in hand to bring in a new research management system, which would assist both administrative and academic staff.
- (iii) Two academic leads had recently been appointed, one for Knowledge Exchange and another for Research, who would act as champions for their respective areas.

19 DEPARTMENTAL STRATEGY REVIEW

Received:

An introduction to the Departmental Strategy Review process and indicative timetable (19-59).

Noted:

- (i) Two Departmental Strategy Reviews (DSR) took place in the Summer term 2019. These were the Department of English and Comparative Literature and the Institute of Management Studies, both of which were currently at the draft report stage of the process.
- (ii) DSR was a holistic review of a whole department, which involved external Panel members acting as critical friends, and brought both qualitative and quantitative data together and worked on longer term planning horizons.
- (iii) Departments were heavily involved in the process, and whilst certain expectations inevitably came out of reviews, the solutions and reflections were very much

departmentally generated and supported by College. The proposed DSR schedule over the next 2 years was included in the paper.

- (iv) The Students' Union had met with a member of the Strategic Planning and Projects team to discuss student involvement in the process, and discussions continued in this area. The Deputy Warden was pleased this was moving forward and confirmed that the pilot DSRs had gathered feedback from student focus groups and the DSR panel had met with students as part of the process.

20 ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHAIR

Noted:

The action taken by the Chair (19-60).

21 SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

Received:

The annual schedule of business for Academic Board (19-61).

22 COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2019-20

Noted:

The dates of meetings of College Committees 2019-20:
<https://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/committees/schedule/>.

23 ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION PLAN 2020-25

Received:

The confirmed changes to Goldsmiths Access and Participation Plan 2020-25 (19-62).

24 TRANSPARENCY INFORMATION

Noted:

The Transparency Information for 2018-19
[\(https://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/public-information/transparency-return/\)](https://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/public-information/transparency-return/) (19-63).

25 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 2018-19 (19-64).

26 VISITING PROFESSORS AND FELLOWS

Received:

The recent appointments of Visiting Professors and Fellows (19-65).

27 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

Received:

Minutes from the following committees:

Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee – 15 May 2019 (19-66)

Academic Development Committee – 19 June 2019 (19-67)

Research and Enterprise Committee – 22 May 2019 (19-68)

28 FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted:

The dates of remaining meetings in 2019-20 as follows:

12.30-16.00 on Wednesday 13 November 2019

14.00-16.00 on Wednesday 18 March 2020

14.00-16.00 on Wednesday 3 June 2020

All meetings will take place in the Professor Stuart Hall Building, Room 3.26.