

# Extraordinary Academic Board

27<sup>th</sup> July 2020

**Present:** Professor Frances Corner, Professor Claudia Bernard, Dr Clea Bourne, Professor Michael Banissy, Mr Timothy Chapman, Dr Debbie Custance, Ms Lauren Corelli, Mr Adrian De La Court, , Dr Henrike Donner, Dr Jasna Dragovic Soso, Ms Sara Ewing, Ms Fowsia Kadiye Professor Anna Furse, Professor Jennifer George, Professor Dimitrios Giannouloupoulos, Dr Stephen Graham, Ms Alison Griffiths, Mr Conrad Heyns, Professor Elisabeth Hill, Ms Wei Jin, Dr Rodger Kibble, Professor Frank Krause, Dr Rebekah Lee, Dr Ben Levitas, Mr Gerald Lidstone, Dr Jo Lloyd, Dr Dagmar Myslinska, Professor Daniel Neyland, Dr Tara Page, Dr Rajyashree Pandey, Professor Alan Pickering, Ms Maggie Pitfield, Dr John Price, Dr Wood Roberdeau, Dr Martin Savransky, Dr Astrid Schmetterling Professor Cris Shore, Dr Ragupathy Venkatachalam, Professor Mike Waller, Mr Shuai Zhao, and Professor Joanna Zylinska

**In attendance:** Mr Nirmal Borkhataria, Mr John Dickinson-Lilley, Ms Louisa Green, Ms Sally Priddle, Ms Melanie Rimmer, Dr Kathryn Woods

**Apologies:** Professor Mark d'Inverno, Dr Ayesha Hameed, Dr Iris Garrelfs, Mr Kevin Jones, Dr Pdraig Kirwan, Mr Steve Keirl, Mr Joseph Leam, Mr Kierin Offlands, Professor David Oswell, Professor Richard Noble, Dr Naomi Thompson, Professor Lauren Stewart, Ms Helen Watson and Professor Robert Zimmer

OPEN BUSINESS

---

## 1 Identification of items for discussion

---

**Reported:**

There had been a request to star item 27.

---

## 2 Chair's action

---

**Reported:**

- 2.1 The Chair welcomed the SU's new Education Officer Fowsia Kadiye.
- 2.2 The Chair had taken action to ensure there was sufficient capacity to support the programme re-approval process and approved the committee

membership for Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee 2020-21. This enabled the new Deputy Chair to be identified to support the programme changes which needed to take place from early July.

- 2.3 The Chair approved the revised term dates 2020-21 for the Department of Art.
- 2.4 The Chair approved an adjustment to the College's enrolment dates from 31 October to 6 November. This adjustment would accommodate any individual student unable to arrive and enrol with Goldsmiths earlier and provides an additional week beyond what had originally been stated (taking account of the adjustment to the standard term dates). The revised date would be consistent with the date provided to Tier 4 students on the CAS and would work in respect of the College's HESA return.
- 2.5 The Chair had approved a recommendation to Council to approve a new prize for a full fee waiver for three British Muslim PGT students. The proposal came on recommendation from the Fees and Scholarships Working Group and was brought outside of the usual schedule of business owing to the timeline required to make this award available for 2020 entry.

---

### **3 Minutes of the last meeting**

---

**Received:**

- 3.1 Minutes (open) from 3 June 2020

**Resolved:**

- 3.2 The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

---

### **4 Matters arising from the minutes**

---

**Noted:**

- 4.1 No matters were raised.

---

### **5 Action tracker**

---

**Received:**

- 5.1 Updates on action from previous meeting(s) (19-328 R1)

**Noted:**

- 5.2 Updates on actions were noted.

---

## 6 Assessment moderation for validation partnerships

---

**Received:**

- 6.1 Revised assessment moderation process for validation partnerships (19-533)

**Resolved:**

- 6.2 The proposal to revise the assessment moderation process for validation partnerships was approved.
- 

## 7 Membership of Academic Board

---

**Received:**

- 7.1 The change to the composition of Academic Board and to recommend the change to Council for ratification, and to note the revised membership of Academic Board for 2020-21 (19-453R)

**Noted:**

- 7.2 The revised membership of Academic Board for 2020-21 was noted.  
7.3 It was proposed that the Dean of Students was added to Class 5: Specified Postholders of Academic Board. If approved, this amendment would be recommended to Council for ratification.

**Resolved:**

- 7.4 Academic Board approved to recommend to Council the change of composition to add the Dean of Students to Class 5: Specified Postholders.
- 

## 8 Library User Group

---

**Received:**

- 8.1 Terms of Reference for the Library User Group (19-534)

**Resolved:**

- 8.2 Academic Board approved the change to the Library User Group terms of reference to include an additional function that the group was a discussion platform for innovation and ideas for Library Service development and that the role of the Chair remains with an 'independent academic' but that this role becomes a specific responsibility for a named academic role.

---

## 9 Tuition Fee Policy and Procedures

---

**Received:**

- 9.1 An additional annexe on PGR fees within the Tuition Fee Policy (19-535)

**Resolved:**

- 9.2 Academic Board approved the addition of a new annex to the current Tuition Fee Policy covering the arrangements for PGR fees. The approved policy would be published on the College's website from the start of the academic year 2020/21.
- 

## 10 Change of department name

---

**Received:**

- 10.1 Change of name of the English Language Centre (19-536)

**Resolved:**

- 10.2 Academic Board approved the proposed name change of the English Language Centre (ELC) to the Centre for Academic Language and Literacies (CALL).
- 

## 11 Media non-standard term date

---

**Received:**

- 11.1 Non-standard term dates for programmes in the Department of Media, Communications and Cultural Studies (19-537)

**Noted:**

- 11.2 The Department of Media, Communications and Cultural Studies requested a change in the term dates for their MA Filmmaking fiction pathways to 11 January 2021 to 17 December 2021. This would apply to: MA Filmmaking (Cinematography); MA Filmmaking (Directing); MA Filmmaking (Editing); MA Filmmaking (Producing) and MA Filmmaking (Sound Recording and Design)

**Resolved:**

- 11.3 Academic Board approved the change in 2020-21 term dates for MA Filmmaking fiction pathways to 11 January 2021 (start of spring term) and the programme would run through to 17 December 2021 (end of autumn term).

---

## 12 Warden's Report

---

### Received:

- 12.1 Report from the Warden on issues of concern and interest to the College (19-538)

### Noted:

- 12.2 The Warden reported that there was a typo in the report and it should have outlined the commitment to renewing the College's approach to tackling and eradicating racial injustice. The Warden thanked colleagues who reported this error.
- 12.3 It was reported that the College had had an unprecedented year with a great many priorities that the College had had to respond to, including the increased expectations of the OfS and a global pandemic.
- 12.4 It was disappointing to end the year with the poor NSS results, these were not what the College was aiming or working for. Colleagues had worked hard throughout the year although it showed that there was a disconnect between what the College thought they were providing and students' perceptions. The College would be taking these results and its response to them extremely seriously to ensure significant improvements going forward.
- 12.5 It was reported that the Racial Justice Board would be established and the first meeting would be held in September, a substantive report on this work and actions would be brought to the November meeting of Academic Board.
- 12.6 The revised REF timeline had been published. Despite the deadline being moved there was still a lot of work required before the submission, alongside the other work the College had to complete.
- 12.7 The Knowledge Exchange update provided clarity on the initiatives that were coming forwards and summarised the outstanding work being done in different areas across the College.
- 12.8 The College's Green New Deal plan would be revised to ensure the impact of Covid was effectively reflected.

---

## 13 Goldsmiths' Financial Position

---

### Received:

- 13.1 Update on the College's financial position and next steps (19-539)

### Noted:

- 13.2 The College have been working on a variety of scenarios to assess the potential position in this and next academic year. Increased financial controls had been implemented since lockdown and these efforts had had a positive impact on the College's cash flow and delayed the date the College would need liquidity support.

- 13.3 The College was undertaking an Independent Business Review. The tender was out and it was hoped this process would be completed in October. Enrolment would not be confirmed until October; this would give clarity on the borrowing requirements. It was likely that deferrals would have a significant impact on the College's financial position.
- 13.4 The Independent Business Review would feed into the College's Recovery plan and provide assurance to the banks that the College could repay any additional borrowing. It would be the College's decision which recommendations from the Independent Business Review were accepted, however the banks would have set expectations of changes made in order to hold sufficient assurance on College's sustainability.
- 13.5 The Government's restructuring regime would be a last resort, the terms were not confirmed and they could potentially be negative for Goldsmiths.
- 13.6 The College would be in discussion with the banks over the next few months to look at potential arrangements. The College currently held a £ [REDACTED] loan with [REDACTED] to repay, an estimated additional £ [REDACTED] would be required to ensure sufficient cash flow.
- 13.7 The College was aiming to maintain its independence and this required robust action.
- 13.8 Academic Board asked for clarity on what the Independent Business Review entailed and the level of input required from departments. It was reported that the Review would look at the financial position, market, comparable institutions. Departments would not be asked to input at this stage.
- 13.9 The recovery plan would be built on the outcomes of the Review and there would be a range of options for Goldsmiths to consider, it would be the College's decision to restructure.
- 13.10 It was reported that lots of institutions in the sector were going through the required steps to ensure sustainability. Goldsmiths had to face its current position and make the necessary changes to ensure viability.

---

## 14 Campus Re-opening

---

### Received:

- 14.1 Plans for re-opening campus (19-540)

### Noted:

- 14.2 The plans to re-open campus have focused on providing learning and teaching opportunities for students. Programmes have been reviewed through the re-approval process to ensure they meet the new blended provision.
- 14.3 All plans needed to continually developed and respond to changing government and PHE guidance. The Critical Incident Group were meeting weekly to review plans and manage risk.

- 14.4 Communication was essential to the effective implementation of the re-opening plan. When there were changes in guidance, this would be integrated into plans and shared with the community.
- 14.5 The College's position of face coverings had been reviewed by the Health and Safety Sub-Group and agreed on the basis that face coverings were not required. If the national position on face coverings changed then the College would review plans. It was important that the College's position included consideration for staff and students with hearing impairments or those unable to wear a mask.
- 14.6 Each department and service area had been required to undertake a risk assessment to identify any additional measures required to safely return to business. The departments were asked to complete these as they best understood their own activities and business, with the risk assessments then being checked by the health and safety team.
- 14.7 There was a central fund in place for the purchase of PPE.
- 14.8 Equality Impact Assessments were being completed against and the amber principles within the operating plans. Departments asked for additional guidance on the best practice for conducting these effectively.

**Action:**

- 14.9 Provide guidance on the completion of EIAs.

---

## **15 BME Scholarships and Bursaries**

---

**Received:**

- 15.1 Proposed BME scholarships and bursaries paper (19-541)

**Noted:**

- 15.2 The proposal was being brought to Academic Board to discuss whether the approach was the right one and to secure the engagement and support from the academic community. The development team aspired to fundraise █████, which was a stretching target but achievable. The College did not have a strong history of securing philanthropic support.
- 15.3 It was agreed that the proposal was interesting however it could be deemed problematic to use the term 'Every Student Matters' given the potential alignment with 'all live matters' campaigns which discredit or challenge the Black Lives Matter movement.
- 15.4 Academic Board asked if there were any plans to introduce BME scholarships for graduate students too. It would be helpful to establish a pipeline effect into diversifying academia. PhD scholarships should also be considered.

- 15.5 It was agreed that this work needed to align with the racial audit work to ensure that that the approach is Goldsmiths specific and responds to the College's needs.
- 15.6 It was reported that the size and the scope of the project would, in part, be based on the amount raised. The more that could be raised, the more that could be achieved.

**Action:**

- 15.7 Remove references to 'Every student matters.'

---

## 16 Committees of the Board

---

**Received:**

- 16.1 Membership of Committees of the Board 2020-21 (19-542)
- 16.2 Review of terms of reference of College Committees with responsibilities relating to quality and standards, including the future of the Regulations Working Group from 2020-21 (19-543)

**Noted:**

- 16.3 It was recommended that the Dean of Students was included on the composition of Council to effectively representative student experience issues.
- 16.4 The committees of Academic Board had been reviewed to ensure they were fit for purpose in monitoring and evaluating issues properly and with sufficient accountability.
- 16.5 The changes aimed to ensure that committees had the right levels of seniority.
- 16.6 The Student Experience Sub-Committee would be dissolved and the business would be absorbed into Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee. This would give the appropriate overview and accountability for student experience; this would include the recommissioning of work relating to student voice work.
- 16.7 The existing Regulations Working Group would be formalised as a committee of Academic Board.
- 16.8 Admissions would become a responsibility of Academic Development Committee which had oversight of programme development.
- 16.9 Academic Board were asked to approve the changes in principle to enable the development of terms of reference and composition over the summer. The changes would be brought to Academic Board in September for final approval.

**Resolved:**

- 16.10 Academic Board would recommend to Council that the Dean of Students would be included on its composition.
- 16.11 Academic Board approved the changes in principle to enable the development of terms of reference and composition over the summer. The changes would be brought to Academic Board in September for final approval.

---

## 17 Academic Regulations

---

**Received:**

- 17.1 Proposals relating to the Exceptional Academic Regulations, the Interruptions process, Assessment Misconduct Policy, the Student Attendance Policy and the Appeals Procedure (19-544)
- 17.2 Amendments to College Policy:
  - a) Extenuating Circumstances Policy (19-545)
  - b) Safeguarding Policy (19-546)

**Noted:**

- 17.3 Academic Board were asked to consider and approve the regulatory and policy changes for 2020-21.
- 17.4 Regulations had been partially suspended to enable the required changes to be delivered and to maintain teaching and learning and good student experience whilst delivering remotely.
- 17.5 In addition, some of the College's policies had been adapted to enable processes to be completed, for example the holding of face to face hearings for academic misconduct. Academic Board asked for clarity on whether in person meetings had to happen. It was suggested that the addition of 'expected or normally' would potentially allow more flexibility.
- 17.6 The Student Attendance Policy aimed to provide a clear definition of engagement. Departments would need to agree what the implementation of the policy looked like at department level based on their programmes.
- 17.7 It was agreed that to ensure effective implementation of policies, they needed to be clearly communicated across the College. Academic colleagues needed to be guided through what was expected of them.
- 17.8 The changes proposed to the Extenuating Circumstances Policy brought together Covid-19 based proposals. It allows students to self-certify and confirmed the expanded definitions within the policy which were agreed in March.
- 17.9 The Student's Union asked whether self-certification could be considered for all academic regulations, as the high threshold for evidence for some policies increased stress to students.
- 17.10 It was reported that a working group had looked at evidence criteria which had then been presented to Quality Standards Sub-Committee. The

changes were recommended for the next academic year and it would be reviewed at the end of the academic year.

- 17.11 Some departments reported that extended deadlines for students were problematic for colleagues within departments as they were already stretched. It was reported that the change to the system was made on the basis of student requests who wanted a single system to engage with.
- 17.12 Academic Board asked whether there were any processes in place for finding out student views on the extenuating circumstances processes. Some departments had received concerns from students who did not understand the revised approach.
- 17.13 The current revisions, previously agreed by Academic Board apply until the end of 2019-20 cohort.
- 17.14 The revised Safeguarding Policy had been revised to provide clearer definitions within the College's responsibility. Academic Board were asked to note their responsibilities within the policy. If approved, Academic Board would receive training to ensure effective implementation of the policy.

**Resolved:**

- 17.15 Approved the proposals relating to the Exceptional Academic Regulations, the Interruptions process, Assessment Misconduct Policy, the Student Attendance Policy and the Appeals Procedure (19-544)
- 17.16 Approved Amendments to College Policies:
- 17.17 Approved changes to Extenuating Circumstances Policy (19-545)
- 17.18 The Safeguarding Policy was approved for recommendation to Council for final approval.

---

## 18 Student Protection Plan

---

**Received:**

- 18.1 Revised Student Protection Plan for recommendation to Council (19-547)

**Noted:**

- 18.2 Academic Board noted the Office for Students consultation and the next steps the College would take following confirm of the outcomes.

---

## 19 Department Development Planning

---

**Received:**

- 19.1 Department Development Plans relating to the 2019-20 academic session (19-527)
- 19.2 Recommendation of a revised DDP process for 2020-21 (19-527)

**Noted:**

- 19.3 The College were looking at a revised approach to better support student improvement.
- 19.4 Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee supported the revised implementation and amendments to the process. The changes intended to support and fully engagement with the departments. Guidance and templates were being adjusted to enable this. Departments would be asked for feedback to make final amendments to the revised guidance.
- 19.5 Academic Board asked for clarity on the timeline for the process to ensure it aligned with the rest of work required of departments.
- 19.6 Departments who had undertaken the DDP process this academic year would be supported to ensure actions were taken forward.

**Resolved:**

- 19.7 The recommendations to revise the DPP process were approved.

---

## 20 Department Board Reporting Process

---

**Received:**

- 20.1 Effectiveness of the Department Board reporting process via Impact Reports to Academic Board (19-548)

**Noted:**

- 20.2 It was reported that Department Boards are required to report to Academic Board and advise them on academic priorities and risks. Historically Boards have not reported consistently and issues have not been highlighted. The reports are intended to improve practice and collectively respond to risks.
- 20.3 Academic Board needs to use the reports to challenge performance and hold each other to account. Academic Board needs to be assured of the work underway in departments.
- 20.4 Academic Board were concerned about the consistency of reporting and the transparency of the reports. It was reported that Academic Board were responsible for academic standards across the College so it was important that these reports enabled a loop of communication.

**Action:**

- 20.5 Review process and identify next steps for Department Board reports.
- 20.6 Work with departments to obtain feedback on the DDP process.

---

## 21 Department Boards

---

**Received:**

- 21.1 Reports from Department Boards outlining activity, impact and risks for escalation:
- a) Anthropology, December 2019 (19-549) and March 2020 (19-550)
  - b) Music, May 2020 (19-551)
  - c) Visual Cultures, March 2020 (19-552)

**Noted:**

- 21.2 Academic Board noted the reports from Department Boards and the updates provided.

**Action:**

- 21.3 Review process and identify next steps for Department Board reports.
- 

## 22 Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee

---

**Received:**

- 22.1 Report from Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee in July (19-553)

**Noted:**

- 22.2 The meeting had been postponed from May to July to enable progression of business. The priorities of the Committee had been re-evaluated to ensure College business could be progressed.
- 22.3 It was important that the departments engaged with the enhancement work to improve provision.
- 

## 23 Academic Development Committee

---

**Received:**

- 23.1 Report from Academic Development Committee in June (19-554)

**Noted:**

- 23.2 It was reported that the offer holders had not yet been responded to.
- 

## 24 Research and Enterprise Committee

---

**Received:**

- 24.1 Report from Research and Enterprise Committee in May (19-555)

**Noted:**

- 24.2 The impact of Covid 19 was not yet known however the College had reviewed the options for extending research projects.
  - 24.3 The metrics and narrative were important for succeeding in the KEF. The Committee had received and considered early drafts of the public and community engagement report.
  - 24.4 There were pros and cons in relation to the changed deadline for the REF, additional guidelines from Research England was due to published shortly.
- 

## **25 Programme changes 2019-20**

---

**Received:**

- 25.1 An update on the delivery of programmes in 2019-20 (19-556)
- 

## **26 Programme (re)approval process 2020-21**

---

**Received:**

- 26.1 The process for (re)approving programmes for delivery from 2020-21 approved by delegated authority to Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee (19-557)

**Noted:**

- 26.2 Academic Board noted process for (re)approving programmes for delivery from 2020-21 approved by delegated authority to Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee (19-557).
- 

## **27 Programmes approved, terminated and significantly amended**

---

**Received:**

- 27.1 Annual report to Academic Board on programmes approved, terminated and significantly amended in 2019-20 (19-531).

**Noted:**

- 27.2 Members of Academic Board had asked for the report to be starred as they were concerned about the processes in place to change or terminate programmes. The concerns aligned with fears over job losses and the list of programmes report did not appear to include all the programmes being discussed in departments which furthered concerns of lack of process.
- 27.3 Members reported that colleagues in departments had been informed that their programmes would be suspended and they were not listed on the report for Academic Board and therefore there was confusion. In addition,

- there were some programmes on the list with firm offer acceptances which meant students would be turned away which seemed counter intuitive.
- 27.4 Academic Board discussed the criteria that resulted in programmes being suspended or terminated, recruitment was not the only factor. It was important that student experience was also considered.
- 27.5 It was reported that any suspended or terminated programme followed the College's policy which involved conversations with the Head of School and Heads of Department. It included review by Programme Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
- 27.6 All programmes with less than ■ students were asked to be reviewed by the Head of Department, in conversation with the Head of School and Pro-Warden Learning and Teaching.
- 27.7 Academic Board asked for an overview of all programmes amended, suspended and terminated, the rationale and whether the changes were supported by the Head of Department.
- 27.8 It was reported that considerations for sustainable teaching had to be made in light of the College's financial position, especially post-Covid. All programmes needed to be considered to ensure strong student experience, workload for colleagues and sustainability of the institution.
- 27.9 Colleagues expressed concern that a one-size-fits-all approach was being implemented and that some potentially viable programmes would be closed.
- 27.10 Concerns were expressed that discontinuity in recruitment and offers for students would result in severe reputational consequences which would impact the Institution's prospects as a whole.
- 27.11 Departments expressed concerns about communications to offer holders and the impact this would have on the relationship with students. Decisions about the closure of modules and programmes was negative to students and would ultimately impact their experience at Goldsmiths.
- 27.12 It was reported that very few PGT programmes expected to close and some of the UG programmes were looking at being suspended for 1 year only. Concerns were expressed that even suspended a programme for a year would impact the experience of students wanting to pursue them.
- 27.13 Heads of Department reported that at times they felt that the direction from committees meant they had not had a choice but to close programmes.
- 27.14 Academic Board noted the annual report to Academic Board on programmes approved, terminated and significantly amended in 2019-20.

**Action:**

- 27.15 Bring a report to next Academic Board outlining the programmes that had been suspended or terminated, the rationale and whether they were supported by the Head of Department.

---

## 28 National Student Survey 2020

---

**Received:**

28.1 NSS participation rates 2020 (19-530)

**Noted:**

28.2 Academic Board noted the NSS participation rates 2020.

---

## 29 Module evaluation: 2019-20 activities and a revised timeline

---

**Received:**

29.1 An overview of module evaluations in 2019-20 and a revised timeline for fully implementing the revised process in 2020-21 (19-559)

**Noted:**

29.2 Academic Board noted the overview of module evaluations in 2019-20 and revised timeline for fully implementing the revised process in 2020-21.

---

## 30 Research Excellence Framework

---

**Received:**

30.1 Update on preparations for Goldsmiths' submission to REF 2021 (19-560)

**Noted:**

30.2 Academic Board noted the update on preparations for Goldsmiths' submission to REF 2021. The Board thanked the team for their hard work and positive progress with this work.

---

## 31 Academic Board representation on Council

---

**Received:**

31.1 The outcome of the election of Academic Board member(s) to Council

**Noted:**

31.2 It was reported that Anna Furse and Naomi Thompson would be members of Council from 1 September 2020 for a term of 3 years.

---

## 32 Annual Review of LASALLE College of the Arts

---

**Received:**

- 32.1 LASALLE College of the Arts, Singapore annual review report from March 2020 (19-561)

**Noted:**

- 32.2 Academic Board noted the LASALLE College of the Arts, Singapore annual review report.
- 

## 33 Any other business

---

**Noted:**

- 33.1 It was noted that the Collective Change Report will be received at the September meeting of the Board, when all colleagues will have had time to consider the content. Receiving the Report in September did not prevent the Report from being discussed in the meantime
- 

## 34 Retirements from the Board

---

**Received:**

- 34.1 Retirements from the Board.

**Noted:**

- 34.2 Academic Board noted the below retirements:
- Joe Leam (SU)
  - Maggie Pitfield (Education)
  - John Price (History)
  - Joanna Zylinska (MCCS)
  - Jasna Dragovic Soso (Politics)
  - Kevin Jones (STaCS)
  - Padraig Kirwan (ECL)
  - Rajyashree Pandey (Politics)
  - Kierin Offlands (SU)
  - Alan Pickering (Dean of the Graduate School)