

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

COUNCIL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 June 2018

Present: Mr Patrick Loughrey (in the Chair), Professor Vikki Bell, Professor Lucia Boldrini, Professor Rebecca Cassidy, Mr Martin Conreen, Ms Eva Crossan-Jory, Professor Mark d' Inverno, Dr Jasna Dragovic Soso, Professor Anna Furse, Mr Ian Gardiner, Ms Annie Guo, Professor Elisabeth Hill, Mr Kevin Jones, Mr Steve Keirl, Dr Rodger Kibble, Mr Gerald Lidstone, Dr Betty Liebovich, Ms Taylor McGraa, Professor Richard Noble, Professor Simon O'Sullivan, Professor David Oswell, Ms Maggie Pitfield, Dr John Price, Dr Caroline Rix, Professor Marsha Rosengarten, Dr Anamik Saha, Ms Astrid Schmetterling, Mr Paul Stocks, Dr Erica Wald, Ms Zoe Walshe, Professor Joanna Zylinska.

Apologies: Professor Michael Archer, Professor Claudia Bernard, Professor Frank Bond, Professor Andy Bremner, Dr Lisa Busby, Dr Debbie Custance, Mr Adrian De La Court, Dr Henrike Donner, Mr Conrad Heyns, Ms Wei Jin, Dr Pdraig Kirwan, Ms Karen Matthewman, Professor Osita Okagbue, Dr Rajyashree Pandey, Professor Alan Pickering, Dr Ragupathy Venkatachalam, Mr Matthew Ward, Mr Joe Williams, Professor Robert Zimmer.

In attendance: Mr Leo Appleton, Mr Kieron Broadhead, Mr John Drever, Ms Tara Mariwany, Mr Ian Pleace, Dr Juliet Sprake (item 10), Ms Helen Watson, Mr Ben Wilson, Mrs Cathryn Thompson (Secretary).

OPEN BUSINESS

1 MINUTES

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2018 be approved.

2 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

Noted:

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

3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Noted:

That as the last meeting of the Board was not quorate the decisions taken had the status of Chair's action until confirmed by the full meeting of the Board. The proposed change to the name of the department of Media and Communications to 'Media, Communications and Cultural Studies, though approved at the meeting (item 7 in the minutes), would now go to the 28 June Council meeting for approval.

4 WARDEN'S REPORT

Noted:

- (i) An oral report from the Warden on issues of concern and interest to the College was received. Both the UCU and UUK had announced their nominations for the experts who will sit on the Joint Panel reviewing the latest scheme valuation, to be chaired by Joanne Segars OBE, who brings a long history managing public sector pension pots. It was hoped that the national bodies were to be successful in convincing the USS Trustee and The Pension Regulator that the steps in place would avoid the need for emergency contribution levels from staff and employers from next April. Further updates would be provided when available.
- (ii) The UCEA 2% base pay increase, with an additional increase for those earning less than £24k, along with additional annual pay progression increases (totaling around 5% for the majority of staff), were noted by the Board. Member views were currently being sought and updates would follow when available.
- (iii) The Post 18 Funding Review drew HE and FE together with a review panel Chaired by Philip Augar. Goldsmiths made a submission last month, calling on the Government to reassess the "marketised view of higher education which calculated worth purely in terms of net economic value", and explained that the College instead saw the value of "education for education's sake". Goldsmiths' response also highlighted the value of the creative skills nurtured by arts institutions, arguing that quite apart from the economic case, creative sectors helped develop a 'good society' more broadly. A number of specific policy ideas had been proposed, drawing upon a range of sources and internal expertise, including papers published by Goldsmiths' own Political Economy Research Centre. Goldsmiths' submission was accessible on the website and Goldmine. The Panel's findings would be published in autumn, with the Government's plans to follow early in the new calendar year.

- (iv) The College had submitted a response to the Department for Education's consultation on the subject-level TEF process. The Government had stated its intention to proceed with the first publication in 2019-20, following a further pilot next year to build on the results of the current piloting of two alternative models and the recent consultation. Goldsmiths' response focused on institutions having the freedom to resubmit for a review of their subject-level rating when they felt such a reassessment was due, rather than remaining with a particular rating for up to 6 years. Goldsmiths also argued that the proposed creative arts grouping be split into more specific subject areas, as these disciplines rarely shared facilities or teaching in the way that other subject groupings did. The College suggested that institutions should be able to make more than one submission against a subject category, as is permitted with units of assessment in the Research Excellence Framework. It was noted that Melanie Rimmer had written an article on WonkHE, which provided a useful introduction to these concerns and how they might be addressed. The College would await the Government's response to the consultation and the results of the current pilot in the coming months.
- (v) Preparation for the Research Excellence Framework (REF), led by Professor David Oswell as Pro-Warden for Research, continued ahead of the census date. REF work was guided by a Strategy Group with high level academic representation from across the Schools, and supported by Jane Boggan, Research Excellence Manager. Academic colleagues had already contributed considerable input to an initial review of around 50 draft impact case studies over three, day-long School events, which were also supported by external reviewers. The degree of maturity of each impact case study had been considered. It was noted that some departments' preparation work with case studies had real potential. However, others were less strong and required further development and consideration. The aim of the review was to give a clear sense of what the College would need to do to develop and refine the material for submission. The next point of review of REF outputs was scheduled for October/November 2018, with protocols and systems to assist academic colleagues in this endeavor currently in preparation. The review would involve Directors of Research working with colleagues to identify their best outputs, with a view to identifying those areas where more support might be required to optimise the quality of Goldsmiths' research submitted to the next exercise. The Draft Code of Practice would be circulated in Autumn, pending comment from the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel. One academic Head of Department queried whether the timeline for the next review was realistic and could be met by departments. This would be discussed further at next week's REF meeting. However, the Warden stressed the need to complete the exercise on time and noted that some other institutions had already completed this process and were ahead of the timeline set by Goldsmiths. Departments were in control of how they might undertake the review exercise and were encouraged to be realistic on where they and colleagues stood on the type and quality of outputs available.
- (vi) The Board were informed that the scale of the challenge for undergraduate recruitment was immense, with no room for complacency. While overall applications were up (approximately [REDACTED]) against the same point last year, Goldsmiths were seeing challenges in terms of UK/EU undergraduate conversion and latest projections suggested that the College would enter clearing with up to [REDACTED] fewer firm

acceptances than hoped for (about [REDACTED] off target). The first UK/EU acceptance deadline passed on 4 May, so Departments were now asked to focus on the conversion of those applicants who either didn't have a decision, or who held an offer and had not yet made their decision. International undergraduate recruitment looked more positive with a [REDACTED] increase in applications and a [REDACTED] increase in firm acceptances. The Warden noted that the College could not rely on Clearing to make up the shortfall, and that the College was competing against other institutions who were unaffected by other factors, including the recent industrial action. The Students' Union challenged whether the strike action had impacted on student recruitment, as their experience of the application process when they applied had not involved academic departments, only central administration. It was confirmed that the recruitment process at Goldsmiths had evolved since this time, with events such as applicant visit days being cancelled this year as a direct result of the industrial action and a five-week period of little or no communication.

- (vii) Home/EU postgraduate recruitment was broadly stable against last year, however, a positive note was a third more international applications and a third more firm international acceptances had been received. There was still further work to be done by academic departments with regards to conversion, however, as there were currently over [REDACTED] applicants holding an offer and a further [REDACTED] outstanding decisions. Departments were asked to focus their attention on providing decisions, and maximising offers and conversion wherever possible.
- (viii) It was queried whether the College should explore opportunities around the introduction of interdisciplinary degree programmes. It was noted that this had been considered some time ago but that research showed students preferred programmes that offered a blend of theory and practice. The constraint at Goldsmiths was that much interest was expressed on already oversubscribed programmes, such as media practice, theatre and fine art. Student dissatisfaction on joint degrees, whilst acknowledged to be different, was noted. The Warden confirmed that Academic Development Committee was the appropriate forum for further discussion on interdisciplinary degree programmes.
- (ix) The Warden was disappointed to report that Goldsmiths had slipped in two of the main domestic league tables: the Complete University Guide (from 51st to 62nd), and the Guardian's University League Table (from 64th to 76th). Whatever limitations might be acknowledged of such league tables, it was nevertheless the case that many potential applicants and their parents or sponsors take them seriously. The main issues in the Complete University Guide related to graduate outcomes and student satisfaction and the biggest issues holding us back in the Guardian were graduate outcomes and non-continuation rates. This was a collective problem we faced at Goldsmiths, which we needed to get right, particularly with declining entrants at age 18 and the lure of the Russell Group. Goldsmiths needed to find effective ways of meeting student needs, ensuring they leave the College satisfied and with the career outcomes they themselves aspire to. More of the detail behind Goldsmiths' drop in these tables would be reviewed at WAG next week, which would provide an opportunity to discuss relatively straightforward ways of improving the College's relative position.

- (x) The Warden concluded by informing the Board of some good news. In the QS World University Rankings, which had been published that very day, Goldsmiths had moved up two places to 396th. The rise was in the face of the huge effort many institutions had put into maintaining or improving their position, and was mainly due to Goldsmiths' relative improvement in the number of citations per faculty and academic reputation survey scores. The Warden expressed thanks to all colleagues who focused their efforts this year on boosting participation in the survey by members of the academy overseas. It had demonstrably had an impact and showed what could be done when we put our minds to it.

5 MITIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIAL ACTION

Received:

An update on mitigation of the effects of industrial action on the student experience and on learning outcomes (17-507) and Guidance for Board of Examiners for approval (17-507 – Appendix A).

Noted:

- (i) The Deputy Warden reminded the Board of its responsibility for maintaining and monitoring the academic standards of the College, and for monitoring teaching quality assurance issues. The mitigation of the effects of industrial action on the student experience and on learning outcomes, quality and standards was outlined in the paper.
- (ii) It was noted that the majority of Departments had provided detailed information to the Strike Mitigation Group on how the effects of industrial action on learning outcomes had been mitigated, following a centrally agreed process. Members were reminded that mitigation must be recorded very clearly and implemented in accordance with set procedures, which would ensure the College remained in line with the Office for Students, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and the Quality Assurance Agency requirements, as well as in accordance with Consumer Laws.
- (iii) The College was using its standard procedures for dealing with complaints, with supplementary guidance for complaints which were specifically strike related. Complaints at Stage 2 were being considered by the Strike Mitigation Group.
- (iv) The Guidance for Boards of Examiners appended to the document for the Board's approval provided a helpful update to existing practice. Information relating to the conduct of Exam Boards in periods of Industrial Action had been included. The suggested statement in the Guidance for Boards of Examiners on mitigation should be used and customised by all Departments within the minutes.
- (v) The Students' Union informed the Board that some students remained unclear how to use the Complaints Procedure in the context of strike action and requested clarification from the College as to whether it would be making financial compensation to those affected. The Registrar and Secretary confirmed that the

complaints information on the website, and specifically the FAQ section, had been updated for some months now. The complaints process followed the same basic format but the form for students to complete had been amended to better fit complaints which related to the impact of strike action.

- (vi) The College was not in a position to provide an answer on whether it would provide financial recompense, as each complaint was being considered on a case-by-case basis and there may be individual instances whereby this might be appropriate. There was, however, no causal calculation on cancelled sessions and fee rebate. The Strike Mitigation Group was reviewing the content of each complaint, cross referring it with the information provided by Departments on mitigation taken, reviewing programme handbooks and learning outcomes, and checking provisions relating to Force Majeure. National guidance was being followed and the College was clear on its position if students felt unable to cross the picket line.
- (vii) The Students' Union were advised to direct students with queries to the College website and if any specific piece of information was missing then to advise us so that it could be updated. The deadline for receiving Stage 1 complaints from students was confirmed to be 22 June 2018, which was an extension beyond the normal timeframe.

Resolved:

Revised guidance for Boards of Examiners (17-507 – Appendix A) were approved with immediate effect, subject to some minor textual amendments following recent feedback from Departmental Business Managers.

6 STUDENT EXPERIENCE WORKSTREAM OUTCOMES

Received:

Outcomes of the three Student Experience Workstreams (17-508).

Noted:

- (i) An update on three projects to enable improvements to the student experience, which have been running this academic year, was noted:
 - Organisation and Management
 - Assessment and Feedback
 - Graduate Outcomes

A huge amount of work had taken place, with the responsibility for its continual development lying with everybody. The Registrar and Secretary expressed thanks to all involved in the workstreams to date, including students and staff in academic departments and the centre. A real sense of collaboration was taking place, which must remain going forward as the outcome of this work had the potential to have a really positive and notable impact on the student experience.

- (ii) Many elements of the projects would now move into 'business as usual' and ongoing work. However, Academic Board would continue to receive updates on the recommendations, as outlined in the timetable contained in the paper.

7 STUDENT FEEDBACK AND MODULE EVALUATION

Received:

Terms of Reference for a review of Student Feedback and Module Evaluation (17-509).

Noted:

- (i) The Board considered the draft Terms of Reference proposing a review of student feedback mechanisms and module evaluation, to ensure a clear understanding of activities relating to the student voice in QA processes and a coordinated approach to responding to feedback received. Recent reports available (e.g. KPMG audit of 3 Departments and Departmental Representatives Annual Project) and staff/student feedback received highlight the benefits of undertaking this review, and would be considered as part of the review.
- (ii) It was not necessarily proposed that existing feedback mechanisms be amended, but rather pulled together in a more coherent and connected way, whilst protecting the individuality of Goldsmiths and its disciplines. It would review how student representatives were to be supported at every stage of their role, how Staff Student Fora (SSF) should operate effectively, the next steps for module evaluation following the recent pilot of a centralised approach, what surveys operate annually or periodically, and how, where and by whom the feedback loop is closed and sound decisions for action taken.
- (iii) The timeframe for completing the review of student feedback and module evaluation varied for each type of activity. Some were to be completed by September and December, whilst the review of module evaluation and SSF were longer pieces of work.

8 BAME STUDENT PROGRESSION AND OUTCOMES – UPDATE ON WORK UNDERTAKEN

Received:

An update on work to address the BAME attainment gap (17-454R).

Noted:

- (i) Three priority areas had been identified by the working group: Goldstart/Welcome Week/Induction; SU Clubs and Societies; and Learning and Teaching. It was noted that the third priority area was much a broader multi-pronged project, however, the timeline for reviewing and addressing activities relating to SU Clubs and Societies was much shorter.

- (ii) A large number of people at Goldsmiths were engaging in this work, with staff and student focus groups planned to gather a wide range of views and to ensure outcomes are meaningful to Goldsmiths.
- (iii) It was pleasing to note that members of the Board had seen many activities instigated by students themselves, such as in the Music and Sociology departments. These 'bottom-up' initiatives should be gathered and recorded as part of this process.

9 STUDENT DATA QUALITY

Received:

The Student Data Quality Policy (17-510).

Noted:

- (i) The Board was reminded of the College's responsibility to ensure it holds accurate and valid student data. The Data Management Leadership Group had considered the new Policy at its January meeting, and recommended it for approval by Academic Board.
- (ii) Staff were reminded not to hold parallel records locally and to engage with the forthcoming training for staff.

Resolved:

To approve the Student Data Quality Policy (17-510).

10 REGULATIONS

(a) Regulations Working Group

Received:

An update from the College's Regulatory Framework Working Group (17-511)

Noted:

- (i) The Board thanked Juliet Sprake for her work as Chair to the Regulations Working Group, and for providing the latest update on progress.
- (ii) The need for a clear process for proposing and approving changes to regulations going forward was noted, as well as clarity over what was deemed to be a 'regulation', 'policy', 'procedure' or 'guidance'. It was noted that it would not be necessary for every Regulation to have a 'policy', 'procedure' or 'guidance' document underpinning it, as in some instances, such as External Examining, a Policy is sufficient. The Academic Manual currently under development would be presented in

such a way that any accompanying policies, procedures and/or guidance documents relevant to a Regulation would be 'linked' and easily accessible.

- (iii) Further development of the Academic Manual in the coming academic year would now be handed over to the Director of Student Experience and Academic Registrar, along with populating any supporting policy, procedure and guidance to the Regulations, ensuring full ownership of each going forward. A full Academic Manual would be launched in September 2019, however, it was noted that if a regulatory change caused 'no detriment' to students then there would be no reason why it could not be introduced with immediate effect.

(b) Resit penalties

Received:

An update on resit penalties (17-512).

Noted:

- (i) At its April meeting the Quality and Standards Sub-Committee (QSSC) considered a proposed change to the resit regulation from the Regulations Working Group (RWG). It was noted that there continued to be a difference of opinion on the best regulation for the appropriate penalty being applied to resits (specifically no penalty, penalty applied or mark capped). However, a greater understanding of the need for an agreed, unified approach was now evident.
- (ii) Following consideration of the data now available (circulated to Academic Board as Appendix B), QSSC recommended a postponement of consideration of the proposed resit regulation until the full cohort data was available for consideration. QSSC was of the opinion that the full implications of the proposed resit regulation must be considered, so that an informed decision could be made, with a clear audit trail of any outcomes reached. The Committee was also alert to external considerations, such as the national focus on perceived grade inflation.
- (iii) Dr Juliet Sprake, Chair of the Regulations Working Group, confirmed agreement with the decision to postpone. Whilst the RWG had looked at an early dataset on the impact of changes relating to the new resit regulation and that this had not demonstrated grade inflation, the analysis of a full dataset would be useful. It was noted that the module structure in some disciplines was the underlying cause of the issue, with module credit values varying from 15-120 across the College, hence the need to apply any penalty or capping to the 'examination' rather than the 'module'.

(c) MSci awards

Received:

Amendments to the classification of MSci awards (17-513).

Noted:

That the amendments rectified an inconsistency in the programme documentation, to which all relevant staff and students had been consulted and agreed to the proposed approach.

Resolved:

To approve amendments to the classification of MSci awards (17-513).

(d) External Examining Policy

Received:

Amendments to the College's External Examining policy (17-414), identifiable in the document by track changes.

Resolved:

To approve amendments to the College's External Examining policy (17-414).

(e) Research Degrees examination outcomes

Received:

Amendments to Research Degrees examination outcomes (17-423R).

Noted:

- (i) Following extensive consideration at Graduate School Board and the May 2018 Research and Enterprise Committee, the proposal to remove the 'Pass subject to major amendments (6 months)' PhD outcome and replacing it with a 'Not Pass, major amendments required (represent for examination within 12 months)' option was considered by the Board. It was noted that the proposed amendment would work much better in practice and brought Goldsmiths' outcomes in line with standards elsewhere.
- (ii) There was a query as to how timeframes for completion might affect part-time students. However it was noted that all students shared the same status post viva as they ceased to pay fees. Therefore, the same PhD outcomes would apply irrespective of whether they had previously been registered as a full- or part-time student.
- (iii) The move from a 'Pass' to a 'Not Pass' in the proposed amendment was discussed and specifically the psychological impact that it might have.
- (iv) It was noted that it was unclear in the document how many times further amendment could be given, which was to be resolved in the development of Goldsmiths' Postgraduate Research Regulations.

- (v) No visa implications were to be expected as a result of the proposed amendment.

Resolved:

To approve amendments to Research Degrees examination outcomes from 2018-19 onwards (17-423R).

11 STUDENTS' UNION ANNUAL IMPACT REPORT 2017-18

Received:

A report from the Goldsmiths Students' Union (SU) reviewing 2017-18 and looking ahead to 2018-19 (17-514).

Noted:

- (i) The Chair thanked the SU for their report on activities, relating to the Board's remit, this academic session. It was noted that the SU was seriously more engaged and that this was reflected and evident within the report. The report would be very informative to Council too.
- (ii) The SU President identified student feedback as a key area of attention, with a notably higher number of applications received for becoming a Student Representative. Academic communities had also seen increased involvement of students, the largest ever Student Assembly was held, membership of sports and societies was up 70%, and the largest number of participants in welcome week was noted. Other areas of focus had included alternative careers week, the BAME attainment gap, sexual violence, involvement in governance structures, teaching awards, and providing advice to students, particularly relating to industrial action.

12 UNIVERSITY OF LONDON BILL

Received:

A proposed amendment to the Charter and Statutes (17-515).

Noted:

- (i) Minimal further amendments to the College's constitutional documents were proposed in response to feedback from the Privy Council, the Department for Education and the Charity Commission;
- (ii) The error in the new final Article 24 clause of the document would be amended to state 'Goldsmiths'.

Resolved:

To recommend to Council for approval the amendments to the Charter and Statutes (17-515).

13 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Resolved:

To appoint the following External Examiners:

Dr [REDACTED]
Senior Lecturer, University of [REDACTED]
MA Queer History
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Dr [REDACTED]
Associate Professor/Reader in Fine Art
University of [REDACTED]
MA Digital Culture (2017-18)
MA Computational Media and Digital Culture (2018-19 onwards)
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Dr [REDACTED]
Senior Lecturer, [REDACTED]
Integrated Degree in Psychology
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Dr [REDACTED]
Head of Art, University of [REDACTED]
BA History of Art/ BA Fine Art and History of Art/ BA Curating
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Ms [REDACTED]
Programme Lead and Senior Lecturer
University of [REDACTED]
MSc/PG Dip Cognitive Behavioural Therapy
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Dr [REDACTED]
Senior Lecturer, University of [REDACTED]
MA Tourism and Cultural Policy / MA Events and Experience Management
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Dr [REDACTED]
Associate Professor in Colonial Urban History
University of [REDACTED]
MA Politics, Development and The Global South
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Mr [REDACTED]
Taught Postgraduate Coordinator, School of Art & Design
[REDACTED] University
BA Interior Design (LASALLE)
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

Ms [REDACTED]
Reader in Film, School of Media, Film & Music
University of [REDACTED]
MA Filmmaking (Screen Documentary)
From 1st January 2018 to 31st August 2021

14 RESEARCH INTEGRITY ANNUAL STATEMENT 2017-18

Resolved:

To approve, following scrutiny by Research and Enterprise Committee, the Research Integrity Annual Statement 2017-18 (17-469).

15 NSS

Received:

A report on NSS completion rates (17-517).

16 LEARNING TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT STRATEGY: OPERATIONAL STRATEGY UPDATE

Received:

An update on the operational aspects of the Goldsmiths Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy 2017-21 (17-281R).

17 ELECTED MEMBERS OF ACADEMIC BOARD

Noted:

The elected Academic Departmental Members on the Board and the election of Academic Board members to Council from 1 September 2018 (17-518).

18 APPOINTMENT OF STUDENTS' UNION SABBATICAL OFFICERS

Noted:

The appointment of Students' Union Sabbatical Officers for 2018-19:

President	Joseph Tema (JT)
Education Officer	Taylor McGraa
Campaigns and Activities Officer	Joe Leam
Welfare and Diversity Officer	Mona Mounir

19 ANNUAL PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORTS 2016-17

Received:

The Undergraduate (17-285 and 17-457) and Postgraduate Annual Programme Review summary reports (17-455) for on-campus provision, and the annual report relating to University of London Worldwide programmes (17-463) and Collaborative Provision (17-287).

20 ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT - LASALLE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS

Received:

The LASALLE College of the Arts, Singapore annual review report from the Collaborative Provision Business Manager (17-432).

21 PERIODIC REVIEW

Received:

- (i) The Periodic Review Report and initial Action Plan response for the Periodic Review of the English Language Centre, undertaken on 18 March 2018 (17-410).
- (ii) The update on the progress of the Action Plan for the Periodic Review of LASALLE, undertaken between 27 February and 8 March 2017 (17-411).

22 ANNUAL REPORT TO ACADEMIC BOARD ON PROGRAMMES APPROVED, TERMINATED AND AMENDED

Received:

The annual report to Academic Board on Programmes Approved, Terminated and Amended in 2017-18 (17-467).

23 ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMMES BY PROFESSIONAL, STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BODIES

Received:

The accreditation or continued approval of programmes by Professional, Regulatory and Statutory Bodies during 2017-18 (17-519).

24 GRADUATION CEREMONIES

Noted:

The dates of Graduation Ceremonies for Summer 2018, as follows:

Wednesday 18 July 2018
Thursday 19 July 2018
Friday 20 July 2018

And Winter Ceremonies, as follows:

Monday 17 December 2018
Tuesday 18 December 2018
Wednesday 19 December 2018

25 VISITING PROFESSORS AND FELLOWS

Received:

Recent appointments of Visiting Professors and Fellows (17-520).

26 COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2018-19

Resolved:

To recommend to Council dates of meetings of College Committees 2018-19 (17-521).

27 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

Noted:

Minutes from the following committees:

Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee – 21 February 2018 (17-522)
Academic Development Committee – 6 March 2018 (17-523)
Research and Enterprise Committee – 1 March 2018 (17-524)

28 RETIREMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Noted:

That Rebecca Cassidy, Robert Zimmer, Matt Ward, Lucia Boldrini, Ian Gardiner, Andy Bremner, Lisa Busby, Claudia Bernard, Astrid Schmetterling, Eva Crossan Jory, Taylor McGraa, Joe Williams and Zoe Walshe were retiring from the Board and were thanked for their contributions. Tara Mariwany was also thanked for her contribution to the Board's business this academic year.

29 FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted:

Dates of meetings in 2018-19 as follows:

Wednesday 12 September 2018

Wednesday 5 December 2018

Wednesday 20 March 2019

Wednesday 5 June 2019

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