

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

COUNCIL

ACADEMIC BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2006

Present: Professor Geoffrey Crossick (Chair), Professor Dennis Atkinson, Mr John Backwell, Dr Herb Blumberg, Ms Hannah Bullivant, Dr Philip Broadhead, Dr Marie-Claude Canova-Green (*vice* Dr Josh Cohen), Dr Simon Cohn, Dr Steve Cottrell (*vice* Mr Keith Potter), Dr Basem El-Haddadeh, Dr Richard Grayson, Dr Janet Hand, Ms Jennifer Huseman, Dr John Hutnyk (*vice* Professor Scott Lash), Dr Helen Jones, Mr Gerald Lidstone, Professor Celia Lury, Professor Simon McVeigh, Ms Mary Nixon, Mr Larry O'Carroll, Dr David Oswell, Professor Carrie Paechter, Professor Alan Pickering, Dr Len Platt, Professor Nirmala Rao, Mr Terry Rosenberg, Dr Gareth Stanton, Ms Joan Turner, Professor Robert Zimmer

Apologies: Dr Sophie Day, Mr Barry Douglas, Professor Michael Dutton, Mr Sam Fisher, Professor Janis Jefferies, Ms Astrid Schmetterling, Professor Maria Shevtsova

In attendance: Director of Resources and Planning, Academic Registrar, Deputy Academic Registrar, Head of Quality, Head of Secretariat, Head of Learning and Teaching

OPEN BUSINESS

16 MINUTES

Resolved:

to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2006 subject to minute 7c being amended so that the last sentence reads "It was also felt that some students might have been lost to other institutions due to slow paper processing"

17 WARDEN'S REPORT

Received:

an oral report from the Warden on the details of the important changes within the University of London

Noted:

- i) that following the major crisis last year when the future of the University of London had looked uncertain due to doubts as to its role expressed by Imperial, UCL, and LSE; the sense of a lack of direction and confidence; and the incomprehensibly unfavourable QAA report, a number of Heads of Colleges had taken the initiative to work with the Vice-Chancellor in taking forward various changes. A small working group had been established consisting of four Heads of College, including the Warden at Goldsmiths, and four independent Council members to address the whole issue of the shape and governance of the University

- ii) that the University of London had been very significant for Goldsmiths. It was less than 20 years since Goldsmiths became a full College, a major moment in its history, and since then the remarkable development of the College had been to a significant extent reliant upon the University, its membership, the brand it gave, and the confidence it provided. It was possible that as a consequence there had developed a culture of overdependence, and that full independence in 1994 came too soon after 1988 and did not have the same impact for Goldsmiths as it did for other Colleges
- iii) that it was now necessary to establish how and in what ways the University of London mattered to Goldsmiths. It did matter but it cost money, and Goldsmiths needed to ensure that it benefited from those costs by paying for what it needed, getting a better provision of the services, and by using the University to make Goldsmiths stronger, for example by working more closely with other Colleges
- iv) that the Constitutional Review Working Group had proved very successful. It had met for nearly a year coming up with radical changes, and getting broadly consensual support for what would be significant changes. Core to the change would be a redefinition of the purpose of the University with the key imperative being supporting the needs and missions of the Colleges. There would be a redefinition of the relationship between the Colleges and the University, with the two acting as partners in a federation. The Colleges would no longer be subordinate
- v) that there were seven key principles of the newly redefined relationship:
 - a) that the role of the University was to support the missions of the Colleges
 - b) that the strategic direction of the University must be determined by the Colleges collectively
 - c) that there must be good management of the University's assets
 - d) that the Colleges (and this included their staff and students) were the principal stakeholders of the University
 - e) that the University of London brand and associated promotional material and activities needed to be managed effectively
 - f) that the central University was a service provider to the Colleges
 - g) that accountability of the central administrative activities was to the Colleges

These key principles represented a significant change by overcoming the existing position of assumed subordination of the Colleges to the University and of a governance structure modelled on a traditional unitary university. The new governance structure would reflect the new reality. The University would remain as an incorporated legal entity separate from that of the Colleges but would then, together with the Colleges, form a federation and that federation would be by the agreement of fully independent institutions (the Colleges) who would be Colleges of the University by agreement

- vi) that under the new arrangement there would be two key bodies:
 - a) the Collegiate Council, consisting of all Heads of Colleges (19) and chaired by the Vice-Chancellor; this would be the driving force of the University shaping its strategy, policy and proposing budgets etc
 - b) the Board of Trustees consisting of 9 independent members (including the Chair), 4 Heads of Colleges, and the Vice-Chancellor; this would be responsible for financial aspects,

estates and other assets. By law it had to be the governing body, but in reality the Collegiate Council would be the driving force

The Senate and Council would disappear along with a number of existing committees, and staff and students would be represented through their College governance systems. Although there was some debate, it was broadly agreed that the Vice-Chancellor would continue to have a role, giving executive leadership and public presence. There would be a minimal academic committee structure since the Colleges in effect exercised the University's degree awarding powers on their own and many will obtain their own as will Goldsmiths

- vii) that the detail was still to be worked out. Statutes had been drafted, and the next step was to begin detailed work on the Ordinances. Discussions had begun with the DfES, who were broadly content, in preparation for the Privy Council. The Constitutional Review Working Group would continue and report in December to the University of London Council. The new Statutes would go to the Council in March with the new Ordinances going for approval in November 2007, with a view to the full changes being in effect for 2008-2009. The legal and governance issues involved were very substantial, opening major new principles and a new kind of university federation, perhaps even making it possible for other, existing universities, to join if they wished
- viii) that at the time the Warden had joined Goldsmiths, he had found the disagreements around and about the University of London worrying. He had feared that Goldsmiths was too dependent on a dysfunctional body. It was not clear what it was for, and some institutions seemed to be undermining it. This was why he became actively involved in bringing together some key Heads of Colleges to identify the reasons for being part of the University, and to set about the change process needed. The group had worked closely with the Vice-Chancellor who was entirely supportive, and he was now driving forward the agenda for change. The consensus that had largely emerged was impressive, the Colleges were in the University not by compulsion but because the membership helped deliver each College's own mission. The Warden believed the University was important for the delivery of Goldsmiths' mission, its brand, for the provision of a framework for collaboration, and for key services, and for that reason would strongly support it and ensure that membership of the University helped the College in the future
- ix) that the School of Advanced Study had been reviewed by HEFCE twice in the last six years, and the latest report had proposed a three-year extension of funding for the School with no further guarantee after that. However the School had proposed two new institutes and HEFCE thought it unwise to decide on those without addressing the larger question of SAS's future. A final review would begin January, reporting in June, and would result in a decision being made on the longer-term future of the funding of the School. It was believed the School would continue. It was intended that the Dean of the School be a member of the new Collegiate Council
- x) that the term 'University of London' was not in Goldsmiths' legal title but that we would want to retain it for use in our degree certificate, where the legal title of the institution would be used. The term 'University of London' was a registered trademark and it was for the University to permit our use of it. It was likely that the future Goldsmiths' degree certificate would indicate Goldsmiths College as being the awarding body, and that Goldsmiths was a member of the University of London. The Warden had secured agreement from the Heads of Colleges Committee on both of these items.
- xi) that the University would still retain the external programmes and a small number of other areas of awards

18 DEGREE-AWARDING POWERS

Received:

a briefing paper and proposals in relation to the College's application to the Privy Council for degree-awarding powers (R/06/223)

Noted:

- i) the proposed schedule for the process of application for degree-awarding powers. That the College had been due to have its next QAA Institutional Audit in 2009, and the two processes would now be combined and take place in 2008. A critical self-analysis document had to be prepared, which would be similar to the self-evaluation document prepared for institutional audit
- ii) that although the College had *de facto* been awarding degrees itself, the full process of scrutiny and assessment would still apply, but that the QAA would provide help and support during the process, and that the DAP Project Team would be asking departments to assist in providing evidence that would support the College's application, through their departmental committee structures, their monitoring criteria and their strategic planning
- iii) that this would be a demanding process, and it was vital that the College should engage seriously with it at various levels. It was likely to take up a lot of time, and the assistance and cooperation of many staff would be necessary. The Academic Board, as the supreme academic body, would need to be properly involved in the process, and it was important that members engaged with the process as it developed. A progress report would come to the March meeting of the Board, and the Head of Quality would bring proposals to the next meeting as to how the Academic Board could further engage in the process

19 INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT

Received:

the College's report on progress since the QAA Institutional Audit of March 2005 (R/06/258)

Noted:

that there had been substantial developments such as the new Committee structure and planning process

the significant role of the new Learning and Teaching Quality Committee in developing an integrated and strategic approach to quality assurance and enhancement

that the action was not being taken forward independently of other action already being undertaken or discussed in the College, as the audit report tended to raise issues that had already been identified by the institution

that the report provided an important input into the revised strategic planning process and helped to inform the continuous evaluation and review of the College's quality assurance framework

20 UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE CLASSIFICATIONS

Received:

a report on undergraduate degree classifications over the five year period 2002-2006 (R/06/283)

Noted:

- i) that one of the statutory requirements of the Board was to monitor and maintain academic standards, and considering this report was one of the ways in which the Board exercised that requirement
- ii) that for the future it was hoped to provide information on the correlation between entry and exit standards, and to make benchmark comparisons between the College and other members of the 1994 Group. It was reported that there was a move to have the 1994 Group share comparative information on a strictly confidential basis so that useful comparisons could be made
- iii) that the next meeting of Academic Board would consider the recent review of College Board, and this would clarify how and where data such as this would be scrutinised
- iv) the relatively low number of first-class degrees Goldsmiths awarded compared to other Colleges. It was pointed out that the new grading criteria had been introduced to encourage staff to mark to all levels of the marking scale, and that the tendency of the old formula for calculation of honours marks to regress towards the mean should have been addressed by the new formula for classification
- v) that statistical information on universities was currently published on the TQI website, and that it was planned in future to be available through UCAS and be more user-friendly. Universities would have the opportunity to write commentaries on the published data
- vi) that unfortunately an error had appeared in the figures presented in respect of the Department of Politics, and that corrected figures for that department would be circulated with the minutes of the meeting

21 REPORTING OF PLAGIARISM IN THE EXTERNAL COMPUTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROGRAMME

Received:

a proposal regarding payment for the reporting of plagiarism in the external Computing and Information Systems programme (R/06/230)

Noted:

- i) that examiners for this external degree were paid according to the number of scripts marked, with no allowance for individual factors such as reporting on plagiarism. The suggestion was that, where additional work was done to report on cases of plagiarism, the examiner be paid for the extra work involved. The aim was to protect standards by ensuring there was no disincentive to reporting plagiarism. It was pointed out that a better way might be to give the examiners a pay rise overall, but also that this would not address the issue of the additional work undertaken when plagiarism was detected

- ii) that one possible option would be for the examiner to make the case for additional payment subsequent to the detecting of the plagiarism, possibly applying for money from a sum set aside by the External Programme
- iii) that there had been significant concerns raised by the Goldsmiths College Students Union and subsequently by the University of London Union about the apparent approach of 'payment by results' and that the exam markers should be paid an appropriate fee to cover the work involved in detecting plagiarism, which they should be trained and encouraged to detect, and should be supported in this through enhanced technology
- iv) that this proposal related only to the External Programme and not to internal programmes
- v) that it was important that the College should take a proactive stance in giving students advice and support in the avoidance of plagiarism

Resolved:

to reject the recommendation that coursework markers be paid for each case of plagiarism detected, and to ask that an amended paper be submitted to the External Systems Academic Board detailing the problem; containing suggestions on how the issue might be addressed, including the option rejected by the Board; and requesting consideration of the technology that supports the detection of plagiarism

22 RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS ANNUAL REPORT

Received:

the annual report on Recruitment and Admissions (R/06/288)

Noted:

- i) that the admissions for September 2006 entry had been very successful. Realistic offers and flexibility in Clearing had resulted in recruitment to target with no likelihood of suffering claw-back
- ii) that the one area for concern was that of the conversion rate, defined as the proportion of offers made which are firmly accepted, which was decreasing year on year. Some departments had very good conversion rates, and lessons might be learnt from those departments

Resolved:

to congratulate admissions tutors for the excellent results they had achieved

23 DISABILITY EQUALITY SCHEME

Received:

the Disability Equality Scheme (R/06/296)

Noted:

- i) that the College target was to have 10% of its workforce people with disabilities, although the current sector average was 2.3%. The target of 10% was a long-standing one based on the number of disabled people in the working population and on the success of other employers' disability recruitment in the local area. It was not felt to be unrealistic in the long term although

it was pointed out that without an incremental timescale or target setting it seemed unlikely to be achievable

- ii) that part of the difficulty was making staff comfortable with declaring a disability. They needed to be encouraged to declare and reassured that they were not in danger of damage to their jobs or careers by declaring. The definition of disabled was now much wider and included dyslexia and mental health disabilities. There was a need to demonstrate that the College was fully engaged in disability equality, and this would not be reflected if targets were suddenly reduced
- iii) that the cost of providing for disabled staff came out of a department's budget, and a central budget to cover these costs would be a fairer and more equitable way of covering costs. It was pointed out that there was an overall move toward having enabling technology as opposed to disability technology
- iv) that the 'Four Ticks' scheme, whereby candidates for employment who reported a disability were given a measure of favourable treatment, might be worth exploring

Recommended:

that the Disability Equality Scheme be approved

24 INTAKE TARGETS 2007-2008

Resolved:

to approve the intake targets for 2007-2008 (R/06/284)

25 CENTRE FOR LIFELONG LEARNING AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Resolved:

on the recommendation of Research and Knowledge Transfer Committee (1 November 2006), to approve the establishment of a Centre for Lifelong Learning and Community Engagement with effect from January 8th 2007, attached to the Department of Professional and Community Education (R/06/242)

26 ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHAIR

Noted:

the action taken by the Chair since the last meeting of Academic Board on 11 October 2006 (R/06/285)

27 REVISION OF STATUTES

Noted:

the progress on the revision of the College Statutes (R/06/286)

28 BURGESS CONSULTATION

Received:

the College's response to the second round of the Burgess consultation (R/06/287)

29 NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY

Received:

a report on the results of the 2006 National Student Survey (R/06/227)

30 ANNUAL REPORTS

Received:

the following Annual Reports:

Enrolment 2006 (R/06/289)

Examinations 2006 (R/06/290)

Careers (R/06/291)

Communications and Information Policy Committee (R/06/292)

Equal Opportunities Committee (S06.145)

Ethical Committee (R/06/293)

Postgraduate Research Committee (R/06/294)

Research Committee (S06.191)

31 COMMITTEE REVIEW PHASE THREE: MODIFICATION OF PLANS

Received:

a paper from the Head of Secretariat on phase three of the Committee Review (R/06/295)

32 PERIODIC REVIEW OF POLITICS

Received:

the report of the Periodic Programme/Departmental Review of Politics and the Departmental response (R/06/226)

33 COMMITTEE MINUTES

Received:

the minutes from the following committees:

Academic Development Committee – meeting held on November 2nd 2006 (R/06/298)

Learning and Teaching Quality Committee – meeting held on October 25th 2006 (R/06/299)

34 AWARDS, PRIZES AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Received:

details of the awards, prizes and scholarships awarded to students (R/06/300)

35 PERSONAL CHAIRS

Noted:

the following promotions to Personal Chairs confirmed since the last meeting (Minute 12, 11 October 2006 refers), with effect from 1 September 2006:

Dr (now Professor) Caroline Knowles – Sociology

Mr (now Professor) John Wood - Design

36 VISITING FELLOWS

Noted:

the names of Visiting Fellows invited by the Warden (R/06/297)

37 EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Noted:

that the Pro-Warden (Academic) had approved, on behalf of the College Board of Examiners, the following External Examiners:

Foundation Certificate: Integrated degree in Music / Certificate in Music

Dr Frank Millward

Senior Lecturer

Kingston University

For a period of 3 years from

1st November 2006 to 30th

September 2009

BA International Studies

Dr Alejandro Colas

Lecturer in International Relations

Birkbeck College, University of London

For a period of 3 years from

1st November 2006 to 30th

September 2009

BA Drama and Theatre Arts

Dr Sophia Lycouris

Reader

Nottingham Trent University

For a period of 1 year from

1st November 2006 to 30th

September 2007

BA European / Latin American / joint degrees

Dr Axel Goodbody

Reader in German Studies

University of Bath

For a period of 1 year from

1st November 2006 to 30th

September 2007

Professor Debra Kelly

Professor of French and Francophone

University of Westminster

For a period of 1 year from

1st November 2006 to 30th

September 2007

BA/Diploma English Studies (External Programme)

Dr Margaret Reynolds

Reader

Queen Mary, University of London

For a period of 3 years from

1st November 2006 to 30th

September 2009

BSc Computing – joint degrees and External Programmes

Professor Luc Moreau
Professor in Computer Science
University of Southampton
For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

BSc Computing – joint degrees and External Programmes/BSc Maths, Computing and Statistics (External Programme)

Dr Christopher Reade
Head of the School of Business
Kingston University
For a period of 1 year from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2007

Certificate in Humanistic and Psychodynamic Counselling

Ms Margaret O'Grady
Co-ordinator
Lorrimore Counselling Service
For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

MA Anthropology of Health and Body in the Twentieth Century

Dr David Pratten
Lecturer
University of Sussex
For a period of 1 year from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2007

MA Art Psychotherapy / MA Dance Movement Therapy

Dr Bonnie Meekums
Lecturer/Programme Co-ordinator – Counselling
University of Leeds
For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

MA Group and Intercultural Therapy (now incorporating PG Certificate in Cultural Diversity)

Ms Lyn French
Director
A Space Community Development Unit
For a period of 1 year from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2007

MA Applied Linguistics: Sociocultural Approaches

Dr Catherine Wallace
Reader
Institute of Education, University of London
For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

MSc Research Methods in Psychology

Professor Eamonn Ferguson
Professor in Health Psychology
University of Nottingham
For a period of 1 year from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2007

MA International Studies

Dr Toby Dodge
Reader in International Politics
Queen Mary, University of London
For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

MA Performance and Culture

Professor Martin Banham
Emeritus Professor
University of Leeds
For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

MA Feature Film

Professor Alan Fountain
Professor of Film
Middlesex University

For a period of 1 year from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2007

MA TV Journalism

Mr Kevin Sutcliffe
Editor
Channel 4 TV

For a period of 1 year from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2007

MA Digital Media

Dr David Bell
Senior Lecturer
University of Leeds

For a period of 3 years from
1st November 2006 to 30th
September 2009

38 NEXT MEETING

that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 31 January 2007, and that this meeting would revert to the usual time of 2.30 pm

AB/23 – VT/November 2006