

**GOLDSMITHS  
University of London**

**COUNCIL**

**EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**13 June 2012**

**Minutes**

**Present:** Baroness Morris of Yardley (in the Chair), Ms Vicky Annand, Ms Donna Hartwell (Secretary), Mr Hugh Jones, Professor Caroline Knowles, Mr Gerald Lidstone, Professor Simon McVeigh, Mr David Mungall; Ms Julie Taylor, Ms Jessica Wanamaker

**In attendance:** Ms Annette Bullen, Mrs Lucinda Parr

**Apologies:** Mr Tim Crook, Mr Joe Killin

**1. MINUTES**

**Resolved :**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2011

**2. AN UPDATE ON PROGRESS OF ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS**

**Received :**

A paper from the Committee Secretary giving an update on progress of actions arising from previous discussions (12.281) Plus a paper from the Pro Warden (Academic Development) listing community engagement projects was tabled.

The Secretary informed the Committee that their past reports on both Collaborations and East Asia had been passed to the Head of International Partnerships and Development as background to his work on the College's Internationalisation Strategy.

The paper tabled by Simon McVeigh was an attempt to map categories of community engagement and then broadly, the types of activities being undertaken in each category.

This was possibly an item for future discussion.

### **3. STRATEGIC PLAN – LONDON AND THE WORLD KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

#### **Received :**

A paper from the Strategic Plan Coordinator giving details of progress on the development of KPI's for the London and the World pillar of the Strategic Plan (12.282)

Lucinda Parr, Strategic Plan Coordinator, attended for this item and gave an update on the development of KPI's for the London and the World pillar of the Strategic Plan.

Some members of the Committee found the KPI's problematic and asked, what problem were they trying to address? It was suggested that rather than developing KPI's as a stand alone exercise, a more useful approach would be to look first at what the College was already doing, or not doing, and then map KPI's on to this.

The Committee were also wary of the idea of simple input/output. Something maybe worth doing even if the benefit could not be quantified.

Concern was also expressed about developing KPI's in relation to partnerships. Was there a way to show the full range of partnerships plus an indication of their quality? How could quality be measured? Julie Taylor reported that the Enterprise Office were currently working on this with regard to work placements.

The Committee felt it odd that there was no strategic aim around Alumni and recommended that one should be developed, with a linked KPI, commenting that in a very real sense, alumni are 'the world' of the London and the World pillar.

The list of community engagement categories in the paper tabled by Simon could also be a means of showing the breadth of relationships and activity with which the College was engaged upon. If Heads of Departments complete this – and information like this would be needed as part of the REF in any case – it could also be used for monitoring activity by returning to it on a periodic basis.

#### **Resolved :**

**That the Strategic Plan Coordinator would report back to the Senior Management Team that a Strategic Aim around alumni, with a linked KPI, should be developed.**

#### **4. CULTIVATING COLLABORATIONS: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ENTERPRISE OFFICE**

**Received :**

A paper from the Head of the Enterprise Office (12.283)

Julie Taylor, Head of the Enterprise Office, described the changing landscape of funding in Higher Education, where the emphasis was very much on external partners. There were few large research grants these days that did not require collaboration with non-academic partners.

The overarching role of the Enterprise Office was to facilitate these partnerships between research and new learning at Goldsmiths and a diverse range of external partners in commercial, charity and other sectors.

Julie noted that some relationships were about money, that some were greater than the sum of their parts, but it was always important to be clear at the start about why the relationship was being forged.

She told the Committee it was important to bear in mind that we lose lots of students with good ideas because it can take time and money to develop them. We needed to find a way to nurture them. There was a role here for alumni in mentoring and providing funding.

The Committee asked who currently performs well in this area of endeavour. Julie cited Imperial, adding that they were difficult to compete with given our discipline mix. A more comparable institution was The University of the Arts, who have Enterprise Officers in each of their schools and centres. Among smaller institutions, Ravensbourne was very active in this area.

It was noted that there was a risk that we only partnered with likeminded institutions. So, what about Imperial?

This was a discussion to come back to.

#### **5. TOWARDS AN INTERNATIONALISATION FRAMEWORK FOR GOLDSMITHS**

**Received :**

A paper from the Pro Warden (Academic Development) and the Head of International Partnerships and Development (12.266)

The Pro Warden (Academic Development), Simon McVeigh, gave an update on the development of an Internationalisation Strategy.

He noted that in the past Goldsmiths has had a tendency to wait for partners to come knocking on the door. The development of this Strategy was an attempt to take control.

Part of the development process included piloting geographical groups, and this was already underway. Professor Michael Dutton was chairing an East Asia group, which would bring all those with an interest in the region together and, would also provide a conduit for passing on opportunities for securing external funding to engage with the region.

The predicted decline in international student numbers hadn't eventuated, the Committee noted, but even so, it would be dangerous to depend on a future stream of international students. Collaborations were seen as the way forward, but what this really means was not clear.

The Committee thought it would be wise to reflect on how the world might look in 7 years as a preliminary exercise before developing the Strategy. They also suggested establishing where our alumni donors came from in order to highlight areas of influence and finally, when thinking about potential partners – aim high! We should not just be aiming to build relationships with our equivalents, go for the elites. This is enriching, and confidence developing on an individual and institutional level.

## **6. THANK YOU**

Thank you to our Chair Estelle Morris for steering us so expertly for the past 6 years and always keeping us on track; and also to Gerald Lidstone and Tim Crook for their considerable input since the Committee's inception.

DH  
13 June 2012