SOAS
GOVERNING BODY
AGENDA

Friday 24th April 2015 from 09.30 hours

Note - Change of venue: London Middle East Institute, SOAS, University of London, MBI Al Jaber Building, 21 Russell Square, London WC1B 5EA

Items marked with an asterisk are formal business, not intended for discussion. If members wish to discuss any issues arising from these items they should inform the Secretary by 9am on Tuesday 21st April 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Conflicts of Interest</th>
<th>[Oral Update]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>To approve: The minutes of the meeting held on 4th February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Actions Taken</td>
<td>[Oral Update]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Matters Arising / Matters for Report</td>
<td>[Oral Update]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>The Director's report</td>
<td>Copies of the Director's report since the last meeting: 27th February 2015 31st March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>The University of London Statutes</td>
<td>To approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Amendment to Standing Order X</td>
<td>For recommendation to the Privy Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Amendment to Standing Orders</td>
<td>To approve: on recommendation from Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>HEFCE letter on Institutional risk</td>
<td>To note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Finance: The forecast financial out-turn 2014/15</td>
<td>To note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>CUC Higher Education Code</td>
<td>[Appendix G]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Governing Body Effectiveness Review</td>
<td>[Appendix H]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>[Appendix I]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>BDS Referendum at SOAS</td>
<td>[Appendix K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Fossil Free SOAS</td>
<td>[Appendix L]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>The Risk Register</td>
<td>[Appendix M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII*</td>
<td>Emeritus status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awarded to: Professor Trevor Marchand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Sub-Committee Reports</td>
<td>[Appendix N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To receive: Minutes/reports from the following sub-committees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>[ii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Committee</td>
<td>[iii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominations Committee</td>
<td>[iv]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Planning Committee</td>
<td>[v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>2015/16 Meeting Dates</td>
<td>[Appendix O]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: dates of 2015/16 meetings of committees which have lay members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>To note: Next meetings of Governing Body</td>
<td>[Oral Update]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal evening meeting of Governing Body:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21st May 2015  4-8pm (Room 4429, 4th Floor, College Buildings, SOAS, with a meal break held in the Brunei Suite at 6pm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next formal meeting (Room 116, SOAS, College Buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday 6th July 2015 at 4pm – 6pm, followed by dinner from 7pm – 9pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue: Barristers Court, Browns Courtrooms, 82-84 St Martins Lane, Covent Garden, WC2N 4AG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Welcome and Apologies
Governing Body noted the apologies.

Governing Body noted that the meeting was taking place to cover the business that had not been completed during the meeting interrupted on 27 November 2014.

36. Conflicts of Interest
There were no conflicts of interest reported.

37. Minutes
The minutes of the last meeting would be approved at the next meeting of Governing Body, along with the minutes of this meeting.
38. Actions Taken
There were no actions due for report.

39. Matters Arising / Matters for Report
(i) External Audit Tender
The Chair of the Audit Committee reported on the periodic review of the School’s external audit arrangements. The tender process had included a detailed specification and three firms had presented to the tender panel. The panel had scored the written submissions and presentations independently. The competition had been strong but the recommendation was to re-appoint BDO as the School’s external auditors.

Governing Body approved the appointment of BDO.

(ii) Fossil Free SOAS
Governing Body received an update from the Working Group looking at the issues raised by the Fossil Free SOAS campaign. This included any changes to the School’s investment policy, the potential impact on the gifts and donations policy and continuing the excellent work to date in carbon management. A full report would be made along with any recommendations to the April meeting.

40. Faculty Plans (Appendix H)
To approve on recommendation from RPC the Faculty Plans:
- Faculty of Arts & Humanities (FAH)
- Faculty of Languages & Cultures (FLC)
- Faculty of Law & Social Sciences (FLSS)
- IFCELS (International Foundation Courses & English Language Studies)

Governing Body approved the Faculty Plans. It noted that although the plans were sustainable in the aggregate there were significant questions around the growth included in the plans. Although the financial forecasts only assumed 75% of the growth in the plans would be delivered this assumption did need to be tested by Governing Body.

Governing Body would discuss the School’s financial performance and sustainability in more detail during the informal meeting following the formal meeting.

41. Governing Body Key Performance Indicators (Appendix J)
Governing Body noted that the report was the first against the new set of key performance indicators, as agreed during the last academic year.

Governing Body agreed that as further work was still required to define some of the outcomes it would review the KPIs later in the academic year to check progress on work.

42. Risk Overview (Appendix K)
Governing Body noted the latest risk overview for the institutional risk register.
43. Annual Diversity Report 2013-14 (Appendix M)
Governing Body discussed the Annual Diversity Report for 2013-14, which was based on the latest data available, for 2012-13. It noted that there was ongoing work to address key areas including the gender pay gap, student attainment gap and the low disability disclosure rate for staff.

44. The LMEI Annual Report (Appendix N)
Governing Body noted the LMEI Annual Report.

45. Students’ Union Report & Financial Statements (Appendix O)
Governing Body considered the Annual Report from the Students’ Union along with its financial statements. The Students’ Union was in a strong financial position and had seen further support for its clubs and societies with the appointment of a new staff member.

The Chair of the Audit Committee reported that the financial arrangements of the Students’ Union had been subject to a review by internal audit and an extensive series of recommendations had been implemented. These had included greater controls on society budgets and the removal of all external bank accounts. It was expected that, subject to agreement, a further review would take place later in the year.

46. The Annual Health & Safety Report (Appendix P)
The Secretary reported on the Annual Health & Safety Report from the Health, Safety & Security Committee. The membership had been expanded to include a member of academic staff nominated by the Research & Enterprise Committee.

The Committee was currently discussing changes to the Health & Safety Policy that were expected to come to Governing Body for approval at the last meeting of the academic year. These changes were likely to include proposals to manage health and safety on a structural basis rather than by building.

Governing Body agreed that future reports should include more detail on issues such as mental health and safety training. It should also include

Governing Body noted that although the Committee had discussed the issue of outsourced contracts this has not been included in the report, even though this had been a significant issue for Governing Body. The Secretary confirmed that the issue had been discussed but there had been no substance to the matter. However, the concerns would be reported to the Committee.

47. Award of Emeritus Status to Dr Geoffrey King
Governing Body noted the award of emeritus status.

48. Report from the Academic Board Governance Working Group (Appendix Q)
Governing Body noted that the Academic Board Governance Working Group would be making a formal report to the next meeting of Academic Board.
49. Sub-Committee Minutes/Reports (Appendix R)
(i) Nominations Report
(ii) DRAFT Academic Board – (12th November 2014)
(iii) Audit Committee (6th November 2014)
(iv) Resources & Planning Committee (11th November 2014)
Governing Body noted the sub-committee reports.

50. Next Meetings of Governing Body
Governing Body noted the dates of future meetings.

51. Dates for Graduation 2015
Governing Body noted the dates for the 2015 graduation ceremonies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline For Report to GB</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Charter &amp; Articles</td>
<td>Discussion on how to promote name change to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>24/4/15</td>
<td>TM / CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Update on financial position post REF, USS and other factors</td>
<td>24/4/15</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(ii)</td>
<td>Fossil Free SOAS</td>
<td>Paper with recommendations</td>
<td>24/4/15</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>Update of KPIs</td>
<td>6/7/15</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Governing Body is asked to note the Director’s Reports.

Executive Summary
The Director’s Reports are circulated to Governing Body at the end of each month. The Director will answer questions on the Reports if required.

Recommendations
To note the contents of the Director’s Reports since the last meeting of Governing Body. The reports of 27th February and 26th March 2015 are included.

Financial Impact
N/A

Risks
N/A

Equality implications
N/A
Voluntary severance scheme
The School launched a generous voluntary severance scheme earlier this week. Employees who apply for voluntary severance and are accepted will receive the following financial package - those with 2-5 years’ service: 6 months’ salary, those with service over 5 years: 12 months’ salary. The scheme will open on 2nd March. Staff will have until Friday 27 March 2015 to express an interest in principle in applying to the scheme, with all formal applications to be submitted by 1 May 2015. This is part of a series of measures to address the financial shortfall which is a consequence of the result of the outcome of the REF and last year’s under-recruitment of students.

Student recruitment
Overall, applications for PGT programmes have seen a 10% (- 308) fall compared to this time last year. Home/EU applications have increased but overseas applications have declined. Final applications last year totalled 5045 so we can assume that we have just over half of the expected applications this cycle. Current forecasts suggest that enrolments will meet the overall target but with Home/EU students exceeding target and Overseas enrolments well below target. This will have significant impact on fee income. This forecast should be treated with caution. Whilst current Home/EU applications have improved compared to last year there is a possibility that they could decline through the rest of the application cycle with fewer new graduates applying due to the financial debt being carried by this first cohort of students coming through the new UG tuition fee regime. As reported last month the situation in respect to the undergraduate recruitment remains generally very good. Current application numbers suggest that we are in a position to over-recruit against targets which would offset some of the funding shortfall we expect for PGT recruitment this year.

The number of research student applications is slightly down compared to last year. Current forecasts suggest PGR recruitment will be 15% below target.
Universities Superannuation Scheme

UUK are now working on the arrangements for the statutory consultation on the proposed changes to USS with affected employees and their representatives. This is planned to run from 16 March to 22 May 2015 and has to be undertaken by individual employers. All USS employers are required to consult with any of their staff who are currently members of USS or are eligible for such membership.

The North Block

The North Block project continues to make good progress, with a great deal of construction work going on at the moment. Demolition work (removal of walls etc.) is proceeding apace, and the piling works in the courtyard should be completed in a day or two. Design work is continuing, with the appointment of a specialist façade consultant, and a workshop held with the design team, specialist consultant and specialist sub-contractor to review the final design details for the glazed roof. Proposals are also being developed for the cloisters and the conference suite. The consultation regarding cycling at SOAS has completed its first phase.

HEFCE circular on funding decisions

The HEFCE Board has taken funding decisions for next year. The relative quality weighting for 4* and 3* activity in the mainstream QR method will be increased from 3:1 to 4:1. Funding for National Research Libraries will be increased by 1.4 per cent for inflation. HEFCE will also provide a one-off transitional allocation of £24 million as a supplement to mitigate the real-terms decline in the rate of funding for RDP supervision in recent years;

In making these decisions, the HEFCE Board has assumed that the funding available for the 2016-17 financial year will be the same in cash terms as for the 2015-16 financial year. However a change in government may mean that in-year changes in allocations are necessary and “Institutions should prudently plan their budgets with this in mind”. The announcement of each institution’s recurrent grants is being brought forward slightly, so that we will be notified on 25 March of our recurrent allocations for teaching and research for next year.
London Weighting
The School recently made a full and final offer on a phased uplift of the London weighting (equivalent to the offer accepted by the unions at the University of London). SOAS unions have carried out ballots on whether to accept this offer. UCU members have voted to accept the offer (with 58.4% in favour) but Unison members have voted to reject the offer (with 91.7% opposed). We understand that the unions will now be seeking further talks with the School.

Counter-terrorism Act
The Counter-Terrorism and Security Act passed its final stage of scrutiny in the House of Lords in mid-February, and has now received the Royal Assent. The Act introduces a duty on universities to have ‘due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism’. The Government introduced an amendment, which was accepted, which emphasises the role of free speech and academic freedom in the exercise by universities of the new duty in the Act. The amendment makes it explicit that in performing the Prevent duty HEIs will be required to have ‘particular regard’ to the duty in that Act to secure free speech. So the Act will require institutions to have ‘due regard’ to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism and in that context ‘particular regard’ to their duties in relation to free speech.

The consultation process in relation to the draft guidance continues. UUK is seeking a number of changes to the draft, in particular in those areas that focus on those described as ‘non-violent extremists’.

To remind Governing Body – our current Code of Practice for the booking and conduct of events held at SOAS, which sets out our current approach to these issues, can be found at: http://www.soas.ac.uk/admin/governance/policies/file37327.pdf

Labour’s policy on tuition fees
Ed Miliband announced today that undergraduate tuition fees in England would be cut to £6,000 a year, if Labour wins the general election. Apparently Universities will receive HEFCE funding to fully compensate for this reduction in income, which will be paid for by reductions in tax relief on pension contributions and higher interest rates for higher earning graduates. It will be important that an incoming government determine the funding regime...
by this September, else recruitment may be severely affected by applicants deciding to defer their entry until the following autumn.

**European Research Council grants**

Governing Body will be pleased to hear that Dr Jieyu Liu (deputy Director of the China Institute) and Dr James Mallinson (Lecturer in Sanskrit and Classical Indian Studies) have each secured funding for two Horizon 2020, European Research Council awards (one starting grant - Dr Liu, and one consolidator grant – Dr Mallinson). The two research projects will total over €3m of research income over 5 years. Dr Liu will undertake “A multi-sited ethnography of Modern Chinese Family Life” specifically researching cross-generational relationships and Dr Mallinson will research “The Hatha Yoga Project: Mapping Indian and Transnational Traditions of Physical Yoga through Philology and Ethnography”. These are SOAS’ first successes in the new Horizon 2020 program and are all the more impressive given the highly competitive nature of such schemes (typically less than 10% of applications are awarded). These awards are subject to negotiation with the ERC but all being well are due to start as early as July this year.

**Green League table**

SOAS was ranked 49th (out of 151 institutions) in the recent Green League by *People and Planet*. This is a significant improvement on 2013 where SOAS was rated 73rd. *People and Planet* is a UK-based student network campaigning to end world poverty with a focus on protecting the environment. SOAS has managed to drive down both its energy use and carbon emissions across the estate during the last 12 months.

Paul Webley
February 27th 2015
Director’s monthly report

The North Block
The North Block project continues to make good progress. The specification, design and costs for the access control systems have been clarified and the decision taken to proceed with these. A promotional video has been filmed on site. Demolition work is nearing completion and the piling works in the courtyard are now complete. A licence has been granted by the University of London to allow Graham (our contractors) to install and work from cradles suspended from the Senate House roof, which will enable Graham to clean the façade and refurbish the windows without the need for scaffolding.

HEFCE grant letter
We received our grant letter on 25th March which specifies our HEFCE funding for 2015-16. In line with our expectations the amount of recurrent teaching grant has declined by £388k. This reflects the progressive shift from HEFCE grants to students’ tuition fees and is substantially less than in previous years as the transition is largely complete. The recurrent grant for research has now been amended to reflect the 2014 REF results. Total research funding of £5.9m is £700k below our original pre-REF result expectations and therefore not quite as bad as the shortfall of £1.1m predicted on receipt of our REF results. This improvement can be explained by the changes that HEFCE have made to the amounts allocated to each unit of assessment. In essence we have benefitted from the removal of the protection of funding for STEM research which has allowed funding to flow back to social sciences, arts and humanities areas. While this change is welcomed, the £700k funding shortfall must still be plugged and actions to address long term sustainability will remain in train.

HEFCE review of institution-specific funding
We have now received details of the consultation on the review of institution-specific funding and need to feedback on this by Friday 1st May. HEFCE are proposing the following eligibility criteria, in order that an institution can apply to the review of institution-specific funding:

Criterion A: The proportion of an institution’s provision that is focused in one Higher
Education Statistics Agency (HESA) academic cost centre should be 60 per cent or higher.  

Criterion B: There should be evidence that the costs of their teaching across the whole institution are significantly, and justifiably, higher than the typical costs for those academic cost centres.

Criterion C: There should be evidence of measures taken to manage teaching costs effectively (for instance through collaboration).

Criterion A seems to rule us out immediately and even substantially reducing the figure of 60% is not going to help us. We can (and will) respond to the consultation suggesting that criterion A be removed and an alternative approach taken which focuses on the value of what is supported through institution-specific funding, but that seems unlikely to be successful. Criterion A seems designed by HEFCE to exclude a number of institutions from institution-specific funding (e.g. UCL, Oxford, Cambridge, SOAS and Falmouth) leaving only monotechnics such as the Courtauld and the Royal Veterinary College eligible. SOAS currently receives approximately £700k p.a. through this route, so there is a serious challenge for us here.

University of London – Master plan

The University of London has recently appointed BDP to develop a Master plan for the whole of the University’s estate (which includes, of course, all of the SOAS buildings in Bloomsbury). It is expected that the Master plan will take around 30 weeks to finalise. The intention is to get the London Borough of Camden’s approval for it, so that subsequent applications for planning consent for individual buildings are facilitated.

University of London – application for membership from City University

The proposal that City University apply for membership of the University of London passed through their Senate in early March backed by uniformly positive outcomes of consultation with academic and professional staff in various groupings and a strong vote from the Students’ Union. The SU referendum got about a 10% response (about 1600 voters) and a 89.5% yes vote. The Council of City University met on the 20th March and agreed in principle to the resolution to apply for membership, with the timing and wording of the application being delegated to the Vice-Chancellor and the Chair of Council.
IFCELS recruitment
At the last comparison date, applications for the Pre-masters foundation programme (FDPS) were 65% up compared to last year and for the Undergraduate foundation programme (ICC) 13 per cent up. Over the past three years there has been a decline in numbers on the Pre-masters programme and we have launched a number of measures to address this including guaranteed conditional offers for FDPS students with SOAS Academic Departments, £2000 scholarships to FDPS students who progress to SOAS and, as part of 30 years of Foundation programmes at SOAS, waiving the application fee for applications received by 30 April.

Guardian HE Awards
The school’s MOOC on Research Methods, launched in 2014, was one of two runners-up for the Guardian Higher Education Award for ‘Online and distance learning’. The MOOC received glowing praise from among the more than 60,000 students from around the world that registered on the programme. The course is designed to help both undergraduates and postgraduates with an interest in improving their research skills.

The Budget and Support for Postgraduates.
The Budget included an announcement about the introduction of a loan scheme to cover research-based master’s degrees and PhDs. While details remain vague the Chancellor referred to a maximum loan amount of £25,000 with an income-contingent repayment system. This policy will apply only in England, but it is not clear whether this would be applied via reference to the domicile of the student, or the location of the institutions at which they would be studying, or both. The Budget document states that this support will be in addition to existing support for postgraduate research students, but it also announces a review of the ‘balance between the number and level of research stipends’ for postgraduate research.

Paul Webley
March 26th 2015
UNIVERSITY STATUTES

Governing Body is asked to approve the changes to the University Statutes.

Executive Summary

When the University of London wishes to amend its statutes, the 1994 University of London Act requires that all Governing Bodies of all the member Colleges are consulted.

The proposed changes are:
(a) to include the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (currently Paul Webley) as an ex-officio member of the Collegiate Council and of the Board of Trustees
(b) to include the Chief Executive of the International Programmes (currently Mary Stiasny) as an ex-officio member of the Collegiate Council.

The outcome of the consultation, and/or any representations would be reported at the Collegiate Council meeting on 1 May 2015.

Recommendations

To approve the changes.

Financial Impact

N/A

Risks

N/A

Equality implications

N/A
1. Preliminary

1.1 The University of London is an incorporated body with a legal identity separate from that of the Colleges of the University.

1.2 In these Statutes it is called "the University" and is distinct from "the University Federation" which refers to the University and the Colleges of the University collectively.

1.3 In these Statutes, unless the context otherwise requires:

   1.3.1 "the Act" means the University of London Act 1994;

   1.3.2 "Central Academic Body" means an educational, academic or research institution established in accordance with Statute 17.1;

   1.3.3 "Central Activities" means those activities, operations and services which the University carries out and provides centrally for the benefit of the Colleges and of Students registered with the University itself;

   1.3.4 "College" means an institution holding the status of College of the University;

   1.3.5 Dean and Chief Executive of the School of Advanced Study means the person who is the Head of the School of Advanced Study;

   "Chief Executive University of London International Programmes" means the person who is the Head of the University of London International Programmes

   1.3.6 "Head of College" means the person who is under its instrument of government the chief academic and administrative officer or executive head of that College;

   1.3.7 "Deputy Vice-Chancellor" means the person in the role and with the responsibilities defined in Ordinance 13

   1.3.8 words in the singular include the plural and vice versa

1.4 Words defined in these Statutes shall have the same meaning in Ordinances and Regulations of the University.

2. Objects of the University

2.1 The objects of the University, carried out through the Colleges primarily, and also through the Central Academic Bodies and Central Activities, are, for the public benefit, to promote education of a university standard and the advancement of knowledge and learning by teaching and research; and to encourage the achievement and maintenance of the highest academic standards.

2.2 In pursuit of these objects, the University will serve and support the interests of the Colleges.
3. **Powers of the University**

3.1 The University has the power to grant degrees and other awards and to do all things permitted by law which are necessary or desirable to promote its objects.

3.2 In pursuit of its objects and in carrying out its functions, the University may act alone or in co-operation with other bodies whether based in the United Kingdom or abroad.

3.3 In the exercise of its powers, the income and property of the University shall be applied solely towards the promotion of its objects as set out in these Statutes.

3.4 As a chartered corporation, the University has the general power to make any form of investment and enter into any form of borrowing, and it shall in addition have the authority to enter into any financial instrument which is ancillary to the exercise of such investment or borrowing powers.

3.5 Within the limits applicable to a charity, the University shall have the power to pay remuneration to a member or members of the Board of Trustees in respect of his, her or their services.

4. **Members**

4.1 The members of the University shall be the Chancellor, the members of the Board of Trustees, all staff employed by the University and the Colleges, all students, graduates and Emeritus Professors and Readers of the University and the Colleges.

5. **Visitor**

5.1 The Visitor of the University shall be the Sovereign acting through the Lord President of the Council.

6. **Chancellor**

6.1 There shall be a Chancellor of the University, appointed by the Board of Trustees, who shall be the Head of the University.

7. **Vice-Chancellor**

7.1 There shall be a Vice-Chancellor of the University who shall assume the role of principal officer of the University.

7.2 The Vice-Chancellor shall be responsible to the Board of Trustees for the organisation and conduct of the business of the University.

7.3 The Vice-Chancellor’s duties may be delegated, with the concurrence of the Board of Trustees.

8. **Board of Trustees and Collegiate Council**

8.1 There shall be a Board of Trustees and a Collegiate Council of the University.

8.2 The Board of Trustees shall be the governing and executive body of the University, within the meaning of the Act. It shall promote the objects of the University and shall have general control over the conduct of its affairs. It shall have no powers and duties in respect of the affairs of the Colleges save as specifically provided in these Statutes.
8.3 The Collegiate Council shall be the body responsible for determining and advising the Board of Trustees of the collective view of the Colleges in respect of all matters concerning the University including its strategic direction.

9. Membership of the Board of Trustees

9.1 The Board of Trustees shall consist of the following members:

9.1.1 Nine-eleven independent members appointed by the Board of Trustees (meaning members who are neither employed by nor students of either the University or a College, and who are considered by the Board to be independent and impartial);

9.1.2 the Vice-Chancellor (ex officio);

9.1.3 the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (ex officio);

9.1.4 four Heads of College, to be chosen by the Collegiate Council.

9.2 The Board of Trustees shall appoint a Chair who shall be an independent member of the Board of Trustees.

9.3 Period of office of members:

9.3.1 Members of the Board of Trustees, apart from the Vice-Chancellor, may hold office for a period of up to four years and may not normally be re-appointed for more than one further consecutive term of up to four years.

9.3.2 A member of the Board of Trustees who has served two consecutive four year terms may be eligible for a further term of up to four years after an interval of at least one year.

9.3.3 A member of the Board of Trustees who is appointed to serve as Chair of the Board shall automatically begin a new term of membership linked to the term of that office.

9.4 The quorum for conducting business of the Board of Trustees shall be seven members. Independent members must form a majority of those present.

10. Functions of the Board of Trustees

10.1 The functions of the Board of Trustees which it shall exercise itself and may not delegate shall be:

10.1.1 to consider and approve the strategic direction of the University, and a plan for its implementation, having received the advice of the Collegiate Council;

10.1.2 to exercise guardianship over and ensure the effective management, control and use of the University’s assets and resources;

10.1.3 to appoint the Chancellor;

10.1.4 to appoint the Vice-Chancellor;

10.1.5 to appoint the Deputy Vice-Chancellor;

10.1.6 to ensure that financial accounts are kept and that an annual statement of the University’s finances is prepared, audited and approved;
10.1.7 to ensure the effective management of the University’s Central Academic Bodies and Central Activities;

10.1.8 to consider and approve an annual budget for the University;

10.1.9 jointly with the Collegiate Council, to publish an annual report for the University;

10.1.10 to appoint the University’s auditors;

10.1.11 to consider and approve the admission of Colleges and their continuing status as Colleges;

10.1.12 to consider and approve the establishment or disestablishment of Central Academic Bodies;

10.1.13 to make or amend Statutes and Ordinances;

10.1.14 to ensure the satisfactory discharge of the University’s responsibilities under legislation.

10.2 The functions of the Board of Trustees which it shall normally delegate to the Collegiate Council shall be:

10.2.1 to ensure the proper discharge of the academic affairs of the University;

10.2.2 to ensure the implementation of the strategic plan of the University.

10.3 Other functions of the Board of Trustees may be set out in Ordinances which shall indicate whether they are to be exercised by the Board itself or through delegation.

11. Membership of the Collegiate Council

11.1 The Collegiate Council shall consist of the Vice-Chancellor, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, all the Heads of the Colleges, the Dean of the School of Advanced Study and the Chief Executive of the International Academy. The Dean of the External System shall be an observer.

11.2 The Vice-Chancellor shall chair the Collegiate Council.

12. Functions of the Collegiate Council

12.1 The functions of the Collegiate Council shall be those delegated to it by the Board of Trustees and the following additional functions:

12.1.1 to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on the strategic direction of the University and on a plan for its implementation;

12.1.2 to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on the admission of Colleges and their continuing status as Colleges;

12.1.3 to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on the establishment or disestablishment of Central Academic Bodies;

12.1.4 to make proposals and recommendations to the Board of Trustees regarding resources and services either provided or to be provided by the University to the Colleges, and on the funding of those services;

Comment [MB3]: This proposes

- that the DVC be ex-officio a member of the Collegiate Council to allow for the possibility that s/he may not be a current head of college but e.g. a recently retired head or other senior person appointed from a college;
- to admit the head of the international programmes into membership, reflecting the very great importance of this aspect of the University’s work. This role currently has observer status only.
12.1.5 to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees on amendments to Statutes and Ordinances.

12.2 To undertake or advise on such other matters as the Board of Trustees may request and which may be set out in Ordinances.

13. Relationship between the Board of Trustees and the Collegiate Council

13.1 The Collegiate Council shall regularly submit to the Board of Trustees for its consideration reports on its proceedings and its decisions on matters for which it is responsible.

13.2 In making any decision on any matter the Board of Trustees shall give proper weight to the views and expertise of the Collegiate Council.

13.3 If the Board of Trustees rejects a recommendation of the Collegiate Council, or refers a matter back to the Council for further consideration, it shall give its reasons in writing for doing so, within a reasonable time.

14. Committees of the Board of Trustees and of the Collegiate Council

14.1 There shall be a committee of the Board of Trustees with responsibility for audit and risk.

14.2 The Board of Trustees and the Collegiate Council may from time to time establish additional standing, special and advisory committees, sub-committees or boards.

15. Auditors

15.1 The Board of Trustees shall appoint auditors of the University who shall be members of a recognised supervisory body (as defined in Part II of the Companies Act 1989) and eligible for appointment under the rules of that body.

16. Colleges

16.1 Each College is a self-governing incorporated body with its own legal identity separate from that of the University and the other Colleges.

16.2 Each College shall be entitled to award degrees of the University, and (provided it has power to do so) may award its own degrees subject to any protocols that the Board of Trustees may establish.

16.3 The Board of Trustees, having received any recommendations from the Collegiate Council, may:

16.3.1 admit as a College any educational, academic or research institution;

16.3.2 withdraw from a College the status of College, having considered any representations by that College;

16.3.3 at the request of a College withdraw from it the status of College.

16.4 An institution from which the status of College has been withdrawn by the Board of Trustees without that institution's consent may appeal against that decision to the Visitor.
16.5 The Colleges are listed in Appendix 1. On the admission or withdrawal of a College to or from the University, the list shall automatically be amended to reflect the change.

17. **Central Academic Bodies**

17.1 The Board of Trustees, having received any recommendations from the Collegiate Council, may make Ordinances under which educational, academic or research institutions (known as the Central Academic Bodies) may be established or disestablished and given such titles as the Board of Trustees shall determine.

17.2 The Central Academic Bodies are listed in Appendix 2. On the establishment or disestablishment of a Central Academic Body, the list shall automatically be amended to reflect the change.

18. **Students**

18.1 The Board of Trustees shall ensure that there are in place procedures for dealing with disciplinary matters, academic appeals and complaints in relation to students registered with the University itself.

18.2 Each College shall have responsibility for all matters in relation to students registered with it.

19. **Staff of the University**

19.1 The Board of Trustees shall be responsible for prescribing the conditions of service of staff employed by the University.

19.2 In relation to staff of the University, the Board of Trustees shall ensure that there are in place procedures for the management of performance, for dealing with discipline and dismissal, and for hearing grievances.

19.3 The Board of Trustees shall have no role in relation to staff employed by the Colleges.

20. **Academic freedom**

20.1 Academic staff employed by the University shall have freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges.

21. **Anti-discrimination**

21.1 The University shall not discriminate against any person on the grounds of race, nationality, ethnic origin, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, age, religion, social background or political belief.

22. **Amendment**

22.1 The Board of Trustees, having received any recommendations from the Collegiate Council, may make new Statutes in accordance with the Act; and may make and revise Ordinances and Regulations on such matters as it considers necessary or desirable.

22.2 Appendix 1 (the list of Colleges) and Appendix 2 (the list of Central Academic Bodies) shall not be treated as part of these Statutes for the purposes of amendment, but shall be amended automatically in accordance with Statutes 16.5.
and 17.2 respectively on the admission or withdrawal of a College, or the establishment or disestablishment of a Central Academic Body.

22.3 Appendix 3 (the first members of the Board of Trustees and their respective terms of office) shall cease to have effect upon the expiry of the initial terms of office of all those named in it.

23. Transitional provisions

23.1 The first members of the Board of Trustees shall be those named in Appendix 3. Appendix 3 also sets out the initial terms of office of the first members

---

EXTRACT FROM ORDINANCE 13

DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR

9. The Board of Trustees, after consultation with the Vice-Chancellor, shall appoint a Deputy Vice-Chancellor who, in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor by reason of illness or otherwise, shall carry out the responsibilities and exercise all the powers delegated to the Vice-Chancellor.

10. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor will hold office upon such terms and conditions and for such period as the Board shall determine. The Remuneration Committee shall determine the honorarium to be paid to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in respect of his/her duties.

11. In the absence of the Vice-Chancellor for any significant period the Remuneration Committee will determine any additional remuneration to be paid to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

12. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor shall normally be a current or recent Head of College
CHARTER AND ARTICLES: STANDING ORDER X

Governing Body is asked to approve for recommendation to the Privy Council, revisions to Standing Order X of the Charter and Articles, as set out in the attached document.

Executive Summary

Standing Order X relates to academic staff and their dismissal, discipline and grievance procedures and other related matters. Unlike other Standing Orders which can be amended with the approval of Governing Body, amendments to this Standing Order require the approval of the Privy Council.

The School had, in the past, a Director & Principal, rather than a Director, and a Vice-Principal rather than a Pro-Director. This is reflected in the version of Standing Order X held by the Privy Council, and therefore needs to be amended.

In addition, the template on which the attached document was based used the term “the Council” to describe the body known within the School as the Governing Body. In two instances within the document this change of title was not made when the document was originally produced in 2004. In order to ensure consistency throughout the document, this alteration is included in the document below.

The School has been advised that, as these are not substantive changes, it will not be necessary to obtain informal approval from the Privy Council Education Advisers, before moving to the formal stage of the approval process.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Governing Body approve for recommendation to the Privy Council the amendments set out in the attached document.

Financial Impact  None.

Risks

If the amendments are not made, the Standing Order will not accurately reflect the current nomenclature used the School.

Equality implications  None.

Dr Chris Ince
February 2015
PREAMBLE

This Standing Order is designed to ensure compliance by the School of forthcoming statutory requirements pertaining to grievance, disciplinary and dismissal matters. The Standing Order is based upon the wording of the Revised Model Statute as drafted by the Universities and Colleges Employers’ Association (UCEA) and approved by Privy Council Office on 31 March 2003 and has been adapted to reflect the SOAS mode of governance.

PART I: GENERAL

1. Application

   (1) This Standing Order applies to members of the academic staff (except for those excluded from Part II by clause 5(1) below)

   ‘Member(s) of staff’ in this Standing Order means those members of staff to whom this Standing Order applies.

   (2) This Standing Order will override any provision in any contract, term or condition of employment which is inconsistent with this Standing Order, whether dated before or after the commencement of this Standing Order, but -

   (i) it shall not affect the validity of any waiver under section 197 of the Employment Rights Act 1996, any compromise agreement under section 203 of the Employment Rights Act 1996, or any similar waiver or agreement permitted by law: and

   (ii) it shall not preclude any member of staff deciding or agreeing to terminate employment with the School, whether by voluntary severance, early retirement or otherwise, on whatever terms have been agreed.

   (3) Parts II to V of this Standing Order shall not apply to removal from an appointment as Director & Principal, Pro-Director, Vice-Principal, Dean or Head of Department, or such other posts as have been designated by the Governing Body, to which a member of staff has been elected or appointed and which is distinct from that individual’s substantive post, where dismissal from the substantive post is not contemplated, but the Governing Body shall prescribe a procedure for handling such removals prior to the prescribed or normal termination date, which shall include a hearing panel and an appeal panel.

   (4) This Standing Order shall not apply to the Director & Principal, except for Part III, which shall, unless the Governing Body, with the Director & Principal’s concurrence, resolves otherwise, apply to the Director & Principal in post at the time it comes into effect, with such modifications and adaptations as the Governing Body, with the Director & Principal’s concurrence, shall prescribe, but it shall not apply to any later Director & Principal, even if also the holder of an academic post.

2. General principles of construction and application
This Standing Order and any Procedures or Regulations made under it shall be applied and construed in every case to give effect to the following guiding principles:

(i) to ensure that members of staff have freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges:

(ii) to enable the School to provide education, promote learning and engage in research efficiently and economically: and

(iii) to apply the principles of justice and fairness.

Where, in any proceedings under this Standing Order, a member of staff invokes sub (1) (i) above, that claim shall be considered by the person or persons dealing with the matter, and, if it is found that any action has been taken against the member of staff because that member of staff questioned or tested received wisdom or put forward new ideas or controversial opinions, the person or persons dealing with the matter shall cancel that action and it shall be treated as invalid.

Where there is any issue as to the meaning of “academic freedom” in any proceedings under Parts II, III, IV, V and VI of this Standing Order, regard shall be had to Sections VI and VII of the Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) in Paris on 11 November 1997.

Any reference in this Standing Order to a provision of an Act of Parliament shall be taken to be a reference to that provision as it may have been amended or superseded from time to time.

In interpreting or construing any provision in this Standing Order, regard shall be had to the Notes on Clauses on the Revised Model Statute issued by the Universities and Colleges Employers Association (September 2003)

3. Dismissal

For the purpose of this Standing Order, “dismissal” shall have the same meaning as in section 95 of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

A member of staff may be dismissed if that dismissal is for a reason set out in section 98 of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

(i) A dismissal by reason of redundancy (other than the non-renewal of a fixed-term contract) shall be handled in accordance with Part II;

(ii) a dismissal for disciplinary reasons shall be handled in accordance with Part III;

(iii) a dismissal on health grounds shall be handled in accordance with Part IV; and

(iv) a dismissal on any other grounds, including the non-renewal of a fixed term contract, shall be handled in accordance with Part
V.

4. Hearing, appeal and grievance panels

(1) Any panel established pursuant to clauses 8(1), 10(ii)(d) and (h), 14(2), 17(2) and 18(5) of this Standing Order shall consist of three persons, none of whom shall previously have had any involvement with the case, at least one of whom shall be a lay member of Governing Body and one a member drawn from a list agreed from time to time by Academic Board.

(2) At any panel within sub-clause (1) above, the member of staff shall be entitled to be represented or assisted by any person.

(3) Any panel within sub-clause (1) above shall give a reasoned decision in writing which shall be provided to the member of staff and reported to the Governing Body.

PART II: REDUNDANCY

5. Application

(1) The power to dismiss, and the procedures prescribed, under this Part shall not apply to those staff defined in sub-sections (3) to (6) of section 204 of the Education Reform Act 1988 [appointed prior to, and not promoted after, 20 November 1987], who shall for this purpose continue to be subject to such powers, if any, as applied to them prior to the introduction of the Standing Order made by the University Commissioners in the exercise of their powers under sections 203 and 204 of the Education Reform Act 1988.

(2) This part shall not apply to the non-renewal of a fixed-term contract, which shall be dealt with under clause 16 below.

6. Definition of “redundancy”

Subject to clause 5(2) above, dismissal by reason of redundancy for the purpose of this Part has the same meaning as in section 139 of the Employment Rights Act 1996.

7. Procedure for dismissal by reason of redundancy

(1) The Governing Body shall by Regulation prescribe the procedures for dismissing members of staff on grounds of redundancy, which shall include the following:

(i) a preliminary stage involving consultation with appropriate representatives in accordance with and to the extent required by section 188 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 and discussion with the staff concerned;

(ii) a procedure which is fair and which allows each staff member concerned, having been informed of the selection criteria to be employed, to make written and oral representations on his or her behalf;

(iii) provision for informing any member of staff dismissed under...
this Part of the reasons for the dismissal and, where selection has taken place, why he or she was selected; and

(iv) authorising the Director & Principal or other person to dismiss any member of staff selected for dismissal under this Part and requiring reports of dismissal to be submitted to the Governing Body.

(2) The procedures following the preliminary stage may be used at any particular time only after the Governing Body has first determined that the circumstances are such that the procedures should be instituted.

8. Appeal against dismissal by reason of redundancy

(1) The Regulations shall include provision for an appeal to a panel by a member of staff who has been given notice of dismissal under this Part.

(2) The panel shall be entitled to review all aspects of the matter other than the Governing Body’s determination under clause 7(2) above.

(3) The panel shall have the power to reach a final decision on the matter or to remit the matter for further consideration by the body whose decision is being appealed.

III: DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

9. Grounds for disciplinary action

Disciplinary action under this Part may be taken, and where found to be appropriate a penalty imposed, in respect of the following:

(i) conduct amounting to a criminal offence, whether or not there has been a prosecution and conviction, of a kind that is judged in all the circumstances to be relevant to the member of staff’s employment by the School:

(ii) failure, refusal, neglect or inability to perform some or all of the duties or to comply with some or all of the conditions attaching to the post, or performing those duties or complying with those conditions in an unsatisfactory or inadequate manner;

(iii) conduct of a kind judged to be inappropriate or unacceptable on the part of a holder of the post held by the member of staff, such as (but not confined to) the following:

(a) breach of any obligation or duty arising under any of the School’s regulations regarding financial matters, harassment, equal opportunities, public interest disclose, health and safety, or data protection or any other rules, regulations or codes binding on the member of staff;

(b) damage to or improper use of School’s facilities, premises, property or equipment;

(c) disruption of, or improper interference with, the activities of the School or of any employee, student, member of Governing Body or visitor (other than any lawful industrial action);
(d) violent, indecent, disorderly, threatening, abusive, insulting or harassing behaviour or language (whether written, spoken or in any other form);

(e) fraud, deceit, deception or dishonesty in relation to the School or any related activity, including research and examining;

(f) action likely to cause injury or impair safety;

(g) divulging information or material received in confidence (unless the disclosure is permitted under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 or in accordance with the University’s Public Interest Disclosure Procedure).

10. Disciplinary procedures

The Governing Body shall by Regulation promulgate disciplinary procedures for members of staff, which shall provide:

(i) for less serious matters to be dealt with by warnings following a fair and appropriate procedure and for a member of staff to be able to appeal against the imposition of a warning to a person designated by the Director & Principal and

(ii) for dealing with more serious matters, which shall include provision for the following:

(a) fair and reasonable time limits for each stage;

(b) investigating complaints and dismissing those found to be without substance;

(c) suspension, on full pay, by the Director & Principal pending an investigation or hearing where this is necessary;

(d) a hearing by a panel, authorised by the Director & Principal, at which the member of staff against whom the complaint has been made shall have been informed of the complaint, shall be entitled to be present, to hear the evidence, to call relevant witnesses, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses (but provision may be made for witnesses in appropriate cases to give their evidence behind a screen or from another room or place and for questions to be asked only by a representative);

(e) appropriate penalties, which in addition to warnings and dismissal shall, for staff appointed or promoted after the coming into effect of this Standing Order, include withholding any forthcoming increment in salary, suspension without pay (for up to three months), and reduction in grade and/or loss of title (and 'promoted' for the purpose of this provision shall have the same meaning as in section 204 of the Education Reform Act 1988);
(f) the award of compensation either to the School or to an individual in respect of any loss caused or damage done;

(g) designating a member of staff's conduct as constituting "gross misconduct" such as to merit summary dismissal without notice; and

(h) a right to appeal against the finding of, or penalty imposed by, the panel, including a finding under paragraph (g) above. An appeal shall not take the form of a re-hearing of the evidence and witnesses may be called only with the appeal panel's permission.

11. Code of Practice

In drawing up the procedures, and in any regulations made or action taken thereunder, regard shall be had to section 1 of the Code of Practice on Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures (as may be amended or replaced from time to time) issued in September 2000 by the Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) and brought into effect by order of the Secretary of State under section 199 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consultation) Act 1992.

12. Dismissal

(1) The Director of Human Resources or other designated officer shall give effect to a decision of a panel that a member of staff should be dismissed:

   (i) where the panel has designated the conduct as "gross misconduct" such as to merit summary dismissal pursuant to clause 10(ii)(g), the Director of Human Resources shall forthwith dismiss the member of staff;

   (ii) in all other cases, the Director of Human Resources shall issue the notice of dismissal or dismiss together with payment in lieu of notice.

(2) Any dismissal or notice of dismissal shall be cancelled, withdrawn or modified if an appeal panel decides that the member of staff should not be dismissed or should only be dismissed with notice.

13. Relationship with Part IV

The Regulations shall make provision for dealing with a case in progress under this Part where it emerges that the member of staff's conduct or performance may have been wholly or partly attributable to a medical condition, but any proceedings under this Part shall be valid even if they could have been brought under Part IV, and a member of staff may, subject to the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, be subject to a penalty, including dismissal, under this Part notwithstanding the fact his or her conduct may have been wholly or partly attributable to a medical condition.
PART IV: INCAPACITY ON HEALTH GROUNDS

14. Dismissal on health grounds

(1) The Governing Body shall by Regulation prescribe a procedure for dealing with staff, including dismissal, because of incapacity on health grounds, whether physical or mental.

(2) The procedure shall include a hearing by a panel, with a right of appeal to another panel, and both panels shall contain an appropriately medically qualified person.

(3) No member of staff may be dismissed whether under this Part or Part III where that dismissal would contravene the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

PART V: OTHER DISMISSALS

15. Non-renewal of a fixed-term contract

(1) The Director & Principal, or other person or persons designated by the Director & Principal, shall in every case where a fixed contract is due to terminate consider whether that contract should be renewed or extended or a contract of indefinite duration should be offered, having consulted the appropriate representatives in accordance with and to the extent required by section 188 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 and having given an opportunity to the member of staff to make representations.

(2) A decision not to renew or extend or offer a contract of indefinite duration under the preceding paragraph must be justified on the basis that, in respect of one or more of the following considerations, it is not expedient or desirable to renew or extend the contract or offer a contract of indefinite duration:

(i) the availability of funding for the post, or the financial situation;

(ii) the individual’s performance (following appropriate warnings and counselling);

(iii) the need for the post or the duties attaching to the post;

(iv) the nature and character of the post;

(v) the desirability of making the post permanent and appointing to it after open competition.

(3) A member of staff whose fixed-term contract is not renewed or extended on termination or is not offered a contract of indefinite duration shall be given full reasons for the decision and shall be entitled to have the decision reviewed by a panel in accordance with a procedure to be prescribed by Regulation.

(4) The panel, whose decision shall be final, shall consider whether the reasons advanced in support of the decision are reasonable and
16. Probationary appointments

(1) This Part shall also apply to members of staff who have been appointed subject to review after a period of probationary service.

(2) The Council Governing Body shall by Regulation prescribe a procedure under which staff on probation shall be reviewed and shall include provision for non-confirmation in post at the end of the probationary period if their performance is found to be deficient or for any other substantial reason or reasons they are judged unsuitable to be confirmed in post.

(3) The review referred to in sub-clause (2) may encompass matters which, in other circumstances, would fail to be dealt with under Parts II, III or IV of this Statute.

(4) The substance of sub-clauses (3) and (4) of clause 15 shall apply to a member of staff who has not been confirmed in post under this clause.

17. Dismissal on other grounds

(1) This clause covers dismissals on any ground falling within clause 3(2) other than those covered by Parts II, III, IV and clauses 16, 17 and 19 of Part V of this Standing Order (i.e. “some other substantial reason of a kind such as to justify the dismissal of an employee holding the position which the employee held” (Employment Rights Act 1996, s. 98(1)(b); “the employee could not continue to work in the position which he held without contravention (either on his part or on that of his employer) of a duty or restriction imposed by or under an enactment” (s. 98(2)(d)).

(2) Dismissals covered by sub-clause (1) above shall be handled in accordance with a procedure prescribed by Regulation, which shall include the right to be heard by a panel and the right to appeal to a panel.

PART VI: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

18. Grievance Procedure

(1) The Governing Body shall by Regulation promulgate a Grievance Procedure for members of staff and in doing so shall have regard to Section 2 of the Code of Practice (as may be amended or replaced from time to time) referred to in clause 11 above.

(2) The Procedure shall apply to grievances by members of staff concerning their appointments or employment in relation to matters affecting themselves as individuals or their personal dealings or relationships with other staff of the University, other than those for which provision is made elsewhere in this Standing Order or in respect of the outcome of any matter dealt with under this Standing Order, or where the Council Governing Body has prescribed other procedures, provided those other procedures are no less favourable to the individual than under the Grievance Procedure.

(3) The Procedure shall provide that consideration of a complaint under the Procedure may be deferred if other proceedings under this Standing Order
concerning the individual and relevant to the application are pending or in progress.

(4) The Procedure shall provide for the fair and speedy resolution of complaints, informally wherever possible, and for the complainant to be entitled to be assisted by any other member of staff or by a trade union representative at any hearings prior to that under sub-clause (5) below.

(5) The Procedure shall make provision for a member of staff who is dissatisfied with the outcome of a complaint to be able to have the complaint heard by a Grievance Panel unless the complaint has been ruled frivolous, vexatious or invalid in accordance with the Procedure.
AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS

On the recommendation of Academic Board, Governing Body is asked to approve the following:

i) The addition of a lay member and a research student to the membership of the Research Ethics Panel;
ii) The addition of up to 3 Students' Union Officers as ‘in attendance’ at Equality & Diversity Committee meetings.

Executive Summary

i) It is recommended that a lay member and research student be added to the membership of the Research Ethics Panel. The appointment of lay members is common practice across ethical committees and is recommended by the Association of Research Ethics Committees. The appointment of a research student will bring the student perspective to the deliberations of the Panel, and will develop the skills base of the student.

ii) It is recommended that up to 3 Students' Union Officers be allowed ‘in attendance’ at Equality & Diversity Committee meetings. Students' Union Officers have specific areas of responsibility, and would therefore only attend where appropriate items appeared on the Equality & Diversity Committee meeting agenda. This would allow a wider range of views to be heard at the meetings, without permanently increasing the size of the Committee.

Recommendations

Academic Board recommends that Governing Body approves these changes, and allows appropriate amendments to be made to Standing Orders in order to enact them.

Financial Impact

None.

Risks

Both recommendations increase the range of views that will be expressed at meetings and therefore enhance the decision-making process.

Equality implications

These recommendations will ensure that a wider range of voices are heard at meetings.
**HEFCE LETTER ON INSTITUTIONAL RISK**

Governing Body is **asked to note** the HEFCE letter on Institutional risk.

### Executive Summary

HEFCE writes to each institution once a year with a detailed assessment of their Institution’s risk. HEFCE have determined that SOAS is not at Higher Risk, therefore Governing Body is asked to note the contents of the letter.

### Recommendations

N/A

### Financial Impact

See attached.

### Risks

None.

### Equality implications

None.
Dear Professor Webley

HEFCE’s annual assessment of institutional risk: The School of Oriental and African Studies

1. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the risk status of The School of Oriental and African Studies, as determined by HEFCE, and of any failure to comply with the institution’s accountability obligations. We have copied this letter to Dr Tim Miller, Chairman of Governing Body, and request that you formally submit this letter to the next meeting of the governing body.

2. Based on the accountability returns submitted for 2013-14 our overall assessment at this time is that The School of Oriental and African Studies is **not at higher risk**. In making this assessment we also conclude that the institution is meeting the accountability obligations set out in the Financial Memorandum (up until 1 August 2014, and then in the Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability) and other HEFCE guidance.

Future context and feedback on financial performance

3. The grant letter to HEFCE of 29 January 2015 from the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) confirmed the funding available for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 financial years (April to March) and the policies and priorities that continue to underpin our approach to recurrent grant. Despite this confirmation, there is uncertainty about the funding that will be available after the forthcoming general election, particularly with a spending review expected to follow shortly after the election. This means there could be in-year changes to the funding available to us in financial year 2015-16 and in subsequent years, including the last quarter of academic year 2015-16. This might mean we have to revise allocations after they have been announced. Institutions should plan their budgets accordingly, in a prudent manner.

4. We encourage you to continue to assess the potential impacts of uncertainties in relation to future funding and expectations of greater efficiency and, to implement mitigating actions.

Chair Tim Melville-Ross CBE  Chief Executive Professor Madeleine Atkins CBE
where necessary. Your scenario planning will need to consider the financial and non-financial impact of possible future changes in student recruitment and retention, and staff pay and pensions pressures. These are among the many factors that will need to be monitored by you, your senior team and governing body, and we are happy to discuss these with you as part of our regular engagements with the institution.

5. Annexes A and B provide feedback on the relative financial performance of the institution compared to the rest of the higher education sector which we fund. Inclusion of this information is intended to be helpful, rather than flagging areas of significant concern to us. To provide context, additional financial benchmarking data has been made available to the institution's head of finance.

Risk assessment process

6. The annual accountability returns submitted to HEFCE by the higher education institutions (HEIs) we fund are the primary means by which HEFCE assesses the accountability, risk and sustainability of institutions. These annual risk assessments are based on current information in a number of areas of activity, including: financial performance, student recruitment and retention, audit findings, and compliance with HEFCE accountability requirements.

7. In relation to the 2013-14 annual accountability returns, we intend to send every institution this letter in the period March to May 2015. We may issue a further risk letter to some institutions following the assessment of July 2015 forecasts, but only if that assessment makes a material change to the earlier risk assessment. Although the risk assessment is an annual process, emerging issues can lead to a review of an institution's risk status and a change to its risk assessment at any point in the year. We currently assess a small number of institutions as being 'at higher risk', with the vast majority 'not at higher risk'. In addition some institutions 'not at higher risk' may have specific risk or compliance issues highlighted for their attention. It is the responsibility of the governing body of the institution to ensure that risks are being managed effectively.

Adverse changes in circumstances

8. We require institutions to report material adverse changes in the institution's circumstances, such as a significant and immediate threat to the financial position, significant fraud or major accounting breakdown. The Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability (HEFCE 2014/12, paragraph 57) provides more detail on the specific requirement. While we fully respect the autonomy of institutions, we remind you of this requirement and that timely reporting of material adverse changes is an important element of the accountability framework for higher education. Given the increasingly competitive environment, it is especially important that you inform HEFCE of any material adverse changes at the earliest stage.

9. We find it helpful if institutions notify HEFCE as soon as possible if they plan to enter into material financial commitments, so that HEFCE has up-to-date knowledge of institutions' circumstances. Furthermore an institution must have written permission from HEFCE before it agrees to a new financial commitment which would exceed its earnings before interest tax
depreciation and amortisation (EBITDA)-based threshold. The Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability (Annex C) sets out the requirements which institutions must follow when entering into such financial commitments.

Who to contact

10. For further feedback from the annual accountability process, or if you would like to discuss any issues relating to risk assessment or accountability, contact the HEFCE Assurance Consultant, Andrew Beazer (0117 931 7223, a.beazer@hefce.ac.uk) in the first instance, or Regional Consultant, Derek Hicks (0117 931 7460, d.hicks@hefce.ac.uk).

Freedom of information

11. This letter is provided in confidence to The School of Oriental and African Studies. While we have no objection to it being made available to third parties, we do not accept responsibility for any reliance they may place upon it. Though we have no plans to release this information proactively, we ask you to consider carefully the implications of any public disclosure you may wish to make or are asked to make. As you know we are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and the content of this letter may ultimately be disclosed if a request is made to us under that Act.

Yours sincerely,

Madeleine Atkins

Professor Madeleine Atkins
Chief Executive

cc: Dr Tim Miller, Chairman of Governing Body.
### Annex A – Table of benchmarking of key financial metrics

**Institution: The School of Oriental and African Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>2012-13 Actual</th>
<th>2013-14 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Historical cost surplus / (deficit) as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Net liquidity / (total expenditure – depreciation) (days)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. External borrowing (on balance sheet) as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Discretionary reserves (excl. pension asset/(liability)) as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Net cash flow as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Staff costs as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Estates: percentage of estate classified in condition categories C and D in 2012-13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of data: Indicators 1 to 6 are calculated from the 2014 financial results data as submitted to HEFCE in December 2014. Further details on this and on how the indicators are calculated are available on the HEFCE extranet under ‘2014 financial results – summary statistics’. Details on how to access this benchmarking information will be sent to Directors of Finance.

Indicator 7: 2012-13 Estates data provided from Estates Management Record. For further information see: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&Itemid=232&mnl=12042

Although not comprehensive, these indicators were chosen to provide an overall view of financial performance:
- Historical cost surplus: generation of surplus for investment
- Net liquidity: coverage of, and ability to respond quickly to, short-term financial pressures
- External borrowing (on-balance sheet): reliance on borrowings for development, balancing need for growth/development with increased costs of borrowing
- Discretionary reserves (excluding pension asset/(liability)): provision of a buffer against large unexpected financial pressures
- Net cash flow from operating activities: financial sustainability of the institution’s core business
- Staff costs: appropriateness and significance of the staff cost structure for the institution
- Estates: indication of possible future estates costs
Annex B - Benchmarking of key financial indicators for 2013-14

Institution: The School of Oriental and African Studies

The figures below show the key financial information for 2013-14 relative to the sector. The data for The School of Oriental and African Studies are highlighted in red.

**Historical cost surplus/(deficit) as a % of total income 2013-14**

- Sector mean: 5.0%

**Net liquidity days 2013-14**

- Sector mean: 122 days
Source of data: Financial indicators are calculated from the 2014 financial results data as submitted to HEFCE in December 2014. Further details on this and on how the indicators are calculated are available on the HEFCE extranet under "2014 financial results – summary statistics". Details on how to access this benchmarking information will be sent to Directors of Finance.
GB is asked to note the School’s 2014-15 Mid-Year Financial Forecast.

Executive Summary

The School’s 2014-15 forecast outturn has been revised following a review of income and expenditure during the first six months of the financial year. The forecast outturn shows a £920k improvement in the School’s bottom line before account is taken of projected voluntary severance (VS) costs of £900k. Although welcomed, the improved position of a £250k surplus, (before the estimate of ‘exceptional’ voluntary severance expenditure), remains approximately £3.9m below the School’s target surplus of 5% of income.

The move from a budget deficit of £670k to a forecast surplus (before VS costs) of £250k is largely attributable to lower than anticipated non-pay expenditure (£762k) made up of factors such as savings on utility bills and lower than expected expenditure on initiatives funded by the accelerated investment fund. Set against the anticipated favourable expenditure variances (when compared to budget) is a forecast reduction in income of £230k.

Gautam Dalal (Honorary Treasurer)

Recommendations

N/A

Financial Impact

N/A

Risks

N/A

Equality implications

N/A
1 Introduction
A review of the School’s income and expenditure has recently been completed and the 2014-15 forecast outturn has been prepared. Annex A, attached, summarised in table 1 below compares the budget approved in November 2014 with the mid-year forecast.

Table 1 Summary Income and Expenditure - Forecast 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb Forecast 2014-15</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2014-15</th>
<th>Variation Favourable/(Adverse) £’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>£82,168</td>
<td>£82,398</td>
<td>(230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>£78,974</td>
<td>£79,959</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING SURPLUS</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation - building</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/Deficit) after Dep’n</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(670)</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Severance</td>
<td>(900)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit After Depreciation</td>
<td>(650)</td>
<td>(670)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forecast outturn shows a £920k improvement in the School’s bottom line before account is taken of projected voluntary severance (VS) costs of £900k. Although welcomed, the improved position of a £250k surplus, (before the estimate of ‘exceptional’ voluntary severance expenditure), remains approximately £3.9m below the School’s target surplus of 5% of income.

The move from a budget deficit of £670k to a forecast surplus (before VS costs) of £250k is largely attributable to lower than anticipated non-pay expenditure (£762k) made up of factors such as savings on utility bills and lower than expected expenditure on initiatives funded by the accelerated investment fund. Furthermore, the forecast assumes that staff costs will be £201k below budget. In contrast, however, it is expected that income will be lower than budgeted principally because we estimate that IFCELS (International Foundation Courses and English Language Study) will suffer a tuition fee income shortfall of £626k and the Language Centre’s income will be £208k under budget.


2.1 Tuition Fees (£621k↓)
Since revising the budget last term the forecast of on-campus tuition fee income has been updated using census data from early December (when student numbers stabilise). In addition, income from other students such as those on Language Centre courses has been reviewed using the latest available information. The results of this review are summarised in
table 2 which show that, over and above the shortfall in tuition fee income of £1.7m noted at the previous meeting of Governing Body, there is a further reduction in income against target of £620k.

Table 2 Tuition Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Category</th>
<th>Forecast (£k)</th>
<th>Revised Budget (£k)</th>
<th>(Shortfall)/Increase (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Home</td>
<td>17,073</td>
<td>16,976</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Overseas</td>
<td>9,177</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Home Taught</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>6,186</td>
<td>(165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Overseas Taught</td>
<td>8,361</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>(99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Home Research</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Overseas Research</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition-Fee Remitted</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISD (Full Fee)</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total On Campus</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,441</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Diplomacy DL</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Arts</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFCELS</td>
<td>3,713</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td>(626)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Centre</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>(208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall shortfall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(620)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounding

The table shows an improvement in forecast income for on campus students, the new Global Diplomacy distance learning Programme and Asian Art courses. However, the improvements are more than offset by significant shortfalls in income in IFCELS and the Language Centre.

Whilst tuition fee income from IFCELS is expect to be ahead of the 2013-14 outturn of £3.5m at £3.7m, recruitment fell short of target on the English Language and Academic Study programme [34 fte] and on the 12 week pre sessional programme [27 students] giving rise to income shortfalls of £456k and £115k respectively.
A review of the Language Centre’s income suggests that the Centre’s turnover will be similar to that achieved last year. The Language Centre and IFCELS both operate in very competitive environments and the current forecast is to some extent a reflection of this.

2.2 Other Operating Income (£532k ↑)
The net increase £532k in other operating income comprises mainly:

- An increase in the share of income from the University of London’s Distance learning laws consortium programme (£283k). This improvement is, in part, caused by the late receipt of income (£93k) that was omitted from the previous year’s accounts plus an underestimate in the budget of income due in the current year under a renegotiated contract for income sharing with the University of London.
- A [technical] one-off adjustment, which has the effect of increasing income by £245k, caused by the reclassification of historic ‘fund’ balances which were treated as restricted but which, strictly, should be transferred to the School’s general reserves.

2.3 Endowment and Investment Income (£97k ↓)
The revised budget overstated the income earned from endowments which offset the salary cost of posts linked to endowments. Assumed earnings from investment income of just over £0.5m remain in the forecast.

2.4 Pay Budget (£191k ↓)
Since the approval the School’s 2014-15 revised budget in November 2014 the staffing budget has been reviewed and updated and it is now assumed that expenditure will be £191k lower than budget. The main factors behind this are:

- Reduced costs caused by estimated vacancy savings and corrections to estimates based on more up to date information (£362k) net of adjustments to provisions for vacancy savings, cover for staff absences etc.
- A reclassification of non-pay expenditure to pay expenditure within Accelerated Investment Fund projects (£170k).

The forecast includes a provision to cover the year one cost of the proposed offer to increase the London allowance (£290k).

2.5 Non-Pay Budget (£762 ↓)
The non-pay budget has reduced significantly by £762k. The changes of note are:

- Academic Departments (£100k ↓): A review of current expenditure against budget indicates that the non-pay budgets in academic departments are likely to be underspent in aggregate. The forecast has therefore been reduced by £100k.
- Distance Learning costs (£103k ↓) – A proportion of Distance Learning expenditure is correlated to student numbers and, whilst tuition fee income is expected to be on
budget the forecast anticipates that the non-pay budget will be underspent by just over £100k this year.

- **Estates and Facilities [£341k↓]** - The forecast savings in the Estates and Facilities budget comprises mainly:
  - Reduced *utility* costs [£218k] caused by a relatively mild winter and the cumulative effect of capital and other expenditure on energy saving measures aimed at reducing the School’s carbon emissions.
  - Lower expenditure than anticipated on *maintenance* [£80k], both reactive and minor projects, in the current year which is partly caused by the shifting of some expenditure to 2015-16 and, importantly, a gradual reduction in the need for reactive maintenance as the School’s estate is improved via its capital programme.

- **Accelerated investment Fund Projects [£436k↓]** - Although pay costs for the Accelerated investment fund have increased by £170k (see 2.4 above), the forecast includes a projected non-pay underspend of £299k as a consequence delays in the commencement of projects.

- **Registry and Student Services (£529↑)** - A proportion of the positive variance above has been offset by an increase in estimated student related expenditure. In particular:-
  - An increase in the take up of *Scholarship and Bursaries* compared to that assumed in the revised budget totalling £279k.
  - An adjustment to the *tuition fee remittance* provision increasing forecast expenditure by £143k. (Note this negative adjustment is linked to positive adjustments made to fees remitted in the tuition fee income forecast in table 2.)
  - An estimated increase in the cost of tuition for students on their ‘Year Abroad’ of £89k to take account of the late receipt of an invoice relating to 2013-14. It worth noting that there has been upward pressure on costs of providing year abroad tuition in the Middle-East as the potential number of suitable locations with good universities for our students diminishes.

**2.6 Depreciation – Premises (£165k ↓)**

The School’s schedule of capital expenditure has been reviewed together with the associated depreciation charge. Current indications are that elements of this year’s capital programme will move to next year. The reduced capital expenditure in the current year will result in a lower 2014-15 depreciation charge than budgeted.

**2.7 Exceptional Item**

The VS costs of £900k are based on the assumption that twenty staff severances are accepted and agreed under the current scheme. These may be further broken down into
fifteen staff with five or more years of service and five staff with less than five years of service.

3. Contingency
The forecast also includes a non-pay contingency of £150k to cover any unanticipated expenditure and a provision for further budget underspends of £200k.

4. Conclusions
The revised budget shows an improved projected outturn of £920k with the School moving from a previously reported deficit of £670k to a surplus of £250k, before the costs of VS are taken into account. Some savings in the current year are caused by a delay in expenditure which, other things being equal, will reduce the net position next year. The School’s target level of surplus is 5% of income which is sought to be reached by 2017-18. At current income levels, this would require a £3.9m improvement in the bottom line over the next three years.

**Governing Body is asked to note the revised forecast.**

Barry Douglas  
Assistant Director of Finance  
February 2015
### School of Oriental & African Studies

#### 2014-15 Forecast vs. Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Feb Forecast 2014 £'000</th>
<th>Revised 2014-15 £'000</th>
<th>Actual Restated 2013-14 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Council grants</td>
<td>11,015</td>
<td>11,059</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition fees</td>
<td>(2.1) 58,388</td>
<td>59,009</td>
<td>(621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research grants and contracts</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating income</td>
<td>(2.2) 7,246</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment and Investment Income</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>(97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred capital gift released</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>82,168</td>
<td>82,398</td>
<td>(230)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Staff costs (2.4)</th>
<th>Exceptional restructuring costs</th>
<th>Other operating expenses (2.5)</th>
<th>Interest payable</th>
<th>Exceptional redemption costs</th>
<th>Depreciation - equipment (2.6)</th>
<th>Total Expenditure 2014 £'000</th>
<th>2014-15 £'000</th>
<th>2013-14 £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51,756</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>25,209</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>81,918</td>
<td>83,068</td>
<td>76,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus/(Deficit) on continuing operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary Severance 'Exceptional' Costs (2.7)</th>
<th>Surplus/(Deficit) on continuing operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(900)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deficit

| Deficit | 650 | (670) | 20 | (420) |
CUC – HIGHER EDUCATION CODE OF GOVERNANCE

Governing Body is asked to **note** the report on the latest CUC Governance Code

**Executive Summary**

The new Code of Governance for the HE sector has been published by the CUC. This makes a number of changes that the Governing Body, and its committees, will need to consider. The Audit Committee held an initial discussion at its meeting in February and the Code is subject to an internal audit in the current academic year.

Formal recommendations on any necessary actions will come to Governing Body in July.

**Recommendations**

To note and comment on the paper

**Financial Impact**

No direct financial impact.

**Risks**

The format of the Code requires the School to be compliant or explain why it is not. It will be much easier for the School to be fully compliant than risk an explanation not being satisfactory.

**Equality implications**

Governing Body (and its committees) will need to review its practices, especially in respect of recruitment, to ensure they meet the requirements of the Code.
CUC HE Code of Governance

Introduction

1. At the end of December 2014 the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) published its revised Code of Governance for the HE sector. This had been developed following extensive consultation over the last two years and on its draft issued in February 2014. The final version has been circulated to members in hard copy and can be found online at:

http://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Published-Version.pdf

2. A key aim of the new Code is to preserve institutional autonomy and the need for any additional regulation by assuring HEFCE and the Government that the sector is well governed. The Code has an “apply or explain” approach and institutions have to agree to the Code to remain members of the CUC. The Code details areas where an institution “must, should or could” have various measures in place.

3. The Code is then broken down in to three parts – Eight core values, seven primary elements to deliver these and then illustrative guidance. This guidance is expected to be released in stages, with the first relating to the operation of remuneration committees.

4. The School’s external auditor, BDO, has produced briefing notes for clients at various stages during the development of the Code. The latest of these was issued in January and was considered by the Audit Committee in February, although he Audit Code of Practice is yet to be updated to reflect any changes to FRS102 and SORP.

5. The internal audit programme for this academic year will assess the School’s current governance structures in place and compare these to the new guide from the CUC. It will suggest areas for improvement to ensure SOAS is fully compliant with the guide and industry practice. The work will focus on four of the ten key governance elements of the Code, which relate to underlying governance structures.

The Code

6. The Code contains eight core values that the Governing Body will be required to commit to:

- Autonomy as the best guarantee of quality and international reputation
- Academic freedom and high-quality research, scholarship and teaching
- Protecting the collective student interest through good governance
- The publication of accurate and transparent information that is publicly accessible.
- A recognition that accountability for funding derived directly from stakeholders requires HEIs to be clear that they are in a contract with stakeholders who pay for their service and expect clarity about what is received.
- The achievement of equality of opportunity and diversity throughout the institution
• The principle that HE should be available to all those who are able to benefit from it

• Full and transparent accountability for public funding

7. The Code then identifies elements that underpin these core values and develops each one in more detail along the apply or explain approach as detailed earlier in the paper.

The governing body is unambiguously and collectively accountable for institutional activities, taking all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern within its remit.

The governing body protects institutional reputation by being assured that clear regulations, policies and procedures that adhere to legislative and regulatory requirements are in place, ethical in nature, and followed.

The governing body ensures institutional sustainability by working with the Executive to set the institutional mission and strategy. In addition, it needs to be assured that appropriate steps are being taken to deliver them and that there are effective systems of control and risk management.

The governing body receives assurance that academic governance is effective by working with the Senate/Academic Board or equivalent as specified in its governing instruments.

The governing body works with the Executive to be assured that effective control and due diligence take place in relation to institutionally significant external activities.

The governing body must promote equality and diversity throughout the institution, including in relation to its own operation.

The governing body must ensure that governance structures and processes are fit for purpose by referencing them against recognised standards of good practice

Actions required

8. An initial review of the detail accompanying each of these elements has identified a number of areas where Governing Body or its committees are likely to have to undertake further work:

• Review and further development of due diligence processes (GB)
• Assurance on application of policies and procedures (AC)
• Ethics/CSR framework (GB)
• KPI on environment (GB)
• Formal report to GB from SSRC (SSRC/GB)
• Policy review (AC/GB)
• Pensions deficit (AC)
• AC effectiveness review (AC)
• Formal delegation for internal audit plan to AC (AC/GB)
9. A formal paper will be prepared for the July meeting of the Governing Body, following the results of the internal audit, so that any necessary actions can be implemented. As the new Code has been introduced mid academic year it is unlikely that the School will have to be fully compliant until reporting in the 2015/16 accounts.

Chris Ince
Secretary
GOVERNING BODY EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW 2015/16

Governing Body is asked to **approve** the proposals for undertaking a review of its own effectiveness.

**Executive Summary**

The Committee of University Chairs (CUC) Code of Practice provides guidance on governance issues including the general principles of governance and the way in which Governing Body business should be conducted. The latest Code requires the Governing Body to keep its effectiveness under regular review; not less than every four years undertaking a formal and rigorous evaluation of its own effectiveness.

The last Governing Body effectiveness review took place in 2013/14 but Governing Body has previously agreed that it would undertake its next full effectiveness review early in the 2015/16 session.

**Recommendations**

Governing Body is asked to:

- Agree the approach to a review of its effectiveness
- Establish a working group to oversee the work

**Financial Impact**

Any cost associated with the use external consultants.

**Risks**

The Governing Body needs to undertake the review to comply with the CUC guidance, to which it has confirmed it subscribes to in the Annual Report. Ensuring a robust governance structure is in place acts as a mitigating action against a number of the risks identified in the institutional risk register.

**Equality implications**

No implications of the review framework. Any impact on recommendations later in the work would need to be considered at the time.
GOVERNING BODY EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW 2015/16

Introduction

1. The latest version of the HE Code of Governance, produced by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC), was issued in December 2014. The Code of Practice provides guidance on governance issues including the general principles of governance and the way in which Governing Body business should be conducted. It is a document to which the School subscribes.

2. The latest Code states the following in respect of reviewing the effectiveness of a governing body:

“Governing bodies need to adopt an approach of continuous improvement to governance, in order to enhance their own effectiveness and provide an example to institutions about the importance of review and evaluation.

Accordingly governing bodies must conduct a regular, full and robust review of their effectiveness and that of their committees, the starting point for which should be an assessment against this Code and the statutory responsibilities alongside those which it has assumed and articulated independently (e.g. through a statement of primary responsibilities). Many governing bodies find an external perspective in this process useful, whether provided by specialist consultants or peer support from other governing bodies.

Codes of governance in other sectors adopt a period of two or three years. Recognising the need to balance the cyclical nature of HE and the impact this can have on the implementation and embedding of new practices, and the swiftly evolving HE and broader legislative environment, reviews must be conducted at least every four years with, as a minimum, an annual summary of progress towards achieving any outstanding actions arising from the last effectiveness reviews.”

3. The last Governing Body effectiveness review took place in 2013/14.

Background - Previous reviews

4. Prior to review in 2013/14 the last effectiveness review of a substantial nature was in 2008/9. As a result of that review, in June 2009 Governing Body approved a large number of recommendations for change, which were implemented before the start of the 2010/11 session. During the 2010/11 session, the Chair of Governing Body held meetings with individual Governing Body members to discuss ways in which Governing Body might work more effectively. As the result of the paper provided to the July 2011 meeting of Governing Body further changes were introduced.
5. Other reviews prior to the 2013/14 review included an internal audit in 2011/12, a HEFCE Assurance Review in February 2011, a review of academic governance in 2009/10 and the work relating to gaining degree awarding powers and the institutional audit by the QAA in 2012/13

Background - Governing Body Effectiveness Review 2013/14 and present situation
6. Given the detail of the previous review and all the other work in this area since 2008/9, Governing Body agreed a light touch review for the 2013/14 year. Although this covered all areas it was via a questionnaire and discussion at committee meetings rather than any external input.

7. The findings from the review were discussed by Governing Body at the first two meetings of the 2013/14 academic year and then in detail at the informal meeting in February 2014 before formal recommendations were made at the meeting in April 2014. These included a number of changes that required approval by the Privy Council and permission for these was subsequently attained.

8. At the April 2014 meeting Governing Body discussed a number of concerns that had been raised by the Democratise SOAS campaign group about the effectiveness review. Although some of the concerns raised were about the effectiveness review a number where complaints about other ongoing issues within the School, which the Executive Board was aware of and they were being managed in line with the School’s approved processes and communication channels.

9. Governing Body approved the recommendations within the report but agreed at its subsequent meeting, in July 2014, to bring forward the timing of its next full effectiveness review to early in the 2015/16 academic session. Separately, the Academic Board would be asked to look again at its own effectiveness and membership during 2014/15.

10. The Academic Board Working Group met between October 2014 and March 2015 and found that a ‘separate’ review of academic effectiveness alone could not address some of the intersecting issues within the School; however, within its remit recommendations on how to enhance academic effectiveness were presented to Academic Board. These recommendations, as well as the need for a more holistic approach to governance, will be a key input in to this review.

11. As members will be aware, the Democratise SOAS campaign has been circulating a detailed paper proposing reform through a model known as ‘shared governance’ involving Governing Body, Executive Board, and Academic Board. This paper also considers a number of management issues, such as faculty and departmental restructuring, in ways that partly overlap with the issues of institutional sustainability that have been discussed at key committees and Governing Body. The paper presents a focus on enhancing the work of academic staff and improving the student experience, keeping in mind the need for a strong academic reputation in a competitive sector.

12. Given the intense interest in this work Governing Body will need to ensure that the review tackles all the governance issues being raised by key stakeholders, including its members, staff and students. The review should look at the overall picture rather than separate reviews of each area.
Framework for a Governing Body Review

13. The CUC and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE) have produced a framework for identifying governing body effectiveness in higher education, which can be accessed at http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/audiences/governance/reviewing-governance/index.cfm

14. There is no universal definition of what constitutes an effective governing body in higher education. The framework is based on the CUC summary of the responsibilities of a governing body, which the School endorses. The latest version of the Code defines these as seven primary elements of governance that underpin the values and beliefs defined in the Code:

- The governing body is unambiguously and collectively accountable for institutional activities, taking all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern within its remit.
- The governing body protects institutional reputation by being assured that clear regulations, policies and procedures that adhere to legislative and regulatory requirements are in place, ethical in nature, and followed.
- The governing body ensures institutional sustainability by working with the Executive to set the institutional mission and strategy. In addition, it needs to be assured that appropriate steps are being taken to deliver them and that there are effective systems of control and risk management.
- The governing body receives assurance that academic governance is effective by working with the Senate/Academic Board or equivalent as specified in its governing instruments.
- The governing body works with the Executive to be assured that effective control and due diligence take place in relation to institutionally significant external activities.
- The governing body must promote equality and diversity throughout the institution, including in relation to its own operation.
- The governing body must ensure that governance structures and processes are fit for purpose by referencing them against recognised standards of good practice.

15. The framework aims to clarify the many inter-related factors involved in governing body effectiveness and to be an aid for institutional self-review. It has been piloted and validated by 16 volunteer governing bodies of UK HEIs, all of whom agreed that the framework was fit for purpose and suitable for dissemination to the HE sector. It is recognised as an example of best practice within the sector and it is therefore recommended that the framework be used as the basis of the governing body effectiveness review.

16. The framework has three main inter-related elements:

a) enablers of an effective governing body
b) working relationships and boardroom behaviour
c) outcomes of an effective governing body

These three elements raise issues and pose a series of questions in relation to these areas for governors to consider.
Enablers

17. The enablers of an effective governing body are the processes which provide the foundation for effective governance. They are the building blocks on which governance rests (for example, a governance structure that is fit for purpose). Without these enablers in place, it is highly unlikely that a governing body could be effective. However, the enablers by themselves do not ensure governing body effectiveness; they merely create the circumstances for it to be achieved.

18. As part of the review process, governing body will need to assure itself that these enablers are not only in place, but are also working well.

19. The framework identifies seven enablers of an effective governing body:
   a) Commitment to effective governance
   b) effective governance structures and processes
   c) effective governing body membership
   d) commitment to organisational vision, culture and values
   e) effective strategic development and performance measurement
   f) effective information and communication
   g) future governance

20. Each of the enablers is subdivided into specific issues for governing bodies to consider. For example, for ‘effective governance structures and processes’ the framework proposes a list of factors to be considered which include whether
   a) the governing body decision making structure (including any sub-committees) is fit for purpose;
   b) there is a clear system of delegation from the governing body with appropriate reporting mechanisms;
   c) effective arrangements are in place for involving staff and students in the governing body and sub-committees.

21. There is also scope within the framework for institutions to add their own factors to the list, should this be thought appropriate.

Working Relationships and Boardroom Behaviour

22. The framework looks at the interactions amongst governors within the boardroom. It identifies factors and modes of behaviour that enable effective governance to take place, and asks governing bodies to assess the extent to which existing working relationships follow this pattern.

Outcomes

23. The outcomes of an effective governing body are those factors that determine ultimate effectiveness, including the extent to which a governing body ‘adds value’. In this sense the real value of governing bodies lies in what they deliver in practice, measuring delivery in terms of outcomes. The School has already started to move in this direction, for example through developing Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to assist in assessing its performance.

24. The framework lists eight factors (with the opportunity for institutions to add specific factors which are relevant to them at that particular time);
   a) that the agreed institutional strategic plan is being achieved;
b) that agreed standards of institutional financial health and sustainability are being achieved;
c) that the required standards of accountability and legal/regulatory compliance are being achieved;
d) that defined quality levels in academic and service provision and the student experience are being achieved;
e) that both the effective management of risk and optimal support for innovation are being achieved;
f) that enhanced institutional reputation and competitiveness are being achieved;
g) that enhanced institutional leadership through effective governance is being achieved;
h) that confidence in governance is being achieved both within the institution and by key external stakeholders.

25. There is recognition that few institutions will select all of these possible outcomes as indicators of effectiveness at any one time. An institution may wish to select a number of the outcomes which it sees as key in highlighting areas on which the institution wishes to focus. Institutions are also free to add other outcomes, if there are particular areas which they feel are of specific relevance at the time of the review.

Recommendations

26. In line with the discussions at Governing Body in 2013/14 it is proposed to undertake a full and thorough effectiveness review in early 2015/16. This will be with some element of external facilitation or assessment. The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, for example, has a number of potential consultants to assist in work of this nature.

27. It is recommended that a small Working Group is established to oversee the work and report back to future meetings on any progress and a detailed plan for the review.

28. The Working Group to bring back detailed Terms of Reference for the Review and the scope of issues to be covered. This should include:
   • Extent of which governance and decision making structures are to be considered
   • Understanding of any links between governance and management ie work on sustainability
   • Proposals for external consultants/input
   • Input from key stakeholders and academic governance work
   • Any consultation with School community
   • Outputs/outcomes expected

29. To facilitate the work of the Group in looking at academic governance and incorporate the work undertaken this academic session and reported to Academic Board it is proposed that the Chair of that Group, the Head of the Doctoral School, is asked to join the working Group to oversee the work.
30. The proposed membership of the Working Group is as follows, with the Group being supported by the Secretary and his team:

- Chair and/or Vice-Chair of Governing Body
- Director
- Student governor
- 1 other governor
- Chair of Academic Board Effectiveness Working Group
- Secretary

31. The CUC guidance recommends that a review of the academic governance arrangements is conducted in parallel to the main review. As detailed above, the School's academic framework has been reviewed in the current session and will form a key input to this work.

32. Governing Body is asked to comment on the paper and approve:

(i) Proposal to review its effectiveness in line with the CUC guidance and framework for reviewing governing body effectiveness

(ii) Setting up of the Working Group

Chris Ince
Secretary
SOAS STRATEGIC PLAN 2015-25

Purpose of this Paper
To set out the draft Strategic Plan 2015-25. Governing Body is asked to confirm current priorities, measures and next steps to take the strategic plan forward.

Context
The draft SOAS Strategic Plan 2015-25 has been developed from the statements of strategic aims developed in the School in the first part of this academic year, in a specific and measurable form that can be moved forward on identifiable timescales. The development document is included as Appendix A.

Next Steps
- Establish baseline data for the measures, for the School and for each Department
- Take forward discussion of how the strategy applies in each Faculty and Department
- Identify supporting enablers and actions needed for the School, Faculties and Departments to deliver against the aims, across People, Resources, Processes, Infrastructure, and Leadership and Governance
- Consider resultant changes to the School’s Key Performance Indicators.

All of the above will be developed and integrated into the next version of the SOAS strategic plan 2015-25 for consideration by SOAS Governing Body in July 2015.

Current Priorities

SCHOOL WIDE

S1 Mission: To be a world-leading institution in all of the School’s subject areas

S1.1 Enhance the School’s reputation
League Tables
(QS, THE, Guardian) School reputation top 10 in UK
Core disciplines rank top 10 in world
All disciplines rank top 100 in world

S1.2 Strengthen the School’s uniqueness, diversity and cultural distinctiveness
Disciplinary coverage of programmes and research Introductions and withdrawals as determined by mission
Cognate research and teaching in all disciplines

S2 Staff Capacity Building: For learning and teaching, research, and enterprise and engagement

Be the institution of choice for the highest quality staff in all of the School’s disciplines

Academic staff R active % 100% (any exceptions justified)
Academic staff 3*/4* (or equiv) publications % 100% at least one 4* publication (any exceptions justified)
Citation Impact Upper quartile
Academic staff with PhD % 100% (any exceptions justified)
Academic staff with HEA T qualification (or equiv) 100% (any exceptions justified)
Student feedback on T quality > 80% excellent
Staff satisfaction Staff Pulse 3.5 (sector currently 3.33)

Note that internationalisation is integrated throughout the strategic plan, on the basis that the School is an international institution, and that international strategy is therefore inseparable from overall strategy.
LEARNING AND TEACHING

LT1 Provide students with high quality programmes of study

Deliver well-designed programmes in all of the School’s disciplines

UG successful progression and completions % 96% (current <90%)
PGT successful completions % 96%

LT2 Be the institution of choice for both undergraduate and postgraduate students in all of the School’s disciplines

LT2.1 Deliver excellent Student Experience

UG Level 4 satisfaction >80%
UG Level 5 satisfaction 96%
UG Level 6 NSS Upper quartile (current 92%)
PGT Level 7 satisfaction 96%
Academic staff with HEA T qualification (or equiv) % [see S2 Capacity Building]

LT2.2 Recruit and retain the best students on merit and potential

Market share by discipline [discipline level targets]
UG Entry tariff AAA (new UCAS tariff 144 )
PGT Entry tariff 1 or 2.1 (any exceptions justified)
Access % Per OFFA agreement

LT3 High quality partnerships to enhance the School’s strategic learning & teaching priorities

Develop and sustain a portfolio of well-designed PGT programmes with high quality international partners

Strategic partnership agreements active (L&T) One a year from 2016
Joint programmes active # One a year from 2017

RESEARCH

R1 World-leading research accessible to, and used by academic communities across the world

R1.1 Produce research publications that demonstrate a major contribution to all of the School’s disciplines

Academic staff producing 3*/4* outputs (or equiv) % [see S2 Capacity Building]
Citation impact [see S2 Capacity Building]

R1.2 Promote research at all levels, including staff, postgraduate and undergraduate students

Academic Staff R active % [see S2 Capacity Building]
PGR progression and completion % [to be established]
R2 A vibrant research environment, including strong engagement in international networks

Retain and attract world-leading researchers, producing world-leading research and impact

Academic staff with doctorate %  [see S2 Capacity Building]
Academic Staff R active %  [see S2 Capacity Building]
Academic staff producing 3*/4* outputs (or equiv) %  [see S2 Capacity Building]
Citation impact  [see S2 Capacity Building]

R3 High quality partnerships to enhance the School’s strategic research priorities

R3.1 Develop and sustain strategic research partnerships with at least one top-ranking university in each of:
China, India, Korea, Japan, Africa and the Middle East

Inter-institutional R agreements active #  One a year from 2016
Joint doctoral programmes active #  One a year from 2017

R3.2 Develop multi-institution, multi-disciplinary, multi-year research collaborations, with external funding

Collaborations active #  One a year from 2016
External funding £ and %  [to be established]

ENTERPRISE AND ENGAGEMENT
Encompassing all external facing activities, across education and research.

EE1 Sustainable enterprise activities across research, teaching and engagement

Engage in knowledge exchange with communities and businesses, including through high quality short courses and Summer Schools, consultancy, and commercialising undertaking practice-based research

Academic staff engaged in E activities #  [to be established]
Major E contracts active #  [to be established]
Client feedback on quality of E activities  >80% excellent

EE2 Taking the School’s expertise to the world and leading intellectual debate in all of the School’s disciplines

Promote public engagement and influence and inform debate in the national, regional and global public realms, including to all of the School’s regions of study and their diasporas

Audience # and reach (attend / follow online)  [to be established]
Feedback and response (feedback forms, social media, citation)  [to be established]

School Key Performance Indicators
Appendix B sets out options to change the School’s Key Performance Indicators, reflecting

- Change from strategies concerned with volume of activity to focus on quality
- Setting specific aims in the context of wider aims
- Use summative indicators (‘baskets’) balancing inputs, activity, and outputs.

end
Appendix A: Development Document
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School
encompassing all activities

Learning & Teaching  SOAS  STRATEGIC
Research  PLAN

external facing across education and research
Enterprise & Engagement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Leadership (Data Manager)</th>
<th>Priority for Action</th>
<th>2025 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 SOAS MISSION: To be a world-leading institution in all of the School’s subject areas</td>
<td>S1.1 ENHANCE THE SCHOOL’S REPUTATION</td>
<td>LEAGUE TABLES (QS, THE, GUARDIAN)</td>
<td>[EXTERNAL] [PLANNING]</td>
<td>CONTINUING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1.2 STRENGTHEN THE SCHOOL’S UNIQUENESS, DIVERSITY AND CULTURAL DISTINCTIVENESS</td>
<td>DISCIPLINARY COVERAGE OF PROGRAMMES AND RESEARCH</td>
<td>DIRECTOR, PD L&amp;T, PD R&amp;E [PLANNING]</td>
<td>CONTINUING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1.3 Maintain a global staff and student body in terms of origin, outlook and engagement</td>
<td>Staff demographic and diversity Student demographic and diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 STAFF CAPACITY BUILDING FOR LEARNING &amp; TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND ENTERPRISE &amp; ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>S2.1 BE THE INSTITUTION OF CHOICE FOR THE HIGHEST QUALITY STAFF IN ALL OF THE SCHOOL’S DISCIPLINES</td>
<td>ACADEMIC STAFF R ACTIVE % ACADEMIC STAFF 3*/4* (or equiv) PUBLICATIONS % CITATION IMPACT ACADEMIC STAFF WITH PHD % ACADEMIC STAFF WITH HEA T QUALIFICATION (or equiv) STUDENT FEEDBACK ON QUALITY STAFF SATISFACTION</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (R Office / HR) PD R&amp;E (R Office / HR) PD R&amp;E (R Office) PD R&amp;E (HR) PD L&amp;T (HR) PD L&amp;T (QA Office) DIRECTOR (HR)</td>
<td>CURRENT CURRENT CURRENT CURRENT CURRENT CURRENT 100% (ANY EXCEPTIONS JUSTIFIED) 100% AT LEAST ONE 4* PUBLICATION (ANY EXCEPTIONS JUSTIFIED) UPPER QUARTILE 100% (ANY EXCEPTIONS JUSTIFIED) 100% (ANY EXCEPTIONS JUSTIFIED) &gt; 80% EXCELLENT Staff Pulse 3.5 (sector currently 3.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 High quality national and international partnerships</td>
<td>{Strategic engagement with institutions of international standing in Asia, Africa and the Middle East is identified in the learning &amp; teaching, research, and enterprise &amp; engagement sections.}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 An international institution</td>
<td>{As the School is an international institution, international strategy is inseparable from overall strategy. However, for convenience, aims that encompass specific international activities are marked with a globe 🌎.}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOAS Strategic Plan: Learning & Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Leadership (Data Manager)</th>
<th>Priority for Action</th>
<th>2025 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1</strong> Provide students with high quality programmes of study</td>
<td><strong>LT1.1</strong> Deliver well-designed programmes in all of the School’s disciplines (including world leading area studies programmes) each with a significant cohort of students</td>
<td>UG successful progression and completions %&lt;br&gt;PGT successful completions %&lt;br&gt;UG Level 4 satisfaction&lt;br&gt;UG Level 5 satisfaction&lt;br&gt;UG Level 6 NSS&lt;br&gt;PGT Level 7 satisfaction&lt;br&gt;UG 5:SR&lt;br&gt;PGT 5:SR&lt;br&gt;Academic staff with HEA T qualification (or equiv) %</td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (REGISTRY)</td>
<td>CURRENT&lt;br&gt;96% (CURRENT &lt;90%)&lt;br&gt;96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1.2</strong> Develop well-structured programmes that cross boundaries between disciplines, each with a significant cohort of students (and eliminate excessive unplanned inter-modularity)</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary programmes active #&lt;br&gt;Students on interdisciplinary programmes #&lt;br&gt;Completions on interdisciplinary programmes %</td>
<td></td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (REGISTRY)</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1.3</strong> Provide all students with the opportunity to possess a working knowledge of one of the languages of Africa, Asia or the Middle East</td>
<td>UG with language study %&lt;br&gt;PGT with language study %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1.4</strong> Develop and deliver dual degree programmes working in partnership with high quality universities across the world, each with a significant cohort of students</td>
<td>Dual programmes active #&lt;br&gt;Students on each dual programme #&lt;br&gt;Completions on interdisciplinary programmes %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1.5</strong> Deliver distance learning and flexible programmes in the School’s regional strengths, each with a significant cohort of students</td>
<td>Distance programmes active #&lt;br&gt;Students on distance programmes #&lt;br&gt;Completions on distance programmes %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1.6</strong> Deliver effective assessment and feedback practices</td>
<td>UG successful progression and completions %&lt;br&gt;PGT successful completions %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LT1.7</strong> Develop on-campus online delivery</td>
<td>Modules deliverable on-campus online #&lt;br&gt;Students using on-campus online delivery #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT1.8</td>
<td>Encourage, support and embed the use of pedagogically tested, flexible learning technologies</td>
<td>Modules deliverable using technology innovation #</td>
<td>Students using learning technologies #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT1.9</td>
<td>Sustain and develop the School’s library and learning resources for Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>Student numbers using library (campus, online)</td>
<td>Library satisfaction survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT2</td>
<td>Be the institution of choice for both undergraduate and postgraduate students in all of the School’s disciplines</td>
<td>LT2.1</td>
<td>Deliver excellent Student Experience</td>
<td>UG LEVEL 4 SATISFACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (QA OFFICE)</td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (QA OFFICE)</td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (QA OFFICE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT NUMBERS</td>
<td>STUDENT NUMBERS</td>
<td>STUDENT NUMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT PLACEMENTS</td>
<td>STUDENT PLACEMENTS</td>
<td>STUDENT PLACEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT EXCHANGES</td>
<td>STUDENT EXCHANGES</td>
<td>STUDENT EXCHANGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT ‘OUTREACHERS’</td>
<td>STUDENT ‘OUTREACHERS’</td>
<td>STUDENT ‘OUTREACHERS’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT VOLUNTEERS</td>
<td>STUDENT VOLUNTEERS</td>
<td>STUDENT VOLUNTEERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENT INTERNS</td>
<td>STUDENT INTERNS</td>
<td>STUDENT INTERNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE2.3</td>
<td>Maintain a diverse student body drawn from all parts of the world including, in particular, those from Asia, Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>Student demographic and diversity in areas of study (Africa, Asia Middle East) and others (Europe, Americas)</td>
<td>Access %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT2.4</td>
<td>Extend the potential for learning in a range of contexts through placements, international exchanges, volunteering, outreach, internships</td>
<td>Programmes with placements</td>
<td>Student placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT2.5</td>
<td>Offer student enterprise opportunities</td>
<td>Students engaged in Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT2.6</td>
<td>Deliver excellent graduate prospects</td>
<td>UG Graduate prospects (graduate role at 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT2.7</td>
<td>Deliver benefits to Alumni</td>
<td>Alumni engaged by School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>High quality partnerships to enhance the School’s strategic learning &amp; teaching priorities</td>
<td>LT3.1</td>
<td>Develop and sustain a portfolio of well-designed PGT programmes with high quality international partners, each with a significant cohort of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (GOVERNANCE)</td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (QA OFFICE)</td>
<td>PD L&amp;T (QA OFFICE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ONE A YEAR FROM 2016</td>
<td>ONE A YEAR FROM 2017</td>
<td>ONE A YEAR FROM 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOAS Strategic Plan: Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Priority for Action</th>
<th>2025 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1 World-leading research accessible to, and used by academic communities across the world</strong></td>
<td><strong>R1.1 Produce research publications that demonstrate a major contribution to all of the School’s disciplines</strong></td>
<td>Academic staff producing 3*/4* outputs (or equiv) % Citation impact</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (R Office)</td>
<td>[see S2 Capacity Building]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R1.2 Promote research at all levels, including staff, postgraduate and undergraduate students</strong></td>
<td>Academic staff active % PGR progression and completion % Academic staff with doctorate % PGR FTE per FTE academic staff PGR Satisfaction PGR Student Numbers SOAS UG/PGT to PGR progression R in UG (modules, reading lists)</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (R Office / HR) PD R&amp;E (Registry)</td>
<td>[see S2 Capacity Building]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2 A vibrant research environment, including strong engagement in international networks</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2.1 Retain and attract world-leading researchers, producing world leading research and impact</strong></td>
<td>Academic staff with doctorate % Academic staff active % Academic staff producing 3*/4* outputs (or equiv) % Citation impact</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (HR) PD R&amp;E (R Office / HR) PD R&amp;E (R Office)</td>
<td>[see S2 Capacity Building]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R2.2 Develop and sustain outward facing world-leading research centres and institutes focused on each of the School’s major regions, that bring leading researchers to the School, and proactively build external research networks</strong></td>
<td>Institutes # Visitors in / engaging (campus / online) Visits out / engagement (physical / online) External funding %</td>
<td></td>
<td>[see S2 Capacity Building]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R2.3 Sustain and enhance the SOAS Library as the UK’s National Research Library for Asia, Africa and the Middle East, and proactively develop the special collections</strong></td>
<td>Library Users (Research) ac staff, PGR, visitors / on campus; inter-library loan; online</td>
<td></td>
<td>[see S2 Capacity Building]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R3 High quality partnerships to enhance the School’s strategic research priorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>R3.1 Develop and sustain strategic research partnerships with at least one top-ranking university in each of: China, India, Korea, Japan, Africa and the Middle East</strong></td>
<td>Inter-institutional R agreements active # Joint doctoral programmes active # Students enrolled on Joint doctoral programmes #</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (R Office) PD R&amp;E (R Office)</td>
<td>One a year from 2016 One a year from 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R3.2 Develop multi-institution, multi-disciplinary, multi-year research collaborations, with significant external funding</strong></td>
<td>Collaborations active # External funding £ and %</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (R Office) PD R&amp;E (R Office)</td>
<td>[to be established] [to be established]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.3 Participate actively in high-profile international university consortia and networks that promote research on Asia, Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>Consortium R agreements active #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.4 Clear opportunities for staff exchange with leading universities worldwide</td>
<td>Staff exchanges #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.4 Develop institutional links with libraries possessing important holdings for studies relating to Asia, Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td>Inter-institutional R Library agreements active #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 Sustainable funding for research</td>
<td>R4.1 Raise external research grants and contracts income, including multi-year, multi-institution and multi-disciplinary programmes of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research grant and contract income per FTE academic staff £ HEFCE QR income per FTE academic staff £ FEC recovered on research grants and contracts %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD R&amp;E(R Office)</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>[to be established]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD R&amp;E(R Office)</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>[to be established]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD R&amp;E(R Office)</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>~100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5 Outstanding research impact to benefit cultural life, economic life and public policy</td>
<td>R5.1 Deliver research focused on matters of global concern and that stimulates debate, influences policy development and increases public understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citation impact Feedback and response (media and social media)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5.2 Implement a responsive and targeted approach to promote impact, based on co-production of research and/or strategic engagement with external partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citation impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5.3 Be home to and contribute to world leading journals on Asia, Africa and the Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owned ‘4*’ journal # Editor ‘4*’ journal # On editorial board of ‘4*’ journal #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Leadership (Data Manager)</td>
<td>Priority for Action</td>
<td>2025 Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE1 SUSTAINABLE ENTERPRISE ACTIVITIES ACROSS RESEARCH, TEACHING AND ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>EE1.1 ENGAGE IN KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE WITH COMMUNITIES AND BUSINESSES, INCLUDING THROUGH HIGH QUALITY SHORT COURSES AND SUMMER SCHOOLS, CONSULTANCY, AND COMMERCIALISING UNDERTAKING PRACTICE BASED RESEARCH</td>
<td>ACADEMIC STAFF ENGAGED IN E ACTIVITIES # MAJOR E CONTRACTS ACTIVE # CLIENT FEEDBACK ON QUALITY OF E ACTIVITIES Consultancy engagements # Enterprise contract income per FTE academic staff E FEC recovered on E contracts %</td>
<td>PD R&amp;E (E Office)</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2 TAKING THE SCHOOL’S EXPERTISE TO THE WORLD AND LEADING INTELLECTUAL DEBATE IN ALL OF THE SCHOOL’S DISCIPLINES</td>
<td>EE2.1 PROMOTE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND INFLUENCE AND INFORM DEBATE IN THE NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND GLOBAL PUBLIC REALMS, INCLUDING TO ALL OF THE SCHOOL’S REGIONS OF STUDY AND THEIR DIASPORAS</td>
<td>Events / appearances (campus, physical, online) # AUDIENCE # AND REACH (ATTEND / FOLLOW ONLINE) FEEDBACK AND RESPONSE (FEEDBACK FORMS, SOCIAL MEDIA, CITATION)</td>
<td>[TO BE ESTABLISHED] (C&amp;PO?) [TO BE ESTABLISHED] (C&amp;PO?)</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE2.2 Encourage young people to explore and understand the things we do, and develop interest in the School’s subject areas through high quality outreach programmes</td>
<td>Outreach programmes # Audience # and reach (attend / follow online) Feedback and response (feedback forms, social media, citation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE2.3 Encourage staff to provide their expertise to inspire public debate and discussion about the School’s research through public events and forums, reporting in the mass media, and discussion on social media</td>
<td>Appearances (campus, physical, online) Audience # and reach (attend / follow online) Feedback and response (feedback forms, social media, citation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3 High-quality partnerships to enhance the School’s engagement and public education</td>
<td>EE3.1 Develop partnerships to promote the School’s expertise in the UK and internationally</td>
<td>Strategic partnership agreements active (engagement) #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE3.2 Deliver public lectures and exhibitions in collaboration with national and international museums and galleries</td>
<td>Events / appearances (campus, physical, online) # Collaborations active #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: SOAS Key Performance Indicators: Options to Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Current KPI</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>New KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[League table positions]</td>
<td>Reinstate, as key measure of reputation as perceived externally</td>
<td>League table positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 1</td>
<td>Overall score in the National Student Survey</td>
<td>Subsumed in updated KPI 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is also an input to KPI 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 2</td>
<td>Student Experience</td>
<td>Replace with wider aim</td>
<td>Student satisfaction and Module feedback all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- presently limited to NSS level 6, too late to take action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 3</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree students who study a language</td>
<td>Replace with wider aim</td>
<td>T and R coverage in Asia, Africa, Middle East (T market share against benchmark by disciplines %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 4</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student Outcomes</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>High quality programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- include all levels</td>
<td>- Input: % staff with HEA T qualification; entry tariff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- balance across inputs, activity, outcomes</td>
<td>- Activity: S:SR, progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reflect focus on building academic staff capacity</td>
<td>- Output: module feedback; completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 5</td>
<td>Graduate Employability</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Graduate Employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 6</td>
<td>Student numbers profile (level of study and level of fees paid)</td>
<td>Replace with wider aim</td>
<td>Progression and completion all levels (basket measure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- and reflect changed aim from quantity to quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 7</td>
<td>PhD Students submit within 4 years (FT) 7 years (PT)</td>
<td>Subsumed in updated KPI 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 9</td>
<td>Research income per research active academic staff FTE</td>
<td>Replace with wider aim</td>
<td>High quality research (basket measure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reflect aim to raise R quality post REF</td>
<td>- Input: % Staff with PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reflect focus on building academic staff capacity</td>
<td>- Activity: % R active staff; £ per R active FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Output: % with *3/*4 publication; citation impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 12</td>
<td>Staff Engagement</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Staff Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 10</td>
<td>Surplus/deficit as percentage of income</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Surplus/deficit as percentage of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 8</td>
<td>Performance of the estate</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Performance of the estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI X</td>
<td>Number of Engaged Alumni</td>
<td>Withdraw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI 11</td>
<td>Number of Donors to the School</td>
<td>[Withdraw – subsume into KPI 10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOAS COMMUNITY REFERENDUM ON BDS

GB is asked to:
(i) **consider** the following report about the BDS referendum organised by the Students’ Union in February 2015
(ii) **approve** the proposal to establish a working group that will look at the possibility to develop principles to be used to assess whether SOAS has an interest in taking a stand on the Israel/Palestine conflict.

**Executive Summary**
At the end of February the SOAS Students’ Union organized, with the support of SOAS UCU and UNISON branches, a SOAS-wide consultative referendum on Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) of Israel, specifically in regards to academic boycott, i.e. the boycott of Israeli universities.

A total of 2056 members of the SOAS community voted, out of which 73% voted ‘Yes’ and 27% voted ‘No’ to the question “should SOAS join the BDS call for an academic boycott of Israeli universities?”. Never did the School have such a wide participation and turnout to any of its usual consultation processes.

SOAS currently has ties to Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where Hebrew language students spend their year abroad.

Hebrew University is complicit with the Israeli occupation and military effort, as it is partly built on the illegal settlement of East Jerusalem and gives preferential treatment to IDF soldiers engaged with operation ‘Protective Edge’ this past summer in the Gaza Strip.

**Recommendations**
Governing Body is asked to:
- Establish a working group that will look at the possibility to develop principles to be used to assess whether SOAS has an interest in taking a stand on the Israel/Palestine conflict.

**Financial Impact**
No financial impact in setting up a working group. Any financial impacts on recommendations later in the work would need to be considered at the time.

**Risks**
No risks in setting up a working group. Any risks on recommendations later in the work would need to be considered at the time.

**Equality Implications**
No implications in setting up a working group. Any impact on recommendations later in the work would need to be considered at the time.
SOAS COMMUNITY REFERENDUM ON BDS

GB is asked to:

(i) **consider** the following report about the BDS referendum organised by the Students’ Union in February 2015

(ii) **approve** the proposal to establish a working group that will look at the possibility to develop principles to be used to assess whether SOAS has an interest in taking a stand on the Israel/Palestine conflict.

The Referendum at SOAS:

Between the 23rd and 27th of February the SOAS Students’ Union, with the support of SOAS trade union branches (UCU and UNISON), organised a SOAS-wide referendum on Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) of Israel, specifically in regards to academic boycott. Voting was open to all members of the SOAS community: current students, academics, non-academic staff, university governors, and outsourced workers such as cleaners, security, and catering staff.

The referendum took place both online and via ballot box, in which all members of the community could vote on the question “should SOAS join the BDS call for an academic boycott of Israeli universities?” The results were announced on the evening of 27th February by the Returning Officer for the referendum, Alex Fulton. A total of 2056 people voted, out of which 73% voted Yes and 27% voted No – find results breakdown in Appendix 1.

The SOAS Students’ Union has supported BDS for 10 years, as decided by its members through its democratic processes, but this consultative referendum was organised to find out the opinion of the whole community. The Union’s concern during the referendum was to ensure a fair and transparent voting process (overseen by the Returning Officer), to facilitate a safe and inclusive environment in which this question could be debated, and to encourage members of the community to engage and exercise their right to vote. The Union facilitated the activities of both the Yes and No campaigns on campus, with both being equally represented in our communications about the referendum and in debates on the subject.

SOAS ties to Hebrew University in Jerusalem:

Currently SOAS has formal links with the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. There are a multitude of reasons why SOAS should sever its ties from Hebrew University:

1) Sections of Hebrew University campus are located on Palestinian land in East Jerusalem, which was confiscated in 1968.

2) The Hebrew University established special scholarships to soldiers who fought in operation ‘Protective Edge’ last August, in which more than 2,000 Palestinians were killed – the scholarship fund is called The Protective Edge Fund. The University provided similar scholarships to students who went on reserve duty in combat units for more than three weeks during operation “Defensive Shield” in 2002, and offered special assistance and academic benefits to students who served in Israel’s 2008 military attack on the Gaza Strip.

3) There is close academic collaboration between the Hebrew University and the Israeli military. In 2008 the Hebrew University won a tender to establish and run a school for military medicine, designed specifically to train medical staff for the Israeli armed forces.
This saw the creation of a special department to train future soldiers as medical officers, and has involved a close and public partnership between the University and the IDF.

4) Hebrew University regularly silences protests by Palestinian students, and students and staff who speak out against Israeli occupation and military violence. A statement made by the University in July 2014 threatens to discipline students and staff who post what the University deems “harmful and extreme” statements on social media in relation to the Israeli military’s attacks on Gaza. Moreover, the University demands a police-issued “character reference” certificate from non-student Palestinian visitors to its campus, supposedly to ensure they are not terrorists.

5) Hebrew University recognises degrees from the University of Ariel, which is based in the West Bank settlement of Ariel, and does not extend this recognition to degrees from Al Quds University, an Arabic Palestinian University and the only Arab university in Jerusalem.

6) Hebrew University’s Vice-President for External Affairs, Carmi Gilon, was formerly Director of the General Security Services, an organisation which is notorious for torture and human rights abuses of Palestinians, and who is accused by various organizations of committing war crimes.


Additional information can be requested to SOAS Students’ Union, or found on the SU statement published on the SOAS SU - website http://soasunion.org/

What would BDS mean for SOAS: Academic Boycott and Academic Freedom

An academic boycott would see SOAS end this link with Hebrew University and refrain from academic cooperation, collaboration or joint projects with institutions funded by the Israeli government. This would be a boycott of institutions, not individuals: Israeli academics would still work with SOAS in their individual capacity, rather than as official representatives of Israeli universities. Anchored in precepts of international law and universal human rights, the BDS movement, including PACBI, rejects on principle boycotts of individuals based on their identity (such as citizenship, race, gender, or religion) or opinion. If, however, an individual is representing the state of Israel or a complicit Israeli institution (such as a dean, rector, or president), or is commissioned/recruited to participate in Israel’s efforts to “rebrand” itself, then their activities are subject to the institutional boycott the BDS movement is calling for.

Please see Appendix 2: the boycott guides produced by the Palestine Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI). The institutional and academic boycott that PACBI is calling for has been endorsed by the Palestinian Council for Higher Education (CHE), is in line with the CHE’s call for “non-cooperation in the scientific and technical fields between Palestinian and Israeli universities”, and is supported by the Palestinian Federation of Unions of University Professors and Employees (PFUUPE).

The BDS campaign and the PACBI guidelines, uphold the universal right to academic freedom. The institutional boycott called for by Palestinian civil society does not conflict with such freedom. PACBI subscribes to the internationally-accepted definition of academic
freedom as adopted by the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (UNESCR):

Academic freedom includes the liberty of individuals to express freely opinions about the institution or system in which they work, to fulfill their functions without discrimination or fear of repression by the state or any other actor, to participate in professional or representative academic bodies, and to enjoy all the internationally recognized human rights applicable to other individuals in the same jurisdiction. The enjoyment of academic freedom carries with it obligations, such as the duty to respect the academic freedom of others, to ensure the fair discussion of contrary views, and to treat all without discrimination on any of the prohibited grounds.


Recommendations for SOAS Governing Body:

The referendum that took place at SOAS is to our knowledge the most democratic policy that the School has been lobbied to make by its own community. Close to 30% of the whole community participated in this vote.

We believe that SOAS should be governed in accordance with the values and ethics of the students and staff who make up the institution. As governors we therefore request that SOAS Governing Body uphold the will of its community by ending SOAS’s links with Israeli universities and thereby ending its connections with human rights abuses committed by Israel.

Nevertheless, we also appreciate concerns about damage to the School’s academic and pedagogical remit, if failing short of providing excellent quality teaching of Hebrew to its students, particularly for those students going to Jerusalem for their year abroad. We in no way want the learning and teaching of Hebrew to be undermined and want SOAS to remain the world’s leading institution in the study of Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

In light of this Governing Body is asked to

(i) set up a working group to consider how the School can best uphold the democratic will of its community by looking at all legal and reputational implications of adopting the PACBI guidelines. The working group will:

a) develop principles to be used to assess whether SOAS has an interest in taking a stand on the Israel/Palestine conflict.

b) provide such an assessment

c) on the basis of that assessment, make recommendations to Governing Body about actions SOAS could undertake

(ii) The proposed membership of the Working Group to be as followed:

- Director
- 2 members of Governing Body
- Student Union member
• Head of the Near and Middle East Department and/or Convenor of Hebrew programme
• 1 other member of Academic Board
• Secretary

GB members proposing this document:
Mr David Suber
Ms Georige Robertson

Appendix 1: SOAS Community Referendum Results

**Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Staff (Cleaners, Security, Catering)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOAS Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL VOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: PACBI guidelines

Specifically, the following events, activities, or situations are in violation of the Palestinian academic boycott:

1. **Academic events (such as conferences, symposia, workshops, book and museum exhibits) convened or co-sponsored by Israel, complicit Israeli institutions or their support and lobby groups in various countries.** All such academic events, whether held in Israel or abroad, deserve to be boycotted on institutional grounds. These boycottable activities include panels and other activities sponsored or organized by Israeli academic bodies or associations at international conferences outside Israel. Importantly, they also include the convening in Israel of meetings of international bodies and associations.

   The general principle is that an event or project carried out under the sponsorship/aegis of or in affiliation with or funding by an official Israeli body or a complicit institution (including lobby groups) constitutes complicity and therefore is deserving of boycott. The same may apply to support or sponsorship from non-Israeli institutions that serve Israeli propaganda purposes.

2. **Research and development activities that fall into these broad categories:**

   (a) **Among academic institutions – Institutional cooperation agreements with Israeli universities or research institutes.** These agreements, concluded between international and Israeli academic institutions, typically involve the exchange of faculty and students and, more importantly, the conduct of joint research. Many of these schemes are sponsored and funded by the European Union (in the case of Europe), and independent and government foundations elsewhere.

   (b) **Among the Israeli government and other governments or foundations/institutions.** Researchers in such projects could be based at U.S., European or other universities.

   (c) **Among corporations and academic institutions –** Research and development activities on behalf of international corporations involving contracts or other institutional agreements with departments or centers at Israeli universities.

   The clearest example of academic complicity with Israel that is supported by governments is Horizon 2020 [7]. Including Israel in this massive academic research project despite Israel’s persistent violations of the human rights clause of the EU-Israel Association Agreement [8], the legal framework for Horizon and other EU-Israel schemes, is tantamount to whitewashing the long list of violations of human rights that Israel and its complicit universities have committed over the last decades.

   Other examples include the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) [9], an institution established by the US and Israeli governments in 1972 to sponsor research by Israelis and Americans, and the “Eureka Initiative,” [10] a European inter-governmental initiative set up in 1985 that includes Israel as the only non-European member. The Britain-Israel Research and Academic Exchange Partnership (BIRAX), a politically motivated project that aims to counter the growing support of the academic boycott of Israel among British academics and their unions [11] is another example.

3. **Funding from Israel or its lobby groups to academic activities/projects.** All academic projects and activities funded, partially or fully, by Israel or any of its lobby
groups are boycottable. Any international academic forum/project that accepts funding from Israel, its lobby groups or complicit institutions is conflicting with the Palestinian academic boycott of Israel.

**Note:** An Israeli academic is entitled, as a taxpayer, to receive funding from his/her government or institution in support of academic activities, such as attendance of international conferences and other academic events, so long as this is not conditioned upon serving Israel’s policy interests in any way, such as public acknowledgement of this support by the organizers of the conference or activity/event. Mere affiliation of the academic to an Israeli institution does not subject the conference or activity to boycott.

4. **Addresses and talks at international venues by Israeli state officials or official representatives of Israeli academic institutions** such as presidents, rectors or deans.

5. **Study abroad schemes in Israel for international students.** These programs are usually housed at Israeli universities and are part of the Israeli propaganda effort, designed to give international students a “positive experience” of Israel, whitewashing its occupation and denial of Palestinian rights. Publicity and recruitment for these schemes through students’ affairs offices or academic departments (such as Middle East and international studies centers) at universities abroad should come to an end.

6. **Special academic honors or recognition granted to Israeli officials, representatives of Israeli academic institutions (such as the bestowal of honorary degrees and other awards) or to Israeli academic or research institutions.** Such institutions and their official representatives are complicit and as such should be denied this recognition.

7. **Normalization Projects.** Academic activities and projects involving Palestinians and/or other Arabs on one side and Israelis on the other (whether bi- or multi-lateral) that are based on the false premise of symmetry/parity between the oppressors and the oppressed or that claim that both colonizers and colonized are equally responsible for the “conflict” are intellectually dishonest and morally reprehensible forms of normalization that ought to be boycotted [12]. Far from challenging the unjust status quo, such projects contribute to its endurance. Examples include events, projects, or publications that are designed explicitly to bring together Palestinians/Arabs and Israelis so they can present their respective narratives or perspectives, or to work toward reconciliation without addressing the root causes of injustice and the requirements of justice. Other factors that PACBI takes into consideration in evaluating such activities and projects are the sources of funding, the design of the project or event, the objectives of the sponsoring organization(s), the participants, and similar relevant factors.

Joint projects that meet the following two conditions are not considered forms of normalization and are therefore exempt from boycott:

(a) the Israeli party in the project recognizes the comprehensive Palestinian rights under international law (corresponding to the 3 rights in the BDS call); and

(b) the project/activity is one of “co-resistance” rather than co-existence.[13]

Debates between Palestinians/Arabs and Israelis are also excluded from the boycott if organized without any cooperation with Israel, its lobby groups, or its complicit institutions.

Conditioning support for Palestinian academic institutions on their “partnership” with Israeli institutions is also a coercive form of normalization that is rejected by the BNC,
including PACBI and the Palestinian Federation of Unions of University Professors and Employees (PFUUPE). It contributes to covering up the Israeli institutions' complicity and to enhancing their legitimacy as centers of excellence, instead of directly and independently strengthening the research capacity of Palestinian institutions.

International academics who insist on crossing the BDS “picket line” by pursuing activities with boycottable Israeli institutions and then visiting Palestinian institutions or groups for “balance,” violate the boycott guidelines and contribute to the false perception of symmetry between the colonial oppressor and the colonized. The BNC (including PACBI) rejects this attempt at “fig-leafing”[14] and does not welcome such visits to Palestinian institutions.

8. **Institutional membership of Israeli associations in world bodies.** Targeted and selective campaigns demanding the suspension of Israeli membership in international forums contribute towards pressuring Israel until it respects international law. Just as South Africa’s membership was suspended in world academic--among other--bodies during apartheid, so must Israel’s.

9. **Publishing in or refereeing articles for academic journals based at Israeli universities or published in collaboration with Israeli institutions, or granting permission to reprint material published elsewhere in such Israel-based journals.** These journals include those published by international associations but housed at Israeli universities. Efforts should be made to re-locate the editorial offices of these journals to universities outside Israel.

10. **Serving as external reviewers for dissertations, writing recommendations or other forms of refereeing such as advising on hiring, promotion, tenure, and grant-making decisions at Israeli universities** [15]. International academics who choose to review the academic work of faculty or students at Israeli universities on a personal basis are not conflicting with the boycott guidelines, so long as their names are not used by those universities in any way (to gain legitimacy). Accepting to be on a dissertation, referee or review committee appointed by or serving an Israeli university, however, directly conflicts with the institutional boycott of these universities, as it legitimates Israel’s academic standing around the world. The boycott also applies to writing tenure or promotion recommendations addressed to university administrators. Furthermore, international faculty should not accept to write recommendations for students hoping to pursue studies in Israel, as this facilitates the violation of guideline 11 below.

11. **International students enrolling in or international faculty teaching or conducting research at degree or non-degree programs at an Israeli institution.** If conducting research at Israeli facilities such as archives does not entail official affiliation with those facilities (e.g. in the form of a visiting position), then the activity is not subject to boycott.

12. **All academic visits or fact-finding missions that receive funding from Israel, its complicit institutions or its international lobby groups.** Israeli government funding or funding by Israeli lobby groups should be boycotted. On the other hand, balanced, independent fact-finding missions, even those that include meetings with complicit Israeli academic institutions, are not boycottable, provided that no institutional link (e.g., seminars, workshops, exhibits, etc.) of any sort is established with Israeli institutions.

The institutional boycott of Israeli academic institutions should continue until these institutions fulfil two basic conditions:
a. **Recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people as enshrined in international law** (including the three basic rights outlined in the 2005 BDS Call) and

b. **End all forms of complicity in violating Palestinian rights as stipulated in international law.** This complicity includes discriminatory policies and practices as well as diverse roles in planning, implementing and/or justifying Israel’s human rights abuses and violations of international law.
Executive Summary

The proposal for SOAS to divest from fossil fuels was first raised in November 2014, gaining widespread support from students and staff. After members of Investment Advisory Panel met with students about the initiative, a report was commissioned from Newton Asset Management about the impact of divestment on SOAS’ portfolio, which found that the impact of divestment would be negligible. Consequently, the Panel decided to freeze all new investments in fossil fuels in June 2014 while the question of divestment was investigated further.

In November 2014 Governing Body decided to set up a working group to look into divestment, consider its wider implications for SOAS, and bring recommendations to Governing Body so that it can make a decision on divestment. The working group, comprising Georgie Robertson (Chair), David Skinner and Christine Oughton, with Chris Ince as Secretary and members of the Fossil Free campaign in attendance, are bringing this paper as its recommendations to Governing Body.

SOAS’ Director, the Director of Development and Alumni Relations and the Energy Manager have all expressed support for the below recommendations.

Georgie Robertson

Recommendations

The working group recommends the following:

Adding the following ethical investment criterion to SOAS' Ethical Investment Policy: “The avoidance of all companies within the oil and gas producers subsector, and all companies deriving more than 10% of their revenues from coal mining.” The working group recommends that this exclusion is implemented within a period of three years.

Amending the School's Gift Acceptance Form and Due Diligence Procedure for Philanthropic Gifts to include consideration of the School's ethical investment commitments. The working group also proposes three internal guidance questions to assist staff in their due diligence.

Comprehensively collecting data across SOAS in order to establish the School's total carbon footprint, setting targets for annual reductions in this footprint, and publicly reporting on progress in relation to these targets annually.

Moreover, the working group recommends that news of a divestment decision at SOAS is communicated in a positive light, and framed as part of a wider story about the various steps SOAS is taking to tackle climate change and take leadership on good environmental practice.

As part of SOAS’ role as a leader in good environmental practice, the working group recommends that SOAS encourages other universities – particularly within the University of
Financial Impact

In March 2014, Newton Asset Management confirmed that the impact of divestment on SOAS’ portfolio returns would have been marginally negative over a past 8-year period, and marginally positive over the more recent 5, 3 and 1 year periods.

Newton Asset Management has confirmed that the above exclusion arrangement would reduce SOAS’ investment universe by 5.76%. Newton Asset Management has confirmed that, while this exclusion arrangement may increase the chances of portfolio volatility, this would remain within a manageable level, and the exclusion criterion would be feasible to perform.

Risks

The working group has considered potential risks, and believes that its recommendations have mitigated against these.

Equality implications

None.
Fossil Fuel Divestment at SOAS: Final Recommendations for SOAS Governing Body

By SOAS Governing Body Working Group

April 2015

I. Context of divestment decision

1. The proposal for SOAS to divest from fossil fuels began in November 2013, with a unanimous student union vote in favour of SOAS divesting. A coalition of SOAS students, staff and alumni formed a group, Fossil Free SOAS, to further the proposal.

2. In February 2014, Fossil Free SOAS met with the Acting Finance Director (Barry Douglas) and Acting Registrar (Graeme Appleby) to discuss the divestment proposal. The Acting Finance Director and Acting Registrar acknowledged the moral case for divestment, in light of the urgency of climate change. They also acknowledged the case for divestment in terms of consistency with SOAS’ core value to “actively seek to embed good environmental practice at an institutional level,” as well as SOAS’ growing leadership in research on environmental and sustainability issues. It was also noted that there would likely be significant reputational benefits for SOAS if the School divested. On this basis, the Acting Finance Director and Acting Registrar suggested that further research be done to investigate the financial impacts of divestment for SOAS.

3. As a result of these discussions, SOAS’ Investment Advisory Panel (IAP), at its meeting in March 2014, directed Newton Asset Management to investigate what impact divestment might have on SOAS’ portfolio returns. Using a historical analysis of the portfolio’s performance, the study concluded that the impact would have been marginally negative over the past eight years, and marginally positive from the past five years onwards.

4. Following this result, the IAP agreed at its meeting in June 2014 to freeze all new investments in fossil fuels whilst investigations into divestment continued, with a view to making a final recommendation to the Resources & Planning Committee (RPC) in November 2014.

5. In November 2014, Fossil Free SOAS met with the Director and Treasurer of SOAS, both of whom expressed support for the proposal.

6. At its meeting on 11th November 2014, the RPC decided to recommend that the Governing Body (GB) should set up a working group to look at divestment and its wider implications for SOAS, and make final recommendations to GB.

7. At its meeting on 27th November 2014, GB created a working group, consisting of members of GB, to consider divestment and how policies on donations and energy usage could be made consistent with a divestment policy, with a view to making recommendations to GB. The working group was directed to finish its work either by the informal GB meeting of the 4th February 2015, or by the formal GB meeting in April 2015 if necessary.

8. The working group comprised Georgie Robertson (SU Co-President and GB member), who chaired the group, and GB members David Skinner and Christine Oughton. Also in attendance were GB Clerk Chris Ince, who acted as secretary to the working group, and members of the Fossil Free SOAS group.
9. The working group met five times between December and March 2015. In the course of developing its recommendations, it consulted with Newton Asset Management, SOAS’ Energy Manager, the External Relations & Development Office, and SOAS’ Director. These discussions and recommendations are presented in this report to the Governing Body.

10. Given the scope of issues to be considered by the working group, it was decided that final recommendations would be presented to GB at its meeting in April 2015. At GB’s meeting in February 2015, Georgie Robertson briefed GB on the case for divestment, updated them on the progress of the working group, and collected their feedback on the work done so far. This feedback has been incorporated into the final recommendations below.

II. Working group recommendations

A. Wording of ethical investment criterion

11. In March 2014, Newton Asset Management confirmed that the impact of divestment on SOAS’ portfolio returns would have been marginally negative over a past 8-year period, and marginally positive over the more recent 5, 3 and 1 year periods.

12. The working group subsequently contacted Newton Asset Management to clarify options for the specific wording of an ethical investment exclusion on fossil fuels. Newton confirmed that they could undertake a subsector-based exclusion of all companies in the oil and gas industry. In addition, they explained three involvement-based exclusions they could also undertake:

   i. Companies with up to or over 33% annual turnover from fossil fuel industries;
   ii. Companies with at least a 5% stake in projects and operations involved in extracting tar sands. In practice this mainly captures companies in the oil & gas production sector, with some involvement from companies in the oil & gas, equipment & services sector and companies involved in building / operating pipelines dedicated to oil sands. In addition, companies from other sectors could be involved if they have investments of 5% or more and report on these investments.
   iii. Companies with over 10% turnover from coal mining.

13. In order to keep SOAS’ investment portfolio as broad as possible, and to keep portfolio volatility to a minimum, the working group agreed that the divestment exclusion should focus on companies involved in the extraction of fossil fuels. Therefore, the working group did not deem it necessary to implement either the first or second involvement-based exclusions proposed by Newton’s most recent analysis, since both of these include activities that fall outside the remit of fossil fuel extraction (processing, equipment & services, infrastructure, and manufacture of non-fossil-fuel goods).

14. The working group therefore recommends the following exclusion arrangement:

   i. A subsector-based exclusion: of companies listed in the oil and gas producers sector.
   ii. An involvement-based exclusion: of companies deriving more than 10% of their revenue from coal extraction.

15. This would translate into the following addition to SOAS’ Ethical Investment Policy: “The avoidance of all companies within the oil and gas producers subsector, and all companies deriving more than 10% of their revenues from coal mining.”
16. Newton Asset Management has confirmed that the above exclusion arrangement would reduce SOAS’ investment universe by 5.76%. Newton Asset Management has confirmed that, while this exclusion arrangement may increase the chances of portfolio volatility, this would remain within a manageable level, and the exclusion criterion would be feasible to perform.

17. Regarding timescales, SOAS’ existing Ethical Investment Policy states: “any Companies held within the portfolio that are deemed to be unacceptable under SOAS’ ethical policy will be exited within six months.” While Newton Asset Management confirmed that they would be able to implement the divestment exclusion within a period of 6 months, they said that a longer timeframe would be preferable in order to provide flexibility and ensure a smooth transition. The working group therefore recommends implementing the new ethical investment criterion within a period of three years.

B. Amendments to donations policy

18. The working group proposes two changes to SOAS’ Gift Acceptance Form and Due Diligence Procedure for Philanthropic Gifts, based on discussions with SOAS’ Director and the External Relations & Development Office.

19. SOAS’ Gift Acceptance Form currently requires those reviewing whether or not to accept donations on behalf of the school, to consider: “Is the gift consistent and compatible with the goals, purposes and strategic plan of the School?” The working group recommends that the following guideline is added beneath the above question within the Gift Acceptance Form: “Consideration should also be made of the School’s commitments regarding ethical investment”.

20. GB proposed at its meeting in February 2015 that guidance should be provided on how potential donations are reviewed, to ensure consistency with a new ethical investment criterion on fossil fuels.

21. The working group identified three categories of donors whose potential donations should be subject to the guidance outlined in this document: companies, individuals, and states.

22. With regard to direct donations from fossil fuel companies, the working group initially considered the possibility of a guideline stating that all such donations should be rejected by SOAS. However, based on feedback given by the External Relations & Development office, and in light of SOAS’ legitimate need to assure a wide range of funding sources in the coming years, the working group recommends taking a more nuanced approach that does not absolutely rule out donations from any sources, but considers the circumstances under which donations from certain sources would be harmful and thus raise a high possibility that they should not be accepted. These circumstances are outlined in the remainder of this section.

23. The most important concern with donations to academic institutions from fossil fuel companies, or individuals or states linked with fossil fuel extraction, is that these donations might cause academic research to be influenced in favour of fossil fuel extraction. The working group believes that SOAS’ existing Due Diligence Procedure for Philanthropic Gifts sufficiently addresses this concern:

“In order to ensure academic integrity and independence at SOAS, it is important that the rights and obligations of both SOAS and the donor are clearly set out in agreed documentation. All such documentation will clearly articulate that the donor of a
philanthropic gift will have no control or influence over any academic, strategic or operational decision making as a result of the gift being accepted.”

24. The working group also proposes adding a question to Section 7(d) of SOAS’ Due Diligence Procedure for Philanthropic Gifts. The Due Diligence Procedure is to help the School weigh up the benefits of a donation versus the potential risk. It sets out a list of questions assessing whether there are “external/internal relations risks associated with the relationship and whether the gift can be accepted on risk grounds”, which are to be applied to donations over £10,000. According to Section 7(e) of the Due Diligence procedure, the analysis of these risk questions “will include a scoring process correlating potential risk factors and the potential reward/benefit to SOAS.”

1) The working group proposes adding the following question to the existing list of questions in section 7(d) of SOAS’ Due Diligence Procedure for Philanthropic Gifts: “Is the donor associated with the fossil fuel extraction industry?”

2) To assist SOAS staff in answering this question, the working group proposes the following three internal guidance questions. These would not be a formal part of the Due Diligence Procedure, but rather be for internal use purposes, to assist SOAS staff in answering the new risk question set out above.
   i. “Would the donor receive naming rights (to a building, research centre, academic award, scholarship, professorship, or similar)?”
   ii. “Is the donor a company that derives more than 10% of its revenues from oil, gas or coal extraction?”
   iii. “Is the donor’s public reputation is primarily associated with fossil fuel extraction? (i.e. is fossil fuel extraction the first thing that comes to mind when a member of the public thinks of the donor?)”

25. SOAS’ Director and the External Relations & Development Office have both confirmed their support for these recommendations. The External Relations & Development Office proposes to prepare an updated procedure and form on gift acceptance following the GB meeting in April, incorporating these new measures on fossil fuels as well as the GB discussions on More Partnership in February.

C. Carbon emissions reductions in estates

26. The working group considered the work being conducted by the Estates and Facilities team to reduce carbon emissions and improve SOAS’ environmental performance overall. This includes:

   i. In 2005, SOAS set a target to cut its onsite carbon emissions by 48% by 2020. SOAS has already overshot this target, reducing its emissions by 52% thus far.
   ii. High environmental building standards in the North Block, through the rainwater harvesting tank, innovative ventilation systems, efficiency boilers and BREEAM “Excellent” design.
   iii. Nurturing onsite biodiversity through a thriving student-run bee colony and community garden.
   iv. A target to achieve ISO 14001 accreditation by early 2016, which will ensure continuous environmental improvements, compliance with international environmental legislation, and pollution prevention.
v. SOAS received awards in 2011 and 2012 from Camden Climate Change Alliance in recognition of its commitment to improving environmental practice within the institution.

27. In addition to SOAS’ reductions in onsite carbon emissions, the working group also noted the expansion of teaching and research on environmental issues at SOAS in recent years. Three new environment-focused Masters’ programmes have been created in the last two years, for distance learning as well as on-campus learning: on Global Energy and Climate Policy; on Environment, Politics and Development; and on Environment and Economics.

28. The working group agreed that a decision to divest from fossil fuels at SOAS would be consistent with, and complement, these impressive initiatives.

29. In addition to the above initiatives, and following discussions with the Estates and Facilities team, the working group recommends systematically collecting data across SOAS in order to establish the School’s total carbon footprint. This should include monitoring the number of flights SOAS takes as a community, including staff and students, and aiming to reduce this through awareness raising and the promotion of overland travel. This information is currently not available, which makes it harder for SOAS to accurately measure the environmental improvements taking place.

30. Furthermore, once the total carbon footprint has been ascertained, targets should be set for annual reductions. Progress towards meeting these targets should be reported to SOAS management, and be made public, on an annual basis.

31. SOAS’ Energy Manager has confirmed his support for these measures.

D. Communication of divestment decision

32. Communications on SOAS’ website and in the press: Based on discussions with the External Relations and Development Office, the working group recommends that news of a divestment decision at SOAS should be communicated in a positive light, and framed as part of a wider story about the various steps SOAS is taking to tackle climate change and take leadership on good environmental practice. In addition to divestment, SOAS is making significant progress in improving onsite environmental performance, and is expanding its academic programmes on the environment. These are all press-worthy examples of SOAS’ proactive stance towards tackling climate change and promoting sustainability. Press coverage of this kind will maximise the opportunity of a divestment decision to increase visibility and student recruitment, increase alumni loyalty and attract new donors.

33. Communications with other universities: As part of SOAS’ role as a leader in good environmental practice, the working group recommends that SOAS encourages other universities – particularly within the University of London – to take similar steps towards divestment and onsite carbon emission reductions. Working group members spoke to the Director of SOAS about this, who confirmed his support for this approach.
RISK OVERVIEW

Governing Body is asked to note the attached Risk Overview for the School.

Executive Summary

Governing Body requested to see the risk heatmap at each of its meetings.

Recommendations

Governing Body to note the current heatmap.

Financial Impact

Many of the risks listed in the Risk Register have financial implications for the School.

Risks

There is the risk that important items will be overlooked and not included in the School Risk Register. The Risk Register is the key document within the School for the identification and monitoring of risk.

Equality implications

N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>High level risk description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Failure to meet income targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Failure to meet rising student expectations, leading to poor retention rates and loss of reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Failure to recruit and retain world-class staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Failure to manage institutional reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Failure to manage academic reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Failure to take advantage of strategic opportunities and be agile in a competitive marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Failure to achieve VfM in all key institutional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Failure to manage the School's cost base and ensure a sustainable institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Failure to manage plans for a major business continuity incident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Net risk represents the risk after all future controls are put in place and if there were no further external changes to the risk.
These minutes are for information only. Any corrections to the minutes will be recorded in the minutes of the subsequent meeting of the committee.
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20. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 November 2014 were approved as a true record.

21. Action Taken

Academic Board noted that all action points from the last meeting which were due for completion had been completed.

22. Matters Arising

(i) Centenary Research Themes
The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) reported that, following approval of the themes, 5 working groups had been set up to take this matter forward. Membership of the groups had been taken from across the School, and from all levels of staff. Several meetings had already taken place, and had produced some interesting and exciting suggestions. Further meetings were scheduled for later in the term.

(ii) National Student Survey
Recent figures had suggested that the response rate of students was lower than at a similar point last year. Academic Board recognised the importance of increasing the response rate, and all members who were in a position to do so were asked to encourage students to complete the survey.

23. Director’s Report

Academic Board received the report from the Director at Appendix A. The Director elaborated on several items within the report.

(i) The Chancellor’s Autumn Statement and Postgraduate Funding

The School had initially been offered 64 bursaries, and a grant of £320,000. This had recently increased by a further 14 bursaries with an associated grant of £70,000. It was likely that the School would be offered a third tranche, as it appeared that some other institutions were not taking up the offer of these scholarships.

(ii) University of London – Annual Service Statement

Academic Board noted that the University of London inter-collegiate halls of residence provided accommodation for 207 SOAS students, rather than the 2007 students mentioned in the report.

(iii) University of London and City University

City University had announced that it was considering making an application to become part of the University of London. The University’s Senate had made a recommendation to its Council that the application should go forward. The Council would meet on 24 March 2015 to consider the recommendation.

City University’s Students’ Union had held a referendum on this, which had resulted in an 89.5% ‘yes’ vote. This gave a strong indication of the positive way in which the University of London was seen.

(iv) Counter-Terrorism Act

This Act had caused a great deal of concern across the Higher Education sector and UUK had lobbied hard for changes to the original Bill, and was seeking a number of changes to the draft guidance. The Government amendment made it explicit that in performing the Prevent duty, HEI’s would be required to have ‘particular regard’ to the duty in the Act to secure free speech. This meant that institutions were required to have ‘due regard’ to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism, and in that context ‘particular regard’ to their duties in relation to free speech. It was not clear how Universities were supposed to perform this function.

The School would take cognisance of the guidelines, but did not intend to change its current approach, which was felt to be both sensible and reasonable.

24. Resources & Planning Committee

The Director reported on the main issues discussed at the meeting of Resources & Planning Committee which had taken place on the previous day.

(i) Financial Forecast

The revised forecast for the current year put the School in a slightly better position than had been anticipated in the autumn. There was likely to be a surplus of £250,000 rather than a deficit of £670,000. While this was good news, it was important to remember that this was almost £4 million below the target surplus necessary to ensure the financial future of the School.

(ii) Sustainable SOAS

Resources & Planning Committee discussed and approved the general approach to creating a sustainable SOAS. There were several elements to this, including ensuring adequate time for research, curriculum reform, a common credit framework, academic performance and workload, reducing the casualisation of teaching delivery and creating fewer, stronger academic Departments. Two of these
on the Academic Board agenda, and others would appear in due course to ensure that Academic Board was fully involved in the discussion of these matters.

(iii) School-Funded Research Leave
Resources & Planning Committee received the paper which appeared as Appendix C on the Academic Board agenda. It noted the benefits of the proposal, and that it was cost-neutral.

25. REF 2014

Academic Board received the report on the REF 2014 at Appendix B, which had been discussed in a number of fora before coming to Academic Board.

Academic Board recognised that the outcome of REF 2014 had been disappointing for the School, although there had been notable achievements in some Departments. The result was likely to have severe financial consequences, not only in relation to the financial settlement for quality-related research income but also because of its negative impact on student recruitment, particularly at postgraduate level.

The report identified what was thought to have gone wrong, but also proposed ways in which these elements could be put right over the course of the next 5 years. The report contained a list of key actions that were already being taken, and asked for Academic Board's approval on a range of specific additional actions.

Every academic Department within the School had been involved in a REF debrief session at which the issues within the paper had been discussed. Academic Board considered the paper in detail.

During the discussion, concern was raised that while external review had been very helpful in certain instances, in others the outcome of that review had been very different to that of the REF. It might be helpful to try to analyse why this had happened. The paper proposed an annual external review of progress towards REF goals, but the precise nature of this review would need to be carefully considered. The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) would work with Heads of Department and Departmental Research Coordinators as soon as possible to agree what the best form of external review would be in each Department.

Academic Board recognised the importance of undertaking a review of the curriculum in order to free up academic staff time for research. The review would need to ensure that the School ran excellent programmes which were deliverable in an efficient way. It would be important to start this lengthy process as soon as possible as the time available for research needed to be increased as a matter of urgency.

There was some discussion of the number of staff submitted to the REF. The School's submission rate had, in general, been higher than institutions in the Russell Group, but in line with those institutions which had been members of the 1994 Group. It was agreed that in future decisions about which members of staff would be submitted would be made in a strategic manner, rather than by setting a GPA across the School.

The effect of the ‘impact assessment’ appeared to vary between units of assessment, with some Departments faring much better than others.

During Academic Board's discussion of the paper, it was recognised that there were an interlinking set of actions which would need to be taken together if the desired outcomes were to be achieved. Each element would be supported by a Project Board (if large enough) or a Working Group to move it through to implementation. These would be facilitative Boards/Groups which would work with Departments on
Implementation of an agreed range of actions. It was important to realise that whatever decisions were made would need to be in the interests of the whole School.

Academic Board approved the following recommendations:

(i) Each unit of assessment for the REF to have a designated research lead, with delegated authority from the relevant HoD(s).

(ii) Progress towards REF goals (publications, impact, research income) should be monitored by Academic Board on an annual basis in the Spring, based on the equivalent of a ‘dummy REF’ each year. This process should be overseen by a School-wide REF steering group chaired by the Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise).

(iii) Performance management measures should be introduced, to include enhanced training & support on research for academic managers, a programme to nurture academic talent and a system of research mentoring for all teaching & research staff.

(iv) A review should take place on the structure of any submission to Area Studies and Development Studies, and consideration given to submission to other sub-panels (e.g. Media Studies).

(v) A full review of curricula across Departments should be considered by Academic Board, in order to rationalize teaching delivery to facilitate research (whilst delivering an excellent student experience).

(vi) Future decisions in inclusion/exclusion from the REF should be made in a strategic manner, and not based on an arbitrary GPA across the School.

More detailed proposals on elements of the recommendations, such as curriculum review and the academic performance framework would need to come to Academic Board for approval in due course.

A report on progress would be made to the next meeting of Academic Board, along with a detailed report on REF planning for the next few years.

26. School-Funded Research Leave

The report at Appendix C set out a series of principles for School-funded research leave for implementation in 2016/17.

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) reported that, despite increased investment in research leave over recent years, concerns remained about the level of entitlement to apply for research leave when compared to other institutions. Research suggested that other London colleges allowed staff to apply for leave more frequently than at the School, and in different circumstances, but the decisions on who should receive such leave were made much more strategically. In these institutions, little or no additional funding was given to Departments to cover the teaching of those who were on research leave. In light of this analysis, and recent confidential REF feedback, the paper set out revised principles for School-funded research leave, which it was intended to incorporate in a draft new policy for implementation from 2016/17.

After detailed discussion of the paper, Academic Board approved the following recommendations, and that these would be introduced in a way that was overall budget-neutral for Departments/Faculties and the wider School:

(i) Entitlement to apply for research leave should move to 1 term after every 8 terms of qualifying service;

(ii) Enhance leave entitlement for ECRs and specified administrative role should remain unchanged;
(iii) Additional entitlement to apply for 1 term of research leave following a period of parental leave;

(iv) Existing limits on sequential periods of leave should be retained;

(v) In considering leave requests, the extent to which applicants have contributed positively to the teaching and administrative demands the Department should also be taken into account;

(vi) Decisions about who should receive research leave should be made on a strategic basis;

(vii) The curriculum should be reviewed in order to ensure Departments were able to cover the work of those on research leave.

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) would bring a revised Research Leave Policy to the summer meeting of Academic Board for approval. The Policy would need to make clear how decisions about research leave would be made, and who would be responsible for doing so. The ability of Departments to cover the work of those on research leave would need to be taken into account when such decisions were made.

It was recognised that transitional arrangements would need to be put in place for 2015/16, and these would need to be discussed with Deans and Heads of Departments, and specified in the paper for Academic Board.

27. Institute of World Languages

Academic Board considered the paper at Appendix D, which set out a proposal for the creation of an Institute of World Languages.

The Dean of the Faculty of Languages & Cultures explained that there had been discussions within the Faculty concerning the setting up of a forum where research expertise in languages could be brought together and thus enhance the research environment, particularly for inter-disciplinary research.

Concerns had been expressed within the Faculty that this Institute would be seen as comparable to the South Asia Institute and the China Institute and therefore might complete with the Faculty, particularly in relation to teaching and PhD supervision. It was confirmed that this was not the intention, and that the Institute would not take resources away from Departments.

In light of the concerns expressed within the Faculty, Academic Board agreed in principle the creation of the Institute of World Languages. The Dean was asked to bring a paper to the June meeting of Academic Board which set out a more detailed vision of what the Institute hoped to achieve.

28. Review of Taught Academic Regulations

Academic Board considered the report on a review of taught academic regulations (Appendix E) which had been provided by the Head of Registry, who was present for this agenda item.

The School's taught academic regulations had originated from the University of London. Over the years they had been amended and adapted, and in some instances this had led to a lack of clarity. The purpose of the review was to make these regulations clearer, and to ensure that they were fit for purpose. A working group had been set up, and a consultation process had begun.

It had been agreed that some regulatory changes would need to be introduced for the beginning of the 2015/16 session. These changes would not disadvantaged students in any way, but would clarify some important issues and would be brought to the June meeting of Academic Board for approval.

29. Reform of Credit Framework
Academic Board considered the paper at Appendix F which set out a series of recommendations relating to the School's credit framework.

The QAA had set out guidance on credit frameworks which included a timetable for implementation. All Institutions were being encouraged to implement credit framework arrangements in line with QAA guidance, and to include details of credit ratings in descriptions of each of their programmes and courses. The majority of SOAS courses had been allocated a credit rating as part of the course approval procedure, which meant that the School was in a good position to start applying the QAA framework across its qualifications. However, the process had highlighted a number of anomalies which required action.

During its discussion Academic Board noted that if courses were to be shared across programmes, it would be important for there to be consistent registration periods for students, which was not currently the case. Care would need to be taken when decisions were made about how to make programmes consistent, given that currently they did not always have the same number of credits.

The paper proposed that LTQC should initiate a wide-ranging review of undergraduate courses and syllabuses, to make clear the element of progression from year 2 to the final year. While it might be appropriate for LTQC to oversee the review, concern was expressed that this might be too large a task for it to initiate.

It was not uncommon for students to be able to take particular courses in either the second or third year of their degree, and thought would need to be given to how this could be managed, given the requirement to show clear progression from one level to another. This might be achieved by providing courses at levels 4, 5 and 6, or using the ISP as the means of differentiation. Whatever was agreed, it would be important to maintain the maximum level of flexibility compatible with the framework.

Academic Board agreed the principle of a single credit framework covering all programmes including distance learning, with appropriate transition arrangements, in line with national requirements.

It further agreed to the following recommendations:

(i) To establish a small working party to implement the remaining compliance issues;
(ii) To review the School's master's structures and propose a single framework to remove inconsistencies and enable sharing of modules between programmes;
(iii) To review Undergraduate, Graduate and Postgraduate Certificates to ensure they met the requirements of the FHEO;
(iv) Undergraduate degrees:
   a) To review the progression requirements for Undergraduate degrees so that all courses met the requirements of a minimum 360 credits for an honours award;
   b) LTQC to initiate a wide-ranging review of undergraduate courses and syllabuses, to make clear the element of progression from Year 2 to the final year, and remove the labelling of courses as Level 2/3. This should be done in such a way as to preserve the maximum level of flexibility allowable within the framework;
(v) To ensure that all credit-bearing courses were assigned a credit value;
(vi) The relevant FLTCs to re-examine syllabuses with a view to ensuring greater academic coherence and alignment with the national FHEQ for graduate diplomas and certificates;
(vii) To produce a School Credit Framework in line with national requirements.
30. Draft Strategic Plan

Academic Board considered the paper on the draft strategic plan at Appendix G. This had been produced as a result of the discussions held during the joint meeting of Governing Body and Academic Board which had taken place in the autumn.

The document developed the ideas and themes which had emerged from those discussions and set out a range of measures which could be used to measure progress against them. After consideration of the document, it was suggested that it would be helpful to include a target to increase the funding of research students.

It was noted that item LT1.4 should read "developed a cohort of significant dual campus and/or distance degree programmes".

31. Academic Board Review Group

Academic Board had set up a working group which was tasked with looking at the effectiveness of Academic Board (Appendix H).

The group had looked at the work carried out by Academic Board and how this was undertaken. The group concluded that it was very difficult to look at the work of Academic Board in isolation, and consideration needed to be given to how Academic Board interacted with other parts of the School. The report contained several options for change which it recommended be considered by the wider governance review which will take place during the 2015/16 session.

Academic Board recommended the report for inclusion in the Governing Body governance review.

32. Student Complaints, Appeals and Disciplinary Cases

Academic Board received the annual report on student complaints, appeals and disciplinary cases (Appendix I).

33. Amendments to Annexes of Standing Orders

a) Equality & Diversity Committee

Academic Board considered the proposal to allow students ‘in attendance’ at meetings of the Equality & Diversity Committee (Appendix J) and approved this for recommendation to Governing Body. It was agreed that the job titles of the Liberation Officers should not be included in the documentation.

b) Research Ethics Panel

Academic Board considered the proposal to add a lay member and a research student member to the Research Ethics Panel (Appendix K) and approved this for recommendation to Governing Body.

34. Sub-Committee Reports

Academic Board received the termly reports from Academic Development Committee (Appendix L), Research & Enterprise Committee (Appendix M) and Equality & Diversity Committee (Appendix N).

Academic Board noted that the School had been shortlisted for the Guardian Higher Education Award for its MOOC on Research Methods, which was launched in 2014. The award ceremony was scheduled for Wednesday 18 March 2015.

35. Emeritus Status
Academic Board noted the award of emeritus status to Professor Trevor Marchand, and expressed its thanks for his service to the School.

36. Governing Body Minutes

Academic Board noted the Governing Body open minutes from October 2014 (Appendix O).

There were no reserved items of business.
### SOAS

#### ACADEMIC BOARD

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 (13/14)</td>
<td>Existing Centres</td>
<td>Report to AB on probationary Centres</td>
<td>AB June 15</td>
<td>MC/Fac Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 (13/14)</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Monitor effect of changes re PGT deadlines</td>
<td>2015/16 session</td>
<td>Director SRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SU priorities</td>
<td>Provide update to summer meeting of academic board</td>
<td>AB June 15</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (ii)</td>
<td>NSS</td>
<td>Encourage students to complete survey</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Provide report on progress, and detailed action plan going forward</td>
<td>AB June 15</td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Provide annual reports monitoring progress towards REF goals</td>
<td>AB in term 2</td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>School-funded RL</td>
<td>Revise policy for AB approval</td>
<td>AB June 15</td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Inst World Langs</td>
<td>Provide more detailed report on Institute</td>
<td>AB June 15</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Taught academic regs</td>
<td>Provide revised regs for AB approval</td>
<td>AB June 15</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Credit Framework</td>
<td>Inform the Registry</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Draft strategic plan</td>
<td>Inform GA of suggested change</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>AB effectiveness</td>
<td>Provide report to Secretary to GB</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Amendments to SO</td>
<td>Produce paper for GB</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Emeritus status</td>
<td>Pass on thanks of AB</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These minutes are for information only. Any corrections to the minutes will be recorded in the minutes of the subsequent meeting of the committee.

SOAS, University of London

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Thursday 5th February 2015

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT MINUTES

Members: Steve Tinton (Chair)
Charles Ilako
Rosna Mortuza
Andrew Popham

In attendance: Graeme Appleby (Director of Finance & Planning)
Laura Gibbs (Registrar)
Richard Hewes (KPMG – Internal Auditors)
Chris Ince (Secretary to Audit Committee)

Apologies: Paul Webley (Director)
James Aston (BDO – External Auditors)
Neil Thomas (KPMG – Internal Auditors)

26. Minutes
The minutes of the meeting on 6th November 2014 were approved.

27. Action Points
The Committee noted that all the actions had been completed or where on the agenda.

28. Matters arising/matters for report
(i) US GAAP
The Chair reported that he had approved the US GAAP accounts, as had been delegated by Governing Body at its meeting in November. There had been some discussions with the School and BDO over the treatment of donation pledges and accounting policies and changes had been made where necessary.

The Committee agreed that there would be a greater involvement from its members when the exercise was next repeated, in three years time.

(ii) REF results
The Committee discussed the results of the REF exercise and the likely financial impact. This was within the remit of the Resources & Planning Committee so the Audit Committee only needed to be assured that the appropriate systems were in place and there were no
gaps in monitoring such a critical area. The Committee agreed that it would consider a review of the finance and budgeting process as a topic for a future deep dive review.

29. External Audit Tender (Appendix A)
The Secretary reported on the tender process to appoint the School’s external auditors. Following this exercise the recommendation had been to reappoint BDO and the Audit Committee ratified this recommendation to Governing Body. It noted that for any future exercise the timing of the process should allow sufficient time for the Committee to meet in person to discuss.

The Chair of the Committee would discuss the contract performance with BDO and the need for all members to be involved in the annual monitoring exercise.

30. Internal Audit Tender (Appendix B)
The Committee discussed this item in the absence of KPMG. The Secretary reported that the tender process for the internal audit contract had commenced and would allow time for the Audit Committee to discuss any appointment. The Committee noted that it was not ideal to have the internal and external audit contracts co-terminus so this should be remedied as part of the exercise.

31. CUC Code of Practice (Appendix C)
The Secretary reported on an initial assessment of the new CUC HE Governance Code and the areas where the School, and in particular the Audit Committee, might need to do further work. A paper would be prepared for the Governing Body meeting in April.

The Committee noted that the Code would be included in the internal audit of governance and risk for this session, which would assist in identifying any gaps. Therefore, this matter would also be discussed in more detail at the next meeting of the Committee.

32. Risk Register (Appendix D)
The Committee discussed the latest version of the institutional risk register. The Committee agreed that the Executive Board should review the risk ratings, especially that around institutional reputation. It should also review the actions and if these were realistic in reducing the current risk to net risk in the timeframe stated. In addition there needed to be a wider range of action areas rather than the current emphasis on professional services.

The Committee agreed it was essential that the risk process was embedded at a departmental level and actions were considered both as part of the planning process and in decision making.

The Committee agreed that a review of the School’s risk framework, appetite and register should be considered as an item for discussion at a future informal meeting of Governing Body.

33. HESES14 Audit Report (Appendix E)
The Committee considered a report on the HESES14 audit, which formed part of the information to support the Committee’s overall opinion on data quality. The data in the report were reconciled and linked to the HESA return that occurred later in the academic year.
34. Internal Audit – Progress Report & Recommendation Tracker (Appendix F)
KPMG reported on the progress against the 2014/15 plan and the previous recommendations. Revisions were being made to the process for tracking recommendations that would make it simpler for staff and a less manual process. It would also be available online.

The Committee agreed it would review the overall internal audit plan at the next meeting. The next meeting would also see a number of internal audit reports for review.

35. Internal Audit – Examinations Audit Report (Appendix G)
KPMG reported on the internal audit of the School’s examination process. This incorporated a new system of four assurance ratings, with this report having received significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities. There had been no concerns raised over the security of examination papers during the audit.

The audit had found lots of good practice but that it was not always well documented or shared with other staff. Although the current processes and systems were well maintained there was not a significant culture of continuous improvement and a reliance on key individuals.

36. Date of next meeting:
The Committee noted the next meeting would take place on 28th May 2015.
### AUDIT COMMITTEE: Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action 2014/15</th>
<th>Deadline for report to AC</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Internal audit – governance</td>
<td>Deep dive review of performance indicators</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Internal audit – governance</td>
<td>Review of progress against recommendations</td>
<td>28/5/15</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>External Audit</td>
<td>Discussion on accounting treatment of USS deficit</td>
<td>28/5/15</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>REF results</td>
<td>Consider finances &amp; budgets as a deep dive review topic</td>
<td>28/5/15</td>
<td>CI / ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Risk Register</td>
<td>EB to review risk register in light of AC comments</td>
<td>28/5/15</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Risk Register</td>
<td>Inclusion of risk register and methodology on GB informal agenda</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Internal audit</td>
<td>Review of internal audit plan</td>
<td>28/5/15</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOAS UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

4th March 2015 at 10.00am
Room 116

Members
Heidi Alderton (Safety Officer)*
Peter Baran (General Manager-Student Union)
Stephanie Blankenburg (UCU representative)
Marcus Cerny (Gordon Square representative)*
Regina Everitt (Library representative)
John Hollingworth (Brunei Gallery representative)
Chris Ince (Chair)
Kabir Joshi (Student representative)
Jahan Latif (UNISON representative)
Brenda Lett (Human Resources Manager)
Richard Lucus (Vernon Square representative)
Richard Poulson (Director of Estates and Facilities)
Michael Smith (Safety Officer)
Anne Weekes (Faber representative)

In attendance
Mike Haddon (Minutes Secretary)

* Member unable to attend.

1. MINUTES
The minutes of the meeting held on the 8th October 2014 were confirmed.

2. MATTERS ARISING
There were no matters arising.

3. REPORT FROM THE SAFETY OFFICER
A report was received from the Health & Safety Officer.

The time taken to evacuate the building at the last fire alarm activation was longer than expected. It was reported that there were pressure points on some staircases of the Philips Building and it was possible that people are using the wrong exits to evacuate the building. Discussions are to be held with Communications on whether all staff e mails may be sent out after evacuations giving the reason for the alarm activation and speed of evacuation. PEEPS are regularly completed and reviewed
but this is dependent on an individual declaring that one is required. Flashing beacons are fitted in areas where it is difficult to hear the fire alarm. EVAC chairs are available for use, however users and evacuees do not always feel confident using them and further training would be considered to overcome this.

A list of lifts now suitable for monitored evacuation by security officers was detailed in the report from the Head of Facilities Management.

The Safety Officer restated the RIDDOR accident reporting process to ensure all members fully understood it. If working in an area where the floor is uneven, reasonable adjustments should be made where possible. When setting up the computer for the user, the IT Department could assist by reporting this need.

Fire drills were last held in November.

4. REPORT FROM THE HEAD OF FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee noted that statutory inspections are being regularly carried out and any faults remedied.

Work continues on the final medium and low risk recommendations from the fire risk assessment undertaken in the last academic year. Eleven recommendations had been carried out since the last meeting.

The main contractor for the Senate House North Block project had started on site. Safety, Health and Environment audits took place on 08/01/15 and 05/02/15. An independent unannounced inspection took place during w/c 23/02/15. Accident free days were 55 out of 55.

The lift project was completed on programme and within budget. Four lifts are now able to be used for emergency evacuation under certain conditions by personnel who have been trained to use them.

A security report detailing incidents for the previous quarter was noted by the Committee. It was agreed that certain events or incidents such as protests or demonstrations will not automatically be listed under “unacceptable behaviour” but will be evaluated objectively.

5. OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Committee considered a proposal from the Human Resources Manager to introduce a Global Challenge programme. This would involve 4 teams of 7 people in a 100 day challenge aimed to support health and wellbeing. SOAS would receive regular reports. Costings were challenged by the Committee and it was suggested that other providers should also be considered. It would be essential that and data storage and protection were secure Some staff may not wish their details to be captured so this might restrict their participation. It was noted that the NHS 10,000 steps programme is similar and less costly.

It was noted that the new occupational health provider should be able to offer the Global Corporate Challenge and possibly to students too.
6. HEALTH, SAFETY & SECURITY POLICY

The draft policy will be considered by Governing Body in July following input from Communications. There will be additional information regarding overseas working. Safety training will be required for certain staff, for example Faculty Safety Representatives. A draft will be circulated within the next 2 months.

7. REPORTS FROM STAFF AND STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

The Committee noted the following:

Library:
No issues were reported.

Vernon Square:
There was a recent evacuation due to a burst water pipe. It was noted that an additional megaphone would be helpful.

Main College Building:
No issues were reported.

Faber Building:
No issues were reported.

Brunei Gallery:
Vermin had been reported and some light bulbs at high level had failed.

Gordon Square:
No representative present.

Student Representative:
No issues were reported.

UCU Representative:
The correct reporting/listing of protests/demonstrations was stressed.

UNISON Representative:
No issues were reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04-03-15</td>
<td>Safety Officer report</td>
<td>Speak to Comms regarding all staff e-mails for fire evacuations</td>
<td>Chris Ince</td>
<td>By next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-03-15</td>
<td>Staff &amp; Student Representatives</td>
<td>Purchase of additional megaphone</td>
<td>Mike Haddon</td>
<td>By next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-03-15</td>
<td>Staff &amp; Student Representatives</td>
<td>Assess high level lighting</td>
<td>Mike Haddon</td>
<td>By next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Meeting: 27\textsuperscript{th} May 2015 at 10.00 in Room 116.
Governing Body is asked to receive the report of the meeting of Nominations Committee held on 30 January 2015.

Executive Summary

The meeting focused on the lay vacancies that will be created from 1 September 2015 as members of various committees come to the end of their second terms of office.

The School will be looking for two new members of Governing Body, one (non-GB) member of Estates & Infrastructure Committee, one (non-GB) member of Resources & Planning Committee, and a member of the Investment Advisory Panel.

The Committee considered the process for recruitment to these positions. It was hoped that this would be completed in time to allow those offered positions on Governing Body to attend the meeting of GB in July 2015 as observers.

Recommendations

N/A

Financial Impact

N/A

Risks

N/A

Equality implications

Nominations Committee is aware of the need to consider the diversity of Governing Body as it undertakes any recruitment process.

Jan Airey
Secretary to Nominations Committee
11/2/15
In attendance:

Mr G Dalal, Chair (Hon.Treasurer)
Ms S Aliker (Chair, Estates & Infrastructure Committee)*
Professor R Black (Pro-Director, Research & Enterprise)
Ms L Gibbs (Registrar)
Sir Martin Harris (Vice-Chair of Governing Body)
Dr T Miller (Chair of Governing Body)
Professor N Rao (Pro-Director, Learning & Teaching)
Professor P Webley (Director)
Sir Graham Fry
Dr L Hammond
Mr J Heskett*
Professor C Oughton
Ms G Robertson
Mr D Skinner*
Mr N Uddin

22. Minutes
The minutes of Resources & Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 11 November 2014 were approved.

23. Action Taken
It was noted that minuted item 14 would be addressed at this meeting of RPC.

Minuted items 17(i)-(v) and 19 are addressed under Matters arising.

24. Matters arising/for report
Following advice from the Secretariat, it was noted that re-submitting the sub-committee reports to RPC was unnecessary as RPC was not required to make a decision based on the reports. However, it was noted that the clarity of the reports could be improved. The committee agreed that use of a pro-forma similar to that used for the Portfolio Reports be adopted for future sub-committee reports.

An aural report was received on the progress of the Fossil Fuel Industries Divestment committee. The committee includes student and staff representatives from RPC and is receiving secretariat support. They had met and were being assisted by Newtons in better understanding the definition of which industries were considered Oil and Gas (coal industries being more straightforward to identify). A final report is due to Governing Body by the end of April and will be available for note at the next (June) RPC meeting.
25. Director’s Report
A report was received from the Director at Appendix A.

A further update on the London Weighting was given, noting that the negotiations were in their closing stages with the School having submitted its final offer. The committee noted that the anticipated cost of £1.3m had been included in the forecast to account for the increase. A further comment on the Master plan for the University of London included a reiteration of the benefits of the University of London being viewed as a whole entity, particularly for facilitating our relationship with the Borough of Camden with capital works. It was also noted that City University was in the process of joining the University of London (subject to approval by Senate and Council), and that a recent vote of their students on the decision to join received a 89.5% approval rating. This shows the strength of the brand for the University of London and reinforces the value to us in being part of it.

A report was received from the Director of Finance and Planning at Appendix B.

The Committee noted that the 2014-15 forecast outturn shows a surplus of £250k, which is an improvement of £920k on last year’s budget before taking account of the projected £900k cost of voluntary severance (VS). While a surplus is an improvement, it is still £3.9m below the School’s target of achieving 5% surplus of income.

Key factors contributing to this outcome included lower than expected tuition fees in IFCELS, which was offset by increases in operating income and salary costs (vacancy savings and a review and update of the staffing budget post-November). Further reductions in utility costs and other underspends also contributed to the improved result. The committee noted that the VS estimated around 20 staff to comprise the cost of £900k, and that the salary forecast includes provision for the year one increase in the London allowance (£290k).

The chair invited the Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) to provide a verbal report on the performance of IFCELS. The committee noted that a severe impediment for students on the pathway from UG to PG was the need for a different Visa if studying for more than one term. The following three strategies have been put in place, or are about to be initiated to improve conversion rates:

1. Guaranteed Conditional Offers from all Departments for students enrolling in Masters level programmes. This has already seen an increase of 66% in applications for pre-Masters and 18% for Foundation.
2. Piloting the abolition of the Application Fee (£90)
3. Offering scholarships of £2000

It was noted that there had been some success on improving the original 21% progression in to SOAS programmes up to 68% and that IFCELS still managed to reach their target of 25% profit of income, but lost money on overheads. There was considerable discussion about the roles of IFCELS and the Language Centre, as well as the role of Distance Learning. The committee noted that the current Track A option and servicing from the University of London was considered acceptable for our needs.

27. Sustainability
A presentation was given and report received from the Registrar and Director of Finance and Planning at Appendix C for the Committee to consider.

It was noted that after six years of substantial student growth, including establishing new programmes, the School had established its independence, and in acquiring the lease of
Senate House North Block will successfully move to a single campus in 2016. But the situation moving forward is not so clear, particularly after missing student targets in 2014 and a disappointing result in the 2014 REF results, which further impacts SOAS’ performance in several League Tables and consequently its ability to recruit students on this strength.

Three options were discussed by the committee:
- Increasing income through student enrolments
- Increasing income through student fees
- Decreasing costs

It was acknowledged that the REF results would impact PGT enrolments mostly. The committee discussed at length how realistic the student growth percentages were, particularly for PGT which was recommended to be reduced to only 14% of past targets for existing programmes, and 75% of new programme targets (a growth of 186 over the next three years). To counter this, UG growth would be higher at 22%, but this was still pegged back a quarter from original targets, with most growth on new programmes rather than existing ones (an additional 202 over three years).

There was little scope for increasing fees or reducing non-salary costs as these options have been extended as much as possible to date.

While noting the decision already made to launch a voluntary severance (VS) scheme to reduce staff costs in the medium term, without further changes this change alone risks added stress on remaining staff and a downward spiral of morale. Taken into account with other problems that have manifested over the last five years, such as duplication and overlap of courses and programmes, significant student staff ratio (SSR) differences between Departments, and other criticisms raised by QAA about the operation and co-operation of Departments and Faculties, there is a need to address academic structures, including management of performance, workload, and curriculum, in the School’s response.

There was considerable discussion on the effectiveness of the VS as a strategy and the likelihood of achieving the number of volunteers required for significant savings. It was acknowledged that wider changes, such as developing training support for Head of Departments, addressing issues in support services (such as through the diverse projects in the Portfolio Board), ensuring an uplift in research performance, and reviewing curriculum across all three faculties would be needed to contribute to the solution.

Other options explored by the committee included the possibility of drawing down on reserves to accelerate the changes if necessary, and expanding the distance learning options offered by the School.

The committee discussed the timing of the proposed changes and the need to begin quickly to ensure changes are captured in the 2016/17 academic year, although many goals had a longer-term frame. The current urgency was also necessary to ensure management decisions had time to flow through the proper governance pathways. It was further noted that to ensure success, a holistic approach was needed where strategies overlap, such as dovetailing curriculum changes with research leave incentives.

**28. Accelerated Investment Fund**

The Committee received an oral report from the Secretary on behalf of the Head of the Portfolio Management Office regarding the resource requirements of the current portfolio of programmes at Appendix D. The paper summarises projects within each...
program of Student, Staff, and IT areas and includes in Annex D the funding approved and pending.

The committee appreciated the new format of reporting. It was noted that on the whole all projects are on track and within funding, with only Student Attendance Monitoring currently on hold. The challenge here has been more around IT capacity and the difficulty to recruit into these roles. Similarly, WebFirst has been delayed 6 months while fixing the IT infrastructure, with the result that a new proposal for the internal component of the project is to go to the Portfolio Board shortly. There are also some dependencies for the Enhancing Resourcelink project on changes to the Chart of Accounts, but it is hoped that this project will help managers manage better. The committee discussed the role of research management and projects and were informed that there were plans for a bigger research project on the horizon that the project in start-up would contribute to.

29. Research Leave
The committee was asked to note a report at Appendix E presented by the Pro-Director (Research) that outlined a set of principles for School-funded research leave to be developed into policy and implemented in 2016/17.

It was noted that a similar proposal had been rejected several years ago on the grounds of cost. This proposal, however, has been structured to ensure it remains cost neutral for Departments and the School. It also draws on a comparator analysis with other HEIs to recommend increasing the frequency that staff can apply for leave, but under stricter circumstances. It is also proposed that Departments manage the absence and its impact on their curriculum, as well as monitor more closely the outcomes from the leave.

The committee discussed several aspects of the proposal, in particular, the operational success and discipline required in enforcing the proposed cut to fractional appointments.

30. Students’ Union Non-Educational Priorities 2014-2015
The Committee received a report from the student representative at Appendix F outlining an earlier paper with the Students’ Union non-educational priorities. It was noted that many of these projects have since been initiated or have addressed the issues raised.

Still outstanding, and for which a forthcoming paper is expected, is the issue of the School acting as Guarantor for International students with regard to accommodation needs. Further discussion at Executive Board is also planned on the issue of free graduations for the graduand.

31. HEFCE
The committee considered the test for reasonableness applied in the preparation for the School’s TRAC return for 2014 at Appendix G.

It was noted that the entire School was surveyed this year and the only significant change from previous years was an increase in research time. The committee agreed with the analysis presented.
32. Planning
The Committee noted the revised planning template and calendar for this year’s Faculty Planning cycle at Appendix H.

One of the changes in line with the School’s Sustainability strategy was a move to more rigorous Departmental Planning, including a pilot of three or four Departments this year. However, only the Faculty Plans would be presented to RPC at its October meeting.

33. Investment Advisory Panel
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting of the Investment Advisory Panel held on 11 November 2014 at Appendix I. There was a brief discussion of the more recent meeting of the panel, in particular on the outcomes that delivered better than expected returns.

34. Cash Position
The Committee noted the reports on Cash flow, the Capital and Debt Statement, and Short Term Deposits.

35. Student Experience Committee
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting of the Student Experience Committee held on 29 January 2015.

There was brief discussion on the issue of increased reporting of students with mental health issues and whether the School was providing adequate support. The committee noted that the School was not in a position to contribute unlimited funds to resolve this and that better embedded structures and prioritising against limited funds would be further pursued as solutions.

36. Date of next meeting
The next meeting of the Resources & Planning Committee is scheduled for:

   Tuesday 9 June 2015

All meetings are scheduled for 2.30 p.m. and will be held in room 116 in the College Buildings, Russell Square.
## Action Points

**Resources and Planning Committee**

2.30pm Tuesday 10 March 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. 24.</td>
<td>Fossil Fuel Industries Divestment (FFID)</td>
<td>The working group to report on findings re impact of fossil fuel industries divestment.</td>
<td>9 June RPC meeting</td>
<td>FFID Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lay committee members are asked to note the following information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>Friday 2/10/15</td>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 27/11/15</td>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 22/4/16</td>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday 11/7/16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>Thursday 1/10/15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 5/11/15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 4/2/16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 26/5/16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality &amp; Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Tuesday 20/10/15</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 16/2/16</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 17/5/16</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates &amp; Infrastructure Committee</td>
<td>Wednesday 21/10/15</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 17/2/16</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 18/5/16</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations Committee</td>
<td>Friday 23/10/15</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 19/2/16</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 20/5/16</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Degrees &amp; Fellowships Committee</td>
<td>Friday 16/10/15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 29/1/16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 6/5/16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Committee</td>
<td>Thursday 22/10/15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 18/2/16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday 19/5/16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Advisory Panel</td>
<td>Tuesday 10/11/15</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 8/3/16</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 7/6/16</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations Committee</td>
<td>Friday 16/10/15</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 29/1/16</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 6/5/16</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Planning Committee</td>
<td>Monday 19/10/15*</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 10/11/15</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 8/3/16</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday 7/6/16</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff Remuneration Committee</td>
<td>Monday 11/7/16</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that this meeting of RPC is in addition to the normal termly meeting, and is being held on a Monday.

JA, 18/2/15