<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>To approve: minutes of the meeting held on 27th November 2015</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>[Oral Updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td>[Oral Updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Matters Arising/Matters for Report</td>
<td>[Oral Updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>The Director’s Reports</td>
<td>[Appendix A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copies since the last meeting (Dec, Jan, Feb, March)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Chair of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>[Appendix B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To receive: A paper from the Acting Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Academic Governance</td>
<td>[Appendix C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve: A paper from Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Standing Order XIX – Removal of a Trustee</td>
<td>[Appendix D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve: A paper from the Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>HEFCE letter on institutional risk</td>
<td>[Appendix E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: A paper from the Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Sustainable SOAS</td>
<td>[Appendix F]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To discuss: A paper from the Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Research Excellence Report</td>
<td>[Appendix G]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider: A paper from the Pro-Director, Research &amp; Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Safety at SOAS</td>
<td>[Appendix H]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: A paper from the Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Annual report on complaints and appeals</td>
<td>[Appendix I]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: A paper from the Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Risk Register</td>
<td>[Appendix J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: A paper from the Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Dates of meetings for 2016/17</td>
<td>[Appendix K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: A paper from the Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Letter from John McDonnell</td>
<td>[Appendix L]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note: A paper from the Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Students’ Union accounts</td>
<td>[Appendix M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Sub-committee reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources &amp; Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>Next Meetings of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>[Oral Update]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal meeting: Thursday 19th May 2016 – 16.00-18.30 hours. Followed by dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal meeting: Monday 11th July 2016 16.00-18.00 hours, followed by the Board of Trustees Annual dinner (venue for dinner TBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Minutes
The Chair welcomed the Board to the second meeting of the Academic Year.

The Board approved the minutes of the last meeting, 9th November 2015 subject to the following amendments, in bold:

"Whilst there was some concern over the proposed Programme Board and the timeline for the work, the Board of Trustees as a whole acknowledged that doing nothing was not an option. It also noted that although the finer detail of all the plans had yet to be worked through, the intention of the programme was to ensure that there was a cohesive attempt to address the serious issues of academic governance and structures as well as the financial situation. Two members of Board had requested that the Board voted on whether to implement the Sustainability Programme Board, as they felt that there was dissent within the School on the issue of trust, sustainability and the programme of change."
The two members proposed deferment of the Sustainability Programme Board. However, the Board as a whole did not agree to the deferment.”

The apologies for the meeting were also noted.

12. Conflicts of Interest
There were no conflicts reported.

13. Actions Taken

Min 6 – Director’s Report (Student Recruitment, Decliner’s Survey, and Student Recruitment Data)
The Decliner’s Survey had been circulated to the Board of Trustees. And the Recruitment data would be incorporated into the Revised Budget. Actions completed.

Min 7 – Director’s Report: Convene Sustainability Programme Board. The first meeting of the Sustainability Programme Board had taken place. Action completed.

14. Matters Arising / Matters for Report

I. Ethics Framework
The Group would be meeting next week, and considering its Terms of Reference. The intention would be to draw up an overarching ethical statement, which would apply across the school. Procurement and related policies would be included in the scope along with other key areas such as research, gifts & donations and investments.

15. The Director’s Report [Appendix A]
The Board received the Director’s Report which had been circulated the day prior. Hard-copies of the Report were tabled.

The Director reported that the intention was to fully integrate the Student Experience across the school. She had undertaken meetings with staff and two meetings with students who all concurred with the idea to make improvements for students. Areas that had been identified as concerns and raised during discussions included, investment in IT, the website, cleanliness around campus, outsourcing, communications, the recent occupation, the Prevent strategy, the academic curriculum (mainly related to choices), and lastly the environment within the school.

The recent occupation had been ended, and the Director gave thanks to all the staff that had helped throughout and to those who helped to negotiate the settlement, including those within the Students’ Union.

The Government’s Higher Education Green paper had recently been published, and an initial analysis undertaken. The Director would meet with staff and students to discuss the key issues and the School would respond to the consultation.

The Autumn Statement and any potential changes would be reported later on the agenda. Although it had not been confirmed yet, the expectation was a 17% reduction in teaching funding from BIS which would be a £370k reduction if applied to the School.
Concerns had been raised by students and staff that the Prevent legislation would increase monitoring on campus. A statement on Prevent had been issued. The Director had participated in panels discussing the impact of the legislation. The Director planned to have discussions with the Vice Chancellor of Kingston, who would be speaking to the Home Affairs Select Committee the following week.


The Chair of the Audit Committee introduced this paper. It was noted that an updated version of the Report had been prepared since the Audit Committee. It was accepted this was a lengthy report, but the Audit Committee were confident that it contained “clean” opinions. There were no reported issues within the Financial Statements.

It was noted that the Auditors had commented favourably on the helpfulness and ease of working with the Finance Department to prepare the report, and ask that this was conveyed to the team.

Two issues of control had been raised. The first was whether SOAS complied with overseas tax regulations, when staff were working abroad and the Director of Finance & Planning was looking into this. The other issue reported was that credit card information was being held/disclosed in full internally in some departments, this procedure had been stopped immediately.

It was reported that plans were in place to bring in a travel certification application, and this was currently under development. This would aim to record details of staff that were working overseas and would be helpful should there be an emergency situation.

The Trustees asked for confirmation as to whether there was a policy in place for staff working outside of the UK, as although insurance was in place it needed to go further than this.

The Registrar confirmed that a Working Group had been convened looking at student placements overseas and this would give a comprehensive view on volatile areas and evacuation procedures.

**Action:** The Registrar will report back on the progress and arrangements in place for Staff and Students working abroad at the July 2016 meeting.

It was noted that the University of London already had a policy in place regarding staff leave and working abroad, and this may be useful to draw information from.

On the recommendation of the Chair of the Audit Committee, the Board approved the report for submission to HEFCE.

It was agreed that the Chair of the Audit Committee would check the summary of the internal auditors activity within the Report.

**Action:** Chair of the Audit Committee to check the summary of the internal auditors within the report.

On recommendation of the Resources and Planning Committee, the Board of Trustees were asked to approve both the future outlook and the financial statements.

The Director of Finance & Planning confirmed that the preparation of the Financial Statements complied with all the UK laws and regulations.

The underlying performance reinforced the need to get to a position where the School was operating in surplus. The target operating surplus was 5% of turnover, and currently the School was £3.2m short of this target.

One factor contributing to the decline in income was due to the fall in the number of diplomas and certificates from within the Language Centre, as there had been a steady decline in enrolments since the introduction of the £9,000 fee cap. Recent enrolments stood at 288 FTE as opposed to 427 FTE in 2010/11.

The Board approved the Financial Statements.

18. Key Performance Indicator Report (KPI Report) [Appendix D]

The Board agreed that the KPI’s overall needed significant revision to be in line with the future direction of the School and with the Sustainability strategy.

With regards to KPI 2 (Student Experience), the Board asked for this to be revised from Amber-green to Amber.

KPI 4 (Undergraduate Student Outcomes), the Board commented that this was significantly below the benchmark. The Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching) explained this was a composite measure of several indicators, including awarded degree honours, retention and progression and the student drop-out rate. It was noted that the national drop-out rate was 10% and SOAS was currently at 14%.

The School was working to improve the retention statistics, and the student experience overall. In its efforts to make improvements, external consultants had been engaged to input into the welcome week design and focus.

The Board expressed concern that KPI’s 2, 4, and 5 (Graduate employability), appeared to be heading in the wrong direction. The new Head of Planning would be engaging with the Careers Department to look at ways to address issues with employability such as internships and looking at practical skills that graduates were expected to have in the workplace. It was felt that internships could potentially offer students opportunities for work based placements and to gain valuable experience.

Some positive KPI’s identifying areas of strength needed to be included, and the Board agreed to look at these as one of the possible themes for the Informal meetings in either February or May 2016.

Action: The Secretary to add KPI’s to the list of themes to be discussed at the Board’s informal meetings.
Therefore, given the on-going work with sustainability within the School, it was agreed as a starting point that the KPI’s would be revised in time for the next meeting of the Board.

**Action:** A paper on KPI’s to be brought to the April 2016 formal meeting of the Board.


The Board approved the Report for submission to HEFCE.

20. The Report on the 2015-16 Revised Budgets [Appendix F]

The Report on the Revised Budget outlined the changes in the budget since the Board approved the draft budget for 2015/16 in July 2015. The main change in the budget was the change to reflect actual recruitment in the current academic year. Since the last report, the School's financial position had deteriorated, and the previous projected deficit of 637k had been revised to a total deficit of £2.8m.

A decline in income/tuition fees was shown in table 2 in the paper. It reflected a disappointing recruitment to the PGT programmes, which had been flat lining for 3 years. It was noted that there had been issues for overseas students in obtaining visas, and that potentially short term finance options and support may need to be considered. The Director was in touch with the Foreign Office and Home Office and in discussion with UUK regarding this issue, especially the need for overseas students to be able to provide evidence of funds within their bank accounts sufficient to support them during their studies.

For undergraduate students a key consideration would be whether to extend unconditional offers based on a student’s predicted A-level grades and actual GCSE grades, this would be revisited by the School.

There was a lengthy discussion relating to the marketing of SOAS, its unique position in the market and specialist courses, what the name SOAS meant and whether the academic merits of SOAS were well publicised. Investment in social networks was mentioned as one potential avenue for future consideration. One of the main considerations was that each guide or league table had different comparators for entry, and they were based on different data, and weighting. The Board noted that it was important to sell SOAS explaining what we do and emphasising the breadth of courses available. Opportunities for free advertising via broadcasts and news articles, such as when SOAS academics were asked to comment on world issues, should be exploited.

The Board noted the contents of the revised budget paper and approved the final budget for 2015/16.


The Board of Trustees recognised that the substantial issue of governance and organisational structure at SOAS needed to be resolved, but this would take up to a year to achieve. With this in mind, the Board approved the Annual Report for submission to HEFCE.
22. Risk Overview [Appendix H]

It was noted by the Board that the current sustainability programme was fundamental to the School. They requested for the Heat Map at Annex A to be shared with the Sustainability Programme Board.

Action: The Secretary to share the Heat map with the Sustainability Programme Board.

23. Annual Assurance Return [Appendix I]

The Director of Finance and Planning commented explaining that this report was one of the standard reports for submission to HEFCE. Some of the terminology had been changed, but the contents were in line with previous reports.

The Board approved the the Director and the Chairman of the Board to sign the return for submission to HEFCE.

24. The Board of Trustees Effectiveness Working Group [Appendix J]

As Chair of this Working Group, the Vice-Chair reported on the progress that had been made. As part of the Democratise SOAS campaign, four main proposals had been put forward:

1. To re-constitute the Academic Board
2. To establish a Senate
3. To establish a staff-student forum
4. To improve the links between Executive Board and Academic Board

The main emphasis was to increase the academic input into academic policy making at all levels throughout the school. The reconstituted Academic Board would potentially be open to all Heads of Department, plus elected members. The Board noted the wish to increase responsibility and accountability between the Board of Trustees, Academic Board and Executive Board. A further report would be made to the Board at a later meeting.

25. Subcommittee Reports [Appendix K]

The Board noted the contents of the reports and the Resources & Planning Committee minutes (Appendix K iii), which had been tabled.

16. Meetings of Governing Body

The Board of Trustees noted the next formal meeting would be held on 22 April 2016 at 09.30am, to be held at College Buildings, SOAS.

The next informal meeting was to be held on the evening of 2nd February 2016, and all day the following day. The venue details would be confirmed in due course.
### Action Points 2014/15

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>Update of KPIs</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Paper on options for Vernon Square</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Student Complaints Procedure</td>
<td>GB to see annual report on complaints and appeals</td>
<td>22/4/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action points 2015/16</th>
<th>Deadline For Report to GB</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HE Green Paper</td>
<td>Review of academic items in annual plan</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The external auditors management Report</td>
<td>The Registrar to report back to the Board on the arrangements in place</td>
<td>22/4/16</td>
<td>LG / CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The external auditors management Report (i) Students &amp; Staff Working abroad</td>
<td>Chair to check the summary section of the Audit Report</td>
<td>1/12/15</td>
<td>ST / CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td>KPI’s to be added to the list of themes to be discussed at the Board’s informal meetings.</td>
<td>1/12/15</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Formal paper to the Board</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
<td>GA / LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Risk Overview</td>
<td>Risk Heat map to be provided to Sustainability Programme Board</td>
<td>04/01/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board of Trustees is asked to note, the reports from the Director since the last meeting.

**Executive Summary**

Attached are the reports from the Director since the Board’s last meeting in November. An oral update will be provided at the meeting on any recent developments.

**Recommendations**

N/A

**Financial Impact**

See attached.

**Risks**

None.

**Equality implications**

None.
January 2016 sees the start of two years of activities which will celebrate the SOAS Centenary. Over the last hundred years, SOAS has built a strong academic reputation throughout the world and especially in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. We are a global university with global reach and we see that every day in the range of issues in which our staff and students are involved. As the leading university in Europe for the study of Asia, Africa and the Middle East, SOAS scholars grapple with pressing issues such as democracy, development, human rights, cultural identity, legal systems, poverty and religion. Our students are interested in languages, cultures and social change because they want to understand the world and they want to make it better.

In 2015, we have had some notable successes. For example:

- The biggest Graduation in the School's history
- SOAS became the first university in London to divest from fossil fuels and one of the first nation-wide
- The School organised its largest Clearing drive, with more staff than ever before taking part in the process to help the School with its recruitment targets; applications were up by 15% against a sector-wide lull
- Huge support for SOAS research from grant awarding bodies, such as the €915,000 grant from the European Commission for research in the Department of Economics and Financialisation; Francesca Orsini's award of an ERC grant worth €2.5 million to study world literature; Irina Nikolaeva's award of £567,403 in order to conduct a comprehensive language study; and a staggering 11 million dollars was awarded by the Arcadia Fund to support the Endangered Languages Programme. There were many more!
- We secured £12m in new philanthropic funding
- Two SOAS films won their individual categories at the Arts & Humanities Research Council Research In Film Awards Ceremony, held at the British Film Institute KANRAXÊL
- SOAS student Joshua Parfitt won an international speech contest after studying Malay for just one year
- Former Director Paul Webley and Asian Art expert Heather Elgood received a CBE and MBE respectively for services to higher education
- Four SOAS academics were welcomed into the British Academy
- Two SOAS exhibitions, one on Persian maps and one on rural Indian villages, attracted massive numbers of visitors to the Brunei Gallery
- SOAS Radio celebrated 10 years on the air

In addition to our successes, we have also faced some challenges this year. In the last three months, there has been a great deal of uncertainty which has had a negative impact on morale. I hope that the joint conversations on the Sustainable SOAS work themes will help to address this going forward.
I look forward to the finalisation of our strategy going forward, the official opening of Senate House North Block and the programme of Centenary events which will showcase the significant successes of the School.

Below please find the regular update on standard topics.

**Sustainability Programme**

The Sustainability Programme Board has now met twice and will continue to meet fortnightly in the New Year. With regard to the strategy work stream, a number of meetings have been held with both staff and students where a series of questions have been used to engage and promote discussion. These questions have also been posted on mySOAS and on the students Q&A section of the website with a deadline for comments of 8th January 2016. A common theme emerging from these discussions is the importance of embedding languages (which makes SOAS unique) in our teaching and research. With regard to the financial sustainability work stream, meetings have been taking place within Faculties, Departments and Professional services to discuss potential savings and areas of investment and partnership.

The curriculum review work stream is on hold until the consultation on the strategy stream is complete.

The Research Excellence Steering Group met at the start of December and has been making progress. A paper needs to go to Academic Board on areas of assessment and reporting requirements.

The Board of Trustees working group on governance met on 15th December and an initial plan has been agreed with a focus on strengthening academic governance.

A further Director’s Open Forum was held on 4th December. An update was given on the plans for the Centenary followed by a discussion on the development of a clear strategy to underpin the SOAS vision.

On 8th December, an open meeting was also held with students. A number of issues were raised including the Prevent duty, Sustainable SOAS work streams, facilities management and communication.

**Green Paper**

As well as preparing a response to the 28 consultation questions that were set out in the Green Paper, the School will also send comments to UUK to feed into their response to the Green Paper.

**The North Block**

Last month I reported that the glass roof to the courtyard was nearing completion. A topping out ceremony was held on 27th November. The supporting scaffold has been
removed and for a short while, it was possible to stand at the lower courtyard level and see the whole space with the unique roof above. A new team are now installing the under-floor heating system on the lower level.

Works in the original building are progressing too. The new heating system has been turned on and the chill is slowly being replaced by a warmth that will dry out the new finishes and allow follow on works to proceed. The construction staff will be taking a well earned break over Christmas, but will return in the new year to complete the project.

**Fund-raising**

The Persian Heritage Foundation has confirmed a $50k donation to enable us to launch a new Yarshater lecture series in Persian literature. The new series will build on the successful Yarshater lectures in Persian art. This new donation will allow SOAS to attract world-renowned scholars in Persian literature to campus. The new series will be an opportunity for engagement with SOAS students, scholars and alumni and the broader Persian and academic communities in the UK.

Trustees will be aware that the School's statue of Thiruvalluvar, the celebrated Tamil philosopher and poet (donated to SOAS by the Tamil Nadu government in 1996), was taken off site at the start of December. The statue will be restored by a skilled conservator. The fully restored Thiruvalluvar will be back on campus in summer 2016. An offer of support towards the restoration costs has been received from the World Tamil Organisation.

Thank you for your continued support and all best wishes for 2016.

Valerie Amos
18th December 2015
Director’s monthly report

This is my first report of the year and the first in the SOAS Centenary year.

The first of our Centenary events is on 1st February with The Dulwich Boys and Beyond: 100 Years of Japanese Studies at SOAS, Chaired by BBC journalist Nick Higham. The event focuses on the young men of Dulwich College who came to SOAS to learn Japanese in order to help the war effort. In March, the Everlasting Flame Exhibition on Zoroastrianism, hosted by the National Museum of New Delhi will be opened by President Modi.

Both these events take place in the lead up to the official launch of the Centenary in June. SOAS will be marking the receipt of its Royal Charter on 6th June 2016 by burying a time capsule on campus. Local schools and the SOAS community will be invited to enter a competition to determine what is put into the time capsule.

Other events in the calendar include a Centenary lecture series and a series of events in September marking the opening of Senate House North Block and the start of the major fundraising campaign.

The Director of Marketing, Student Recruitment and Communications and the Centenary Project Manager will give an update on Centenary plans to the Board of Trustees next week.

Sustainability Programme

The Sustainability Programme Board has met twice in January and will continue to meet fortnightly over the next few months.

With regard to the strategy work stream, individual and collective responses have been received to the eight Sustainable SOAS questions posted on mySOAS before Christmas. The responses have been grouped into categories and shared with staff and students on mySOAS and Moodle. The most popular themes across the responses included the teaching of languages and review of the curriculum. Discussions on the strategy are ongoing. The focus now is on two areas of the strategy where there are currently gaps: academic outcomes and the student experience.

With regard to the financial sustainability work stream, the three Faculties plus Professional Services have developed proposals for meeting their projected financial shortfalls. The proposals, which include a mix of plans for growth and non-pay and staff cost savings, have identified a financial improvement in the range of £3.1m to £4.2m by 2018/19. This leaves a shortfall of between £2.3m and £3.4m still to address. The individual Faculty and Professional Services proposals have been consolidated into a single document which will be circulated to all staff in early February for formal consultation.

The curriculum review work stream is on hold until the completion of the draft strategy in mid-February.
The research excellence work stream is making progress on conducting an audit of the past two years (including publications across Departments) and drafting a research strategy for every Department for the next five years. A summary report will be presented to the Research Excellence Steering Group in February, before being presented to Academic Board in March.

A paper was presented to Academic Board on 21st January that focused on academic governance. The proposed changes to Academic Board were discussed and there was a strong view that the creation of an Academic Senate should go ahead. However questions remain about its proposed membership, the frequency of its meetings, and its role in relation to Academic Board.

A further Director’s Open Forum was held on 27th January. An update was given on the Sustainable SOAS programme, plans for the Centenary, the move into Senate House North Block and the priorities of the new Director of Academic Services.

**Senior staff update**

I am pleased to announce that Dr. Deborah Johnston will be assuming the position of interim Pro Director for Learning and Teaching, beginning February 1st until July 31st. Deborah will focus on our Learning and Teaching Strategy, the Curriculum review and the implementation of the credit framework, recently approved by Academic Board. She will be supported in this work by Dr. Ian Pickup, Director of Academic Services and his team. Interim arrangements for the Head of Economics will be announced shortly.

During this interim period, the Dean of Languages and Cultures will report to the Pro Director for Research and Enterprise. The arrangements with respect to the Language Centre review and the reporting line for the Head of IFCELS will be announced shortly.

Finally, Professor Gurharpal Singh has agreed to extend his role as Dean of Arts and Humanities for up to two years.

A search for the permanent role of Pro Director for Learning and Teaching will begin immediately and both internal and external candidates will be considered.

**Student Applications**

**Undergraduate**

The initial UCAS application deadline for 2016 entry was 15th January. At that point, UG applications to the School had seen an increase of 13.54% compared to the same point in 2015. This compares well to the sector as a whole where applications have risen by just 0.47%. At the same time, applications to our competitor institutions have seen a fall of 2.12%. Whilst the increase in applications is encouraging, there is still some way to go to ensure that we meet our recruitment targets. Not all departments have seen application growth and some subject areas have seen a fall in applications. In the case of African Studies and History, for example, this is largely due to a fall in the market as a whole, although the decline in African Studies at SOAS has seen a greater decline in applications as a proportion of the market fall which has been an on-going trend over the last three years. In other areas
SOAS has seen a fall in applications at a time when the market overall has seen increased applications. This may indicate that other HEI's are marketing more aggressively or that new programmes have been introduced elsewhere.

There are some subject areas where we have seen very healthy increases in applications. Most noticeable are applications for Law which have increased by over 50% at a time when the market overall is showing only a 6.6% increase.

**Postgraduate**

To date applications for postgraduate taught programmes stand at 2257, an increase of 2.9% compared to last year.

The government have confirmed the loans of £10k for postgraduate study will be made available to students this year and it is expected that this will go some way to improving postgraduate recruitment.

**Integrated Facilities Management contract**

The APSE report commissioned by SOAS, as part of the process of evaluation for facilities maintenance contracts, is now complete and the findings will be presented by Julie Pickering at an open meeting on Monday 1st February. There will also be a follow up meeting to ensure that staff have time to digest the report and can ask informed questions.

The report strongly rejects the perception that the only way cleaning staff will be treated with dignity, equality and respect is through an in-house solution. The report makes it clear that there are good private sector companies in the market who offer opportunities for development and promotion via the Integrated Facilities Management model (IFM) and can ensure that the existing services which are outsourced are compliant according to SOAS’s core values.

There will be a project board meeting towards the end of February where the board will consider input from the APSE report, the new ethics framework and the outcomes of the contract evaluation to make a final decision on the proposed facilities management contract.

**Prevent**

The working group has continued to meet and SOAS submitted its initial self-assessment to HEFCE earlier this month. At the beginning of January SOAS was named along with several other universities by the Daily Mail and other newspapers where it was implied that universities were failing to meet their duties under Prevent legislation by hosting a range of events where controversial speakers were provided with a platform. SOAS strongly rejected these claims, making it clear that we have a rigorous due diligence procedure for all such activities and that we had no concerns about any aspect of the legality of these events. We also repeated our commitment and duty to uphold freedom of speech and academic freedom.
Although HEFCE made it clear that they would not, as claimed by the Mail, be holding an investigation they have treated the press reports as an incident and we have been required to respond to a series of questions from HEFCE relating to these events.

**The North Block**

Construction work is progressing well at Senate House. With the completion of the glazed roof just before Christmas, the building is watertight and this has allowed the team to work in better conditions and to commence some of the finishing elements. Underfloor heating has been laid in the courtyard and some of the lighting, power and data installations have commenced.

Within the original building, the top (third) floor is nearing completion. Carpets have been laid, light fittings installed and some of the original marble and hardwood features have been restored and reinstalled.

Over the next month, a series of engagement sessions with building users will restart. These will run to and beyond our moving into the building. The details of all the sessions will be posted in the staff bulletin and on MySOAS.

**Fund-raising**

In the last month, we have received further support from Michael Palin. This new £70k donation will fund a full two-year scholarship for the South Asia Institute’s MA Intensive South Asian Studies and a project to digitise and catalogue a collection of photographs of sacred sites in India. Michael has been a friend and Honorary Fellow of the School for many years, and this gift is the result of a team effort with Professor Mike Hutt working in collaboration with the Development office.

We’ve also received a $20k gift (via the American Friends of SOAS – a US charity which exists to benefit us) from an alumnus from Kenya, Thomas S Gale. This donation will support students from Kenya and the US who wouldn’t otherwise be able to attend our summer schools.

Valerie Amos
30th January 2016
Resignation of the Chair

Following over six years as Chair of the Board of Trustees, Tim Miller has decided to step down.

Tim has made a tremendous contribution to the School in his time as Chair including presiding over the board during the development of SOAS’ 2020 vision which set the strategic direction for the School going forward, the strengthening of the Board of Trustees and the decision to acquire and develop Senate House North Block which will make a significant and positive difference to the student experience. He has also helped to steer the School through challenging times with the retirement of the previous Director and ongoing changes to the higher education environment which have had a significant financial impact on the School.

In addition to his time commitment to SOAS, Tim has been a significant personal donor to the School.

We thank him for his contribution, hope he will continue his engagement with SOAS and wish him all best wishes for the future.

The Vice Chair, Martin Harris will take over as acting Chair while steps are taken to appoint a new Chair and Steve Tinton will act as Vice Chair.

Sustainability Programme

The Sustainability Programme Board has met twice in February and will continue to meet fortnightly over the next few months.

A draft narrative to frame the objectives of the updated SOAS strategy has been developed and shared with the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board. The draft paper will be presented for discussion at Academic Board on 9th March and then for wider dissemination within the School. The strategy work stream has also established a working group to look at the student experience. The working group comprises academic and professional services staff and students.

A financial sustainability document containing proposals from the three Faculties and Professional Services to address projected financial shortfalls was circulated to all staff on 2nd February for consultation. The consultation period is to runs until 4th March. A number of Department and Faculty-level meetings have been held with staff to discuss the proposals and all staff members have the opportunity to respond – collectively or individually – via a dedicated consultation email address.
A paper on curriculum review was presented to the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board and is being presented to Academic Board on 9th March. It sets out three core principles for curriculum review, identifies priority areas and discusses implementation of short and long-term changes.

A paper has been developed that outlines a draft vision and strategy for research excellence at SOAS. It identifies strategic objectives and summarises progress to date. The paper was presented to the REF Steering Group and shared with the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board for discussion. A revised paper will be presented to Academic Board on 9th March.

The initial focus of the governance work stream has been on academic governance, working with Democratise SOAS. A revised version of the paper on the creation of a Senate (which was presented to Academic Board in January) was presented to the Board of Trustees at their informal meeting in early February. While there is broad agreement about the creation of a Senate, there are still some outstanding questions which are to be addressed by Academic Board in March.

**Integrated Facilities Management contract**

The APSE report commissioned by SOAS, as part of the process of evaluation for facilities maintenance contracts, is now complete and the findings were presented by its author Julie Pickering at an open meeting on Monday 1st February. A number of demonstrations in support of bringing the cleaners “in house” followed the publication of this report.

A project board meeting has been held and the board considered input from the APSE report, the new ethics framework and the outcomes of the contract evaluation. EB will make a final decision on the proposed facilities management contract in the next few weeks.

**The North Block**

The project remains on target for completion by the contractor in June.

On the lower levels of Senate House, the site is still very much a construction site with heavy work, dust and noise. On the upper levels, the rooms are being finished with final parts of the installations being put in place.

A number of engagement sessions are taking place involving prospective users of the building. The sessions are focusing on how to get the best from the building when it opens as well as the processes of the physical moves from different parts of campus.

**Fund-raising**

February was another good month for attracting philanthropic income. Amongst new support secured, we received a three year pledge from the Khyentse Foundation for
postgraduate work in Buddhist Studies. We also received £10,000 for publication subventions for the Yarshater lectures on Persian art.

Our Singapore alumni are some of the most active in the world and there is enthusiasm from them for raising a scholarship for SOAS students. We have received an initial donation to start this off. Our US alumni community already support an American student each year and we hope that other international groups of former students will come together to fund future SOAS scholars.

**Centenary**

February has been a busy time with centenary planning. We had the first event “Dulwich Boys and Beyond: 100 Years of Japanese Studies of SOAS” on 1st February. Chaired by BBC journalist, Nick Higham, the event included a panel of speakers including Professor Ronald Dore, one of the young men who learnt Japanese at SOAS in the 1940's.

We will be marking the receipt of our Royal Charter by burying a time capsule and having a street party in the precinct on the 6th June. We are asking staff, students and Trustees for ideas on what to put in the time capsule to represent SOAS and why. For more information, please email centenary@soas.ac.uk.

**Summer School**

The school is advertising its summer school for 2016. There are 3-5 week courses covering a range of subjects, including development, law, management, culture and language. The courses are aimed primarily at undergraduate students in their junior or senior year (2nd/3rd year) in other institutions but last year attendees included a number of mature students, including a number of alumni. Please share information about the summer school – details can be found here. LMEI is also running an Arabic immersion school at Easter from 19-24th March, details can be found here.

**Research award**

We have been invited to enter into exclusive negotiations for a €4m contract by the EU to launch a research and evidence facility on the Horn of Africa. The bid, led by Dr Laura Hammond, will be the largest enterprise contract won through the Research & Enterprise Office since it was set up in 2010 and will allow the provision of advice to the EU over the next two and a half years, in association with Oxford University and the Rift Valley Institute.

**Other news**

We have just signed an agreement with the Ferdowsi Center for Teaching Persian to Non-Persian speakers of Mashhad University, for our BA Persian student to spend a year abroad in Iran.

The lifting of the sanctions against Iran means that the country is poised to be a major regional player, drawing on considerable economic power and a rich intellectual heritage.
The agreement is an exciting development for SOAS and we are proud to offer students the chance to study in Iran and contribute to improving understanding and cooperation between our two countries.

Valerie Amos
29th February 2016
**Director’s monthly report**

**Paul Webley**

We received the sad news on 2\textsuperscript{nd} March that Paul Webley passed away after a long illness. Paul made a tremendous contribution to both SOAS and the wider academic community - as an inspired leader, as an eminent economic psychologist, as a member and chair of many influential bodies in higher education and as a champion of specialised research and of freedom of speech. His work was recognised in the award of a CBE in the 2015 New Year’s Honours list.

SOAS can be proud to have had Paul as its champion and leader for the last decade. He leaves a great legacy. Paul’s warmth, generosity and loyalty was felt by all. The whole SOAS community of staff and students, alumni and friends and supporters are greatly saddened by his loss and our thoughts are with Julie and his family.

**Recent disruption**

On 15\textsuperscript{th} March, a small group of protesters supporting the Justice for Cleaners Campaign made their way on to the Senate House North Block construction site. Graham Construction called the police and those protesting were encouraged to leave. No arrests were made. This incident was followed by a noise demonstration outside the Directorate office. On 16\textsuperscript{th} March a planned demonstration in support of Justice for Cleaners took place on the steps of College Buildings and a number of smoke flares were let off. The ground floor including the library was affected and although the building was not evacuated, the fire alarms sounded intermittently until the smoke had cleared. Some staff and students reported health and safety concerns following smoke inhalation.

**Sustainability Programme**

Work continues on the different strands of work and the Sustainability Programme Board met twice in March.

A first draft of the narrative to frame the objectives of the updated SOAS strategy was discussed at Academic Board on 9\textsuperscript{th} March. It was also presented at the Director’s Forum on 9\textsuperscript{th} March and published on MySOAS. All staff have been invited to comment on the draft paper by 8\textsuperscript{th} April. An updated version of the draft strategy will then be put to the Board of Trustees on 22\textsuperscript{nd} April.

A working group on academic outcomes and the student experience had its first meeting in early March. The focus of the meeting was on the Pre-entry and Transition stage of the student journey, and the student members of the working group provided very useful feedback and suggestions. Further meetings are scheduled during Term 3.
A number of responses have been received from across the School on the financial sustainability consultation document. These responses are currently being considered by the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board. A Voluntary Severance Scheme was opened on 14th March and the initial closing date for applications is 6th May. The scheme will remain open for applications until 2nd December. The financial sustainability proposals were presented to the Resources and Planning Committee on 8th March. There was a detailed discussion of the proposals, and it was agreed that take-up of the Voluntary Severance Scheme would be monitored closely over the next few months.

A paper on the curriculum review was presented to Academic Board on 9th March. A further paper on taking forward the curriculum review, including the initial areas of focus for the review, will be shared with the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board in Term 3.

A paper outlining a draft vision and strategy to deliver research excellence at SOAS was presented to Academic Board on 9th March.

The governance work stream has focused on academic governance and a paper was discussed at Academic Board on 9th March. Academic Board agreed to the expansion of its membership to include all Heads of Department and a number of academic staff elected from a newly created Senate. The first meeting of the Senate is expected to take place on 11th May after the proposed changes are put to the Board of Trustees for approval in April.

Undergraduate Enrolment

Admissions data shows that SOAS had received 5,045 undergraduate applications in the current admissions cycle as at 24 February 2016. This total excludes applications from last year’s cycle for deferred entry to 2016.

In order to try to forecast total new UG enrolments for 2016/17, two scenarios have been developed. Using last year’s conversion ratio and assuming no more applications and no students admitted through Clearing, the School is forecast to under-recruit against its target by 320 students. However if an additional 19% of applications are received between now and June and no students are admitted through Clearing, the School is forecast to under-recruit against its target by 182 students. In both scenarios, the School will need to enter clearing to reach its recruitment target but with a lower number required than in the previous year.

A clearer picture will be available after the 9th May which is the deadline for applicants to make a decision on which offer to accept.

QS World Rankings

The QS World University Rankings by Subject 2016 were published on 22nd March. Four SOAS subjects were ranked in the top 50 in the world, up from two subjects last year. Nine SOAS subjects were rated in the UK’s top 20. The full rankings are available to view here: QS World University Rankings by Subject
Facilities Management

The School is putting in place a facilities management contract for services for cleaning, security and maintenance for SOAS. As we have gone through the process, we have been listening to the views of staff and students. Many SOAS staff and students feel strongly that the employment contracts of cleaning staff should be managed in-house rather than by an external provider. The School and UNISON are currently in discussions in relation to the direct employment of cleaning staff by SOAS as there are complex matters to work through.

Prevent

SOAS submitted its initial self-assessment of compliance with the Prevent Duty to HEFCE in January. The deadline to submit evidence of our compliance with the duty is 1st April 2016. We received some initial feedback on our submission from HEFCE, and the Working Group has been preparing the documentation ready for formal submission by the deadline. We have been contacted by the Evening Standard who have advised us that they intend to cite SOAS in an article on universities which are 'failing to deal with extreme speakers'.

The North Block

The project team are working towards the completion of the building in June.

Works have progressed well on the upper levels and with finishing now complete and furniture in place it is now possible to see how the completed rooms will look.

Data cabling is being pulled into the building which will connect into College Buildings and to the University of London Computer Centre. As well as providing connectivity for Senate House, the installation should make the entire SOAS network more resilient.

Fund-raising

I am pleased to report that we received new donations for scholarships from a number of funders in March including the Charles Wallace India Trust, the Khyentse Foundation and alumna Helen Pickering.

Later this year, the School will launch a major fundraising campaign. Securing additional funding for scholarships will form a key part of the campaign.

Centenary

SOAS' Everlasting Flame exhibition in partnership with the British Library opened at Delhi’s National Museum on 19th March. The inauguration event was opened by India's Finance Minister with a number of other Ministers and key members of the Zoroastrian community present. I attended with the Chair and Director of the British Library. I and also gave the opening address at the Zoroastrianism in the New Millennium conference. Papers were
presented by several SOAS academics including Sarah Stewart, Almut Hintze, Nicholas Sims-Williams and Burzine Waghmar.

A special private viewing of the exhibition was attended by SOAS alumni and student offer holders in Delhi.

Planning continues for events to take place in Senate House North Block in September to officially mark the building’s opening.

The 6th June is the date when the School received its Royal Charter in 1916 as the School of Oriental Studies and to mark the occasion, we will bury a time capsule near the Thiruvalluvar statue. The time capsule will contain a collection of items that represent SOAS and the world today. We are encouraging staff, students, trustees, friends and alumni to enter the competition to suggest items to go into the time capsule eg texts, photographs or objects. Those who have items placed in the time capsule will win a pair of tickets to an independent cinema of their choice.

The Centenary Project Manager is recruiting two event officers to support the centenary events programme.

Other news

SOAS has just signed an agreement with the FCO to develop and deliver online PG Certificates, Diplomas and Master’s degrees in ‘Global Diplomacy (South Asia)’. The programmes will be based on CISD’s current distance learning ‘MA in Global Diplomacy’ whilst offering a new South Asia pathway through the addition of new, South Asia related, core and elective modules.

SOAS will receive £75,000 from the FCO to develop those new modules and has been contracted to deliver this offering for 10 years. The programme will be officially launched in December 2016 and will be advertised to FCO staff, all HMG departments and other Government bodies. It will also be open to the general public.

Valerie Amos
31st March 2016
CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Board is asked to note the update on the process to select the next Chair of the Board.

Executive Summary

At its last meeting in January the Nominations Committee agreed the outline of a process for the selection of the next Chair of the Board. Following the resignation of the Chair of the Board, Tim Miller, the Vice-Chair agreed to be Acting Chair and oversee this process as a matter of urgency.

An update was sent to the Board on 17 March 2016 on the process and the appointment of Minerva to assist in the search. A formal advertisement was made on Sunday 10 April and the School will also be seeking any nominations from the Board and the school community including our alumni.

Trustees were invited to contribute their thoughts on what type of individual we need for the next Chair. The intention is to hold final interviews in June so a formal recommendation can be made to the Board of Trustees meeting on 11 July.

The interview panel will be comprised as below. We are also considering other options for how a wider group of stakeholders might be able to be involved at the final stage.

- Martin Harris (Acting Chair)
- Steve Tinton (Acting Vice-Chair)
- Gautam Dalal (Honorary Treasurer)
- Deborah Johnston (Interim Pro-Director, Learning & Teaching)
- Laura Gibbs (Registrar)
- Elizabeth Wright (Former Vice-Chair of the Board)

Recommendations

To note the update

Financial Impact

Costs of external search at around £20,000.

Risks

None

Equality implications

None from update. The search process will aim to produce a diverse field of potential candidates.
ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

The Board of Trustees is asked to **approve** the proposals around academic governance

**Executive Summary**

The attached paper outlines proposed changes to the Standing Orders to create an Academic Senate, revise the membership of Academic Board and take steps to improve transparency and accountability in decision making on academic matters.

These proposals are based on those developed by the Democratise SOAS campaign but do not include all their suggestions.

These proposals were discussed by Academic Board its extraordinary meeting in January and then refined by the Academic Board Working Group and discussed with the Board of Trustees as part of the joint informal meeting in February 2016.

The final paper was discussed at Academic Board at its meeting in March 2016 and a decision taken on recommendations to the Board of Trustees

**Recommendations**

To consider and **approve** the changes to the Standing Orders on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

**Financial Impact**

None

**Risks**

No direct risks

**Equality implications**

None. However, any changes to the membership of committees would provide an opportunity to improve the diversity of their membership.
**Executive Summary**

This paper outlines recommended changes to the Standing Orders, see Annex 1, to create an Academic Senate, revise the membership of Academic Board and take steps to improve transparency and accountability in decision making on academic matters.

**Background**

The Board of Trustees initiated a 2015/16 Effectiveness Review to address issues on institutional governance raised by the 2013/14 Governing Body Effectiveness Review, the 2014/15 Academic Board Working Group and the Democratise SOAS campaign. The Board of Trustees also received an internal audit report covering a number of recommendations at its meeting in July 2015.

The Board established an Effectiveness Review Group to oversee this work, chaired by the Vice-Chair, which it does within the context of external standards such as CUC Guidelines on university governance, best practice in the sector and SOAS' own commitment to exemplary standards of governance.

The initial focus of the Group has been on academic governance and four proposals considered by the Group were:

- Establish a Senate
- Re-constitute Academic Board
- Improve the links between Executive Board, Academic Board and the Board of Trustees
- Establish a Student-Staff Forum

The Group supported the proposals and agreed that reforms to governance along these lines should be pursued with some urgency by the School and be the immediate focus of the Effectiveness Review. This approach was subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees for further development and discussion with the Academic Board.

The papers were discussed briefly at the Academic Board meeting on 21 January and initial views given. The meeting agreed that the Academic Board Working Group should be reconvened and agree a final paper for discussion at the informal meeting with the Board of Trustees on 3 February. This was discussed and endorsed with the only issue remaining to be considered the membership of the Senate.

A more detailed background summary is given at Annex 2.

The Academic Board discussed a final paper at its meeting in March and agreed recommendations to make to the Board of Trustees on changes to the existing Standing Orders and a new Standing Order to cover the creation of a Senate.
Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees has existing powers under the Articles in relation to academic matters and Academic Board:

- **Article IV 1c** - to appoint committees for the proper exercise and discharge of all or any of the Board of Trustees' powers and responsibilities;

- **Article IV 1g** - to approve the academic scope and academic structure of the School, and any changes to such scope or structure, after having received advice from the Academic Board;

- **Article VI 1** - There shall be an Academic Board of the School the terms of reference and membership of which will be determined by the Board of Trustees.

- **Article VI 2** - The Academic Board shall be responsible for:
  
  (a) advising the Board of Trustees on any proposal relating to the academic scope, academic structure and academic standards of the School; and
  
  (b) bringing to the attention of the Board of Trustees any matter which in the opinion of the Academic Board affects the teaching and/or research of the School.

Under its own Terms of Reference the Board of Trustees has the following term “Seek and consider the advice of Academic Board on matters affecting the academic scope and academic structure of the School”. These existing powers give the Board of Trustees the necessary powers to make the changes outlined within this paper.

Proposals

**Senate**

The rationale for having an Academic Senate is threefold: first, it serves as an organised and inclusive deliberative forum for discussing matters of academic policy and institutional strategy within the academic community of the School; second, it serves as a check on policy decisions which may prejudice the academic standing of the School; and, third, it communicates its decisions to key stakeholders in the School, in particular the Board of Trustees, Executive Board, and the student body.

The Senate is here understood as working closely with the Academic Board (of which it is a sub-committee). Academic Board will continue to play a primary role in terms of responsibility for academic governance in the School; however, in keeping with the procedures outlined below, key matters of academic policy or strategic importance will be passed to the Senate for discussion and a vote if called for. Academic Board will also draw some of its members directly from the Senate through elections.

The Senate will be open to a wider group and will meet twice annually. It is suggested that the first meeting will be in the summer term 2015/6 at which two dates for 2016/17 can be discussed. At the moment the draft proposals do not include any representation of Professional Services within the Academic Senate, and Academic Board needs to consider how to define the membership of an Academic Senate to ensure it works effectively. Options include staff on permanent academic contracts, all academic staff as well as those
professional services above a certain grade etc. The Academic Board Working Group considered this in some detail and saw four potential options, which it discussed further:

1. All permanent academic staff
2. All permanent academic staff as well as those from a defined group of professional services (e.g. Grade 8 or above) in attendance
3. All permanent academic staff as well as those from a defined group of professional services as ex officio members
4. All permanent academic staff with an agreement to create a comparable body for professional services

There was strong support for an Academic Senate as a sub-committee of Academic Board with a duty to safeguard the academic reputation of the School and provided academic input on matters of academic policy. However there was some debate at Academic Board over the composition of the Senate and if the membership should include staff from professional services.

The Senate will have an Agenda Steering Group comprised of its elected Chair, the Director, and an elected Academic Board member. The Steering Group would also have a Secretary. The Agenda Steering Group will be responsible for scheduling meetings, setting the agenda, agreeing what are key matters of academic policy for discussion and circulating relevant papers in a timely way. It will also report the activities and decisions of the Senate to the Academic Board, the Executive Board, and the Board of Trustees. This will involve passing on minutes and providing an annual report to the Board of Trustees.

The Senate will also be responsible for organising the election of members to act as representatives on Academic Board in a revised membership of Academic Board. The rationale for electing these members is that they will provide a continuous presence for a wider range of academics within the decision-making structures of the School. The expectation is that they will act in the general interests of the institution whilst articulating a wider range of views relating to academic policy and practice. Elected members will serve for three academic years.

After debate the Academic Board decided to recommend the creation of a Senate with a membership comprised of all permanent academic staff and all those professional services staff at Grade 8 (around 100 staff) as full members. A new Standing Order (XXIV) is included in Annex 1 on this basis for the membership and Terms of Reference for a Senate.

**Academic Board**

The proposal is that Academic Board should be reconstituted to include existing ex-officio members, all Heads of Departments and the Deans, a number of members elected from the Academic Senate (equal to the representation on Academic Board of HoDs and Deans) and four student members.
These proposals, based on the current 13 departments and 3 faculties, would increase the size of Academic Board from its current membership of 25 to 42, plus those in attendance. This would be a size consistent with a number of other London institutions and would also allow it to change depending on any future academic structures. However, Academic Board may wish to consider the overall number of staff involved and the staff time this represents. Any future rationalization of School administration would be reflected immediately in the composition and size of Academic Board.

To facilitate a close relationship between SOAS students and School-wide decision-making, it is proposed the student representation should be increased and there should be four student members of AB, including one postgraduate taught student and one doctoral researcher.

All members (or groups of 25+ Senate members) will be entitled to submit items for the agenda, and each agenda will be placed online (together with relevant papers, as recently enacted) for all staff to read in advance of meetings.

These changes would require amendments to Standing Order II (See Annex 1) along with possible changes to that relating to the selection of Heads of Department.

Academic Board approved these changes and agreed to retain the membership of one Associate Dean (Learning & Teaching) and one Associate Dean (Research).

**Heads of Department**

Heads of Department are currently appointed for a term of three or four years (depending on seniority), renewable once. Academic Board agreed to recommend a change in the Standing Orders to the Board of Trustees with respect to the selection of Heads. It is proposed that the selection of a new Head within a Department (via election or general consensus as felt appropriate) must occur by Reading Week in Term 2 so that an incoming Head is in place with sufficient time for there to be a smooth handover. Where a Department is unable to select a Head by this date the Director will be empowered to appoint one from within the Department concerned. The terms of office would not change from the existing tenure.

**Links between Academic Board and Executive Board**

To ensure that Academic Board and Executive Board are in regular communication and engaged in a process of ‘shared’ decision-making, Academic Board will meet twice in the first two terms and once in the summer term. This will allow Executive Board to send items to Academic Board which it can then feedback to Executive Board in a timely fashion.

This proposal to facilitate more frequent meetings will require a change in Standing Order II(ii), which currently specifies three AB meetings per year.

To improve the frequency and quality of interaction between these key committees the Academic Board will ‘receive and approve’ proposals substantially affecting research, teaching, and student welfare from Executive Board.
Changes of this nature will ensure that SOAS governance structures/processes are more in keeping with the SOAS Charter VI(2)(b), linking Academic Board to ‘any matter which in the opinion of AB affects the teaching and/or research of the School’

**Student-Staff Forum**

Although not strictly part of Academic Board’s remit, it was asked to note that this Academic Year a number of new mechanisms have been established for communication between staff and students. This includes more regular open meetings for students and staff in addition to the existing channels such as the student/staff bulletins, meetings with the Students’ Union and the Heads’ Forum.

**Recommendations & next steps**

The Board of Trustees is asked to approve the paper and changes to the Standing Orders on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

The changes will take effect from the 2016/17 academic year, except for the creation of a Senate via Standing Order XXIV, which will take effect immediately so that elections to Academic Board can take place and an inaugural meeting will be held in May.

Further work will take place later in 2016 to look at the wider issues of governance and committees within the School, in particular the sub-committees of Academic Board, bearing in mind that changes will be impacted by any future academic re-organisation of the School.
Annex 1

Standing Orders

SOAS Standing Order II: Academic Board

Academic Board reports to the Board of Trustees.

(i) The membership of Academic Board will comprise

Chair:
Director (Chair)

Ex-officio Members:
Pro-Directors
Deans
Head of Doctoral School
Registrar
Director of Library & Information Services
All academic Heads of Department (NB - 13 as of February 2016)

Other Members:
One Associate Dean (Learning & Teaching)
One Associate Dean (Research)
Four members of academic staff from each Faculty Board nominated by Faculty Board through a process to be agreed within the Faculty
A number of academic staff elected from the Senate, including the Senate Chair (equal to the number of academic HoDs and Deans serving on Academic Board)
Two Four student members nominated by the Students’ Union Executive, each of whom must either be a Sabbatical Officer of the SOAS Students’ Union or a full-time registered student of the School. One will be a taught postgraduate student and one a doctoral researcher.

In attendance:
Secretary, Director of Academic Services, Director of Research & Enterprise, Head of IFCELS, Students’ Union Manager

(ii) The Registrar will nominate a Secretary. The Board will normally hold three-five ordinary meetings per session;

(iii) Academic Board will appoint the following Standing Committees. Academic Board will receive regular reports from these committees and approve proposals from them;

Academic Senate
Academic Development Committee
Equality & Diversity Committee (reports also to Resources & Planning Committee)
Faculty Boards
Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (reports through Academic Development Committee)
Research & Enterprise Committee
Student Experience Committee (reports through Academic Development Committee)

Academic Board may delegate activities and authorities to its Standing Committees as appropriate, but retains overall responsibility for these.

(iv) The remit of Academic Board is to advise the Board of Trustees on any proposal relating to the academic scope, academic structure and academic standards of the School and to
bring to the attention of the Board of Trustees any matter which in the opinion of Academic Board affects the teaching and/or research of the School.

(v) Academic Board will have the following terms of reference:

(a) To make arrangements for the delegation of responsibility as necessary to Standing Committees, the Chair and other School Officers;

(b) To advise the Board of Trustees on the strategic development and future direction of the School's academic activities, as incorporated in the strategic plan and sub-strategies, and to keep these under review;

(c) To approve strategies/sub-strategies where this responsibility has been delegated from the Board of Trustees

(d) To receive reports and approve recommendations from its Committees, the Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching) and other School Officers in respect of educational developments;

(e) To receive reports and approve recommendations on other issues which fall within its remit from its Committees, the Pro-Directors and other School Officers and to approve;

(f) To receive reports and approve recommendations from the Regional Centres through the Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise), and from other School Centres through the appropriate Dean of Faculty;

(g) To determine academic policy where this responsibility has not been devolved;

(h) To receive reports and approve recommendations on quality assurance and quality assessment measures employed by the School and to review outcomes;

(i) To consider matters and approve recommendations affecting the academic scope, academic structure and academic standards of the School or any other matter reasonably falling within the remit of Academic Board and advise the Board of Trustees, Resources & Planning Committee, or Executive Board as appropriate;

(j) To establish regulations and procedures for compliance with the Statutes and Ordinances of the University of London, and to award degrees;

(k) To establish regulations and procedures for School awards and to award School qualifications;

(l) To receive reports from Resources & Planning Committee.

SOAS Standing Order IV: Executive Board

(iii) The remit of the Board is to advise the Director on the exercise of his/her authority vested by the Charter and Standing Orders with respect to general matters of policy, planning and corporate strategy, making recommendations for approval to Academic Board (for matters substantially affecting research, teaching and student welfare), Resources & Planning Committee and the Board of Trustees. The Board will also act within delegated authority on behalf of other Standing Committees to co-ordinate and progress School business.

(iv)(c) To help coordinate the academic and non-academic management of the School.
SOAS Standing Orders: Annex XII: Appointment Procedures for Heads of Department

Heads of Department

2. To fill any vacancy, each Department will select its Head before Reading Week in Term 2. After consulting with the Director, Academic Board will note the outcome.

(a) If a Department is unable to select a new Head of Department, the Director will appoint one from within the department concerned.

SOAS Standing Orders: Annex XIV: Procedures for the Conduct of Committee Meetings

6. There will be a quorum for all Committees which unless specified otherwise will be one third of the membership. For the Board of Trustees the quorum will be eight, the majority of whom must be lay members, for Resources & Planning Committee five, for Academic Board nine, for Audit Committee two and for Executive Board three. For the Academic Senate the quorum will be 100.

7. Where issues are put to the vote, a majority of those present and voting will be binding. Any member of a Committee may request a vote. Should the Committee be equally divided, the Chair may exercise a casting vote. Vote tallies (and minority opinions raised during meetings) will be minuted.

13 The Chair will call an extraordinary meeting on the receipt of a written request to that effect stating clearly the purpose for which the meeting is required and signed by no fewer than five members in the case of the Board of Trustees, three for Resources & Planning Committee, eight for Academic Board and one third of the membership for other Committees. Extraordinary meetings of the Academic Senate, focusing on a specific issue, may be called by the Director, 50% of Academic Board, or 60 members of the Senate writing to the Senate Chair.

14. Notice of an extraordinary meeting will be issued a minimum of five working days before the meeting is convened where the Committee has no lay members, and seven working days when the Committee has lay members.

15. The agenda for an extraordinary meeting will only contain papers relevant to the issue(s) under discussion. The meeting will not be asked to approve minutes, deal with any matters arising, nor will any other business be allowed.

SOAS Standing Order XXIV: The Senate

The Senate reports to the Academic Board

(i) The membership of the Senate will comprise

Chair:
Elected from the permanent academic staff members

Ex-officio Members:
Director

Members:
All permanent academic staff
All professional services staff at Grade 8 or above

Observers:
(ii) Terms of Reference

(a) To consider matters referred to it by Academic Board, Executive Board or 50 of its membership, regarding academic policy and institutional strategy

(b) To provide academic input in to key School issues and feed this back to Academic Board, Executive Board or the Board of Trustees

(c) To report annually to the Board of Trustees

(d) To elect a Chair of Academic Senate from its membership

(e) To convene an Agenda Steering Group; comprised of the Senate Chair (as Chair), the Director and one additional elected Academic Board member

(f) To elect from its membership a certain number of Academic Board members. The number of Academic Board members so elected (including the Senate Chair who will serve as an AB member) will equal the number of Heads of Department and Deans on Academic Board.

- Members elected will include four ‘reserved’ seats, namely (i) at least two members drawn from Area Studies departments and (ii) at least two representatives of Languages.

- Of these elected members, at least four will not be Professors.

- Elections from the Senate to the following session’s AB will be conducted electronically prior to the Senate’s meeting in Term 3. Candidates may nominate themselves and include a statement of up to 150 words in support of their nomination. Votes for ‘reserved’ seats and non-professorial staff will be counted first, followed by a general count to fill the remaining positions.

- In the event that an elected Senate member of AB consistently fails to attend AB meetings (e.g. more than 50% in an academic year), the Chair can recommend that the member stand down, triggering an election.

(g) To undertake a ballot of its full membership via electronic voting

(h) To remit matters to Academic Board and/or Executive Board for reconsideration or amendment with the agreement of the majority of a quorate meeting. The Senate may only do this once in respect of a specific matter
Annex 2

Amended version of the paper considered by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on 27 November 2015

Background

The 2015/16 Effectiveness Review was initiated to address issues on institutional governance raised by the 2013/14 Governing Body Effectiveness Review, the 2014/15 Academic Board Working Group and the Democratise SOAS campaign. The Board of Trustees also received an internal audit report covering a number of recommendations at its meeting in July 2015.

The Board established an Effectiveness Review Group to oversee this work, chaired by the Vice-Chair, which it does so within the context of external standards such as CUC Guidelines on university governance, best practice in the sector and SOAS’ own commitment to exemplary standards of governance.

At its meeting on 23 September 2015 the Group agreed that the immediate focus of its work should be around issues of academic governance. The latest version of the CUC Code has the following as one of its seven primary pillars of good governance:

“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.”

Working Group progress

At its last meeting in November, the Group discussed the DemocratiseSOAS proposals, which, predominately, built upon the issues raised by the Academic Board Working Group. These were presented in a petition signed by over 600 staff and students supporting four specific reforms to governance arrangements in the School. This was accompanied by comparator information on academic governance arrangements in the University of London.

The initial proposals from the Democratise SOAS campaign group were:

- Amend SOAS Standing Order II(i) to re-constitute Academic Board with an equal number of elected HODs and elected non-executive academic staff (as well as 3-4 elected student representatives, 3-4 ex officio managers, and an elected non-executive academic chair) to receive reports, vote on proposals, and communicate directly with the SOAS Board of Trustees
- Amend SOAS Standing Order IV(iii) to modernize Executive Board so that proposals affecting academic research, teaching, and student welfare are put to a vote by Academic Board as a matter of routine (not merely ‘as necessary’)
- Amend SOAS Charter Article IX to establish a SOAS Senate with universal academic-staff membership and, meeting once each term, the power to vote on proposals put forward by the School’s Academic and/or Executive Board
- Establish a Staff-Student Forum meeting once each term to provide all members of SOAS with a venue to discuss issues of mutual concern
The Group considered steps to improve the ‘shared governance’ model of decision-making at SOAS. This entails developing a better working relationship between the Board of Trustees, the SOAS executive, SOAS academic staff, and SOAS students. The rationale is that a more inclusive, transparent, and accountable approach to institutional decision-making will support better, sustainable and more collegial forms of decision-making across the School.

The four proposals are to:

- Re-constitute Academic Board
- Establish a Senate
- Establish a staff-student forum
- Improve the links between Executive Board and Academic Board

The four proposals are based upon those put forward by the DemocratiseSOAS campaign group but would require further discussion by the Effectiveness Group and Academic Board. In outline they are:

Senate – The initial proposal was to amend the Standing Orders to create a Senate with wide, possibly universal, membership of academic staff. This would meet and consider key topics as well as any matters that were put to it by Academic and/or Executive Board

Academic Board - The proposal would be to amend the Standing Orders to re-constitute Academic Board with an equal number of elected HODs and elected academic staff. There would also be appropriate student representation as well as relevant ex-officio appointments. The Board would to receive reports and communicate directly with the SOAS Board of Trustees

Staff-Student Forum – Establish a regular forum to provide all members of SOAS with a venue to discuss issues of mutual concern

Links between EB/AB - Amend the Terms of Reference of both committees to ensure the appropriate consideration of matters and proposals affecting academic research, teaching, and student welfare

The Group was sympathetic to the proposals, and agreed that reforms to governance along these lines should be pursued with some urgency by the School and be the immediate focus of the Effectiveness Review. A work plan was also that proposed a sequencing of actions along these lines. Some actions, such as the faster publication of Academic Board papers and agenda to the School were already underway.

The Group also discussed the related issues of Departmental autonomy and the planning process in terms of budgeting for academic units. There was a need to ensure that appropriate lines of decision-making were also observed in these areas.

The Group agreed that specific practical details would require elaboration. These included the processes and constituencies for any elections to Academic Board, the membership of the Senate and the frequency and sequencing of meetings of an expanded Academic Board and the Senate. These will have to be elaborated in a way which accommodates any potential changes in the size and number of academic units.
Initial recommendations

The outline recommendations approved by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on 27 November 2015 are below:

- The establishment of an Academic Senate with (universal) academic-staff membership, with the power to vote on proposals referred to it by the Academic Board, Executive Board (or the Board of Trustees)
- The re-constitution of Academic Board to consist of ex-officio members, Heads of Departments and elected members (from an Academic Senate) & students
- The re-calibration of the relationship between the Board of Trustees, Executive Board and Academic Board, to ensure the consideration and approval of business related to research, teaching and student welfare by Academic Board
- The establishment of an all Staff-Student forum (meeting termly) to discuss issues of interest

The Board of Trustees agreed that specific practical details of these proposals would be brought to the joint February meeting of the Board of Trustees and Academic Board pending further work on the detail and discussion within Academic Board.
### ANNEX XIX – REMOVAL OF A TRUSTEE

The Board of Trustees is asked to **approve** a change to Annex XIX of the Standing Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In preparation for the new CUC Code of Governance the internal auditors recommended the School revise Annex XIX relating to the removal of a Trustee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To <strong>approve</strong> the changes to Annex XIX on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Removal of a Trustee from Office**

The Board of Trustees is asked to approve, on the recommendation of the Nominations Committee, a change to Annex XIX of the Standing Orders to clarify when a Trustee may be removed from office.

1. **Background**

   Annex XIX of the School's Standing Orders contains a provision for removal of a Trustee from Office:

   **4. Removal from Office**
   
   *Under exceptional circumstances the Board of Trustees may decide to ask members to step down before the end of their term of office. This would normally occur when:*
   
   i) a serious conflict of interest occurs;
   
   ii) a member is unable to reasonably carry out his/her duties.

   *With regard to ii) above, Nominations Committee will normally review all members' attendance at meetings. Anyone who fails to attend more than a third of normally scheduled meetings over a two year rolling period, may be asked to stand down.*

   In preparation for the new CUC Code of Governance the internal auditors made the following recommendation:

   Although the Governing Body has the power to remove a member there is no definitive procedure to follow.

   With the exception of members leaving due to cessation of their term, there have been no removals from the Governing Body to date; however SOAS risks insufficiently dealing with the matter if the process is not clearly defined.

   SOAS should formally document the process to be followed in the event a member is to be removed following inappropriate behaviour.

2. **Recommendation**

   It is recommended that the Standing Orders be amended as below. Any changes would require approval from the Board of Trustees. Section 2 of the Standing Order covers the 7 Nolan Principles of Public Life -

   **4. Removal from Office**
   
   *Under exceptional circumstances the Board of Trustees may decide to ask members to step down before the end of their term of office. If required a panel of three Trustees, chaired by the Chair or Vice-Chair, will be convened to review the matter and make a recommendation to the Nominations Committee and then to the Board of Trustees. This would normally occur when:*
   
   i) a serious conflict of interest occurs;
   
   ii) a member is unable to reasonably carry out his/her duties.
iii) the conduct of a member is not in accordance with the criteria in section 2 of this Standing Order.

With regard to ii) above, Nominations Committee will normally review all members' attendance at meetings. Anyone who fails to attend more than a third of normally scheduled meetings over a two year rolling period, may be asked to stand down.

Where a member is asked to step down but refuses or does not respond to the request then the Nominations Committee will review the matter and, when necessary, make a recommendation for termination of their membership to the Board of Trustees.
**HEFCE LETTER ON INSTITUTIONAL RISK**

The Board of Trustees is **asked to note**, the HEFCE letter of 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 Baroness Amos

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 2014-15 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 Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability and other HEFCE guidance.

Future context, and feedback on financial performance and on quality matters

3. Whilst the financial health of the sector is sound, at institutional level the picture is mixed, and future projections of reducing surpluses and cash levels and a rise in borrowing signal a trajectory that is not sustainable in the long term. Institutions face significant challenges including increased uncertainty over future government funding, overseas student recruitment and cost pressures such as rising pension costs, as well as the need to sustain higher levels of investment to respond to growing competition and meet student expectations. These challenges are likely to lead to continued volatility and growing variability in the financial performance of institutions.

4. We therefore encourage all institutions to monitor the wider changes in the sector, and continue to assess the risks and opportunities that these present, implementing mitigating actions where necessary. Your scenario planning with your governing body 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. We are happy to discuss this and other issues with you as part of our regular engagements with the institution.

5. Annexes A and B provide feedback on the relative financial performance of your 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.

6. You will be aware that the Government asked HEFCE to put in place arrangements to identify and address any concerns about the quality of the student academic experience that may have resulted from growth or contraction in student numbers in an institution following the removal of student number controls. The HEFCE Board approved a low-burden approach to this issue that built on existing accountability mechanisms used by the Council and recognised the importance of providers’ own systems for planning for and managing (potential) changes in student numbers. Our approach this year has been twofold:

a. we are using recruitment and student progression and achievement data in a more structured and consistent manner for all institutions we fund to identify any areas for further discussion and to prompt improving actions where necessary,

b. we used this year’s Annual Accountability Return to collect assurances from all providers we fund to confirm that institutions are able to identify and address any early signs of concern about the quality of the student experience.

7. We will continue to develop these activities and in future years we will provide you with relevant benchmarking data and our view of your performance in this important area.

Risk assessment process

8. 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.

9. We may issue a further risk letter to some institutions following the assessment of July 2016 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

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Given the implications of the new HE SORP on financial reporting and in particular earnings before interest tax depreciation and amortisation (EBITDA) on which our financial commitment process is based, a proposed a new approach to HEFCE's financial commitment threshold based on adjusted operating cash flow will be tested in April following the submission of financial information in the new SORP format by institutions in March. The HEFCE Board will then consider the analysis of the information submitted by institutions at its May meeting and we will announce the revised approach and threshold shortly after this meeting to become effective from the 1 August 2016 as part of the Memorandum of Assurance and Accountability.

Who to contact

13. 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, Jacqui Brasted (0117 931 7389, j.brasted@hefce.ac.uk) in the first instance, or Regional Consultant, Derek Hicks (0117 931 7460, d.hicks@hefce.ac.uk).

Freedom of information

14. 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 disclosable if a request is made to us under that Act.
Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Madeleine Atkins
Chief Executive
cc: Dr Tim Miller, Chairman of Governing Body.
Annex A – Table of benchmarking of key financial indicators

Institution: The School of Oriental and African Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators:</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Historical cost surplus / (deficit) as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Net liquidity / (total expenditure – depreciation) (days)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>175</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>11.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>39.1</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>65.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>87.8</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>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Staff costs as % of total income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Estates: percentage of estate classified in condition categories C and D in 2013-14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sector mean</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st quartile</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd quartile</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source of data: Indicators 1 to 6 are calculated from the 2015 financial results data as submitted to HEFCE in December 2015. Further details on this and on how the indicators are calculated are available on the HEFCE extranet under ‘2015 financial results – summary statistics’. Details on how to access this benchmarking information will be sent to Directors of Finance.

Indicator 7: 2013-14 Estates data provided from Estates Management Record. For further information see:

https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_studrec&Itemid=232&mn=13042

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 2014-15

Institution: The School of Oriental and African Studies

The figures below show the institution's key financial indicators for 2014-15 relative to the sector. The data for The School of Oriental and African Studies are highlighted in red.

[Graph: Historical cost surplus/(deficit) as a % of total income 2014-15]

Sector mean: 6.6%

[Graph: Net liquidity days 2014-15]

Sector mean: 126 days
Source of data: Financial indicators are calculated from the 2015 financial results data as submitted to HEFCE in December 2015. Further details on this and on how the indicators are calculated are available on the HEFCE extranet under 'Financial results summary statistics (December 2015 submission)'. Details on how to access this benchmarking information will be sent to Directors of Finance.
The Board is asked to comment on the paper

Executive Summary

The Sustainable SOAS Programme Board is currently overseeing 5 areas of work:

- Update to the SOAS Strategy
- Financial Sustainability
- Curriculum Reform
- Research Excellence
- Governance

Below please find the draft updated strategy and the financial sustainability plans which have been updated following consultations. The strategy document is a dynamic document which sets out SOAS's objectives and will be supported by the development of key performance indicators against each objective.

The financial sustainability plans set out the actions to be taken to tackle the School's financial shortfall and enable us to invest in our priority areas.

Recommendations

Board of Trustee members are asked to comment on the proposals. Final sign off will take place at the Trustees meeting in July.

Financial Impact

As detailed in the paper

Risks

As detailed in the paper. The proposals link to all the risks on the School's institutional risk register

Equality implications

Any final proposals will be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment, which will be included in the papers for the July meeting.
Introduction

The Sustainable SOAS Programme Board are currently overseeing 5 areas of work:

- Update to the SOAS Strategy
- Financial Sustainability
- Curriculum Reform
- Research Excellence
- Governance

Below please find the draft updated strategy and the financial sustainability plans which have been updated following consultations. The strategy document is a dynamic document which sets out SOAS's objectives and will be supported by the development of key performance indicators against each objective.

The financial sustainability plans set out the actions to be taken to tackle the School's financial shortfall and enable us to invest in our priority areas.

Board of Trustee members are asked to comment on the proposals. Final sign off will take place at the Trustees meeting in July.
Update to SOAS Strategy

Context

We live in a world of unprecedented change bringing opportunities and challenges. Technological innovation moves on apace with a major impact on how we communicate, where and how we work and how we live. Despite falling absolute poverty, inequality is increasing in some parts of the world. Climate change and intensified conflict over resources have increased uncertainty, whilst growing agrarian crises combined with the politics of food security and land are fundamentally altering the relationships between the rural and urban world. Cultural diversity has grown in some places, but is often under threat globally. Global and local discourses are becoming increasingly interconnected and challenge notions of centre and periphery. How political and economic power is distributed in the world has also changed with emerging economies gaining greater influence. As a result, global governance mechanisms, established in the immediate aftermath of Second World War, now struggle to deliver peace, security and human rights.

Against this backdrop, the higher education sector in the UK and around the world continues to evolve. In the United Kingdom the shift from a Government funded higher education sector as a public good to one in which student fees are now the biggest share of university income has led to a competitive environment for students and research income, fundamentally changing the relationship between students and universities and potentially between students and their teachers. Expectations are higher. Perceptions of the role, contribution and value of education are shifting and contested. The pressures to perform well are greater. To thrive, UK universities must demonstrate excellence, pioneer new modes of thought and explanation, and challenge approaches rooted in outdated intellectual legacies. They must also negotiate the complexities of the current environment, including the threat of worldwide economic downturn, and competition from new and/or more welcoming overseas providers.

For a university like SOAS whose niche is its internationalism, the challenge of the status quo and a strong values base with a commitment to justice, diversity and equality, continuing to thrive in a market based higher education sector can pose additional challenges. As a small research led university with language and area studies specialisms the challenge of maintaining and balancing academic excellence and financial sustainability is even greater as there are many areas in which it is difficult for us to achieve economies of scale.

But there are also significant opportunities. Given the global challenges outlined above there has never been a better time for a university like SOAS. The world needs SOAS more than ever before. For the last 100 years we have grown and developed to take our place as a global university, teaching and researching across a range of social science and humanities subjects, rooted in the culture and languages of the regions in which we specialise. We make the connections that others cannot. We have the expertise – in terms of depth and breadth. We have the understanding of cultures and contexts. To be interconnected people need to be able to talk with each other, communicate. So SOAS has an important role to play in addressing the world's needs by:
• Challenging perspectives through its research and teaching
• Helping to build bridges in a complex world
• Applying a global lens to the critical issues of our time
• Developing graduates who can influence and make an impact throughout their careers
• Developing new intellectual and strategic partnerships

And SOAS students leave our university with the ability to:
• Challenge and interpret the world
• Connect communities and cultures
• Change and impact the world

SOAS’ strength lies in using our strong language base, area studies specialisms and disciplinary expertise to show the interconnectedness of the world. By advancing knowledge and understanding of our regions and their diasporas through excellent research, teaching and independent scholarship. And through this promoting a sense of global citizenship and mutual understanding because even as our world has become more interconnected through trade, travel and global communications it also seems more fragmented requiring innovative approaches to help us understand the world’s unity and complexity. Scholars at SOAS work collectively to demonstrate the interconnectedness and changing contours of the world.

We see ourselves continuing as a niche institution with regional specialisms, providing a balanced portfolio and maintaining excellence in all our areas of research and scholarship. We will need to grow to thrive but that growth will be in line with our commitment to excellence. Our base in Bloomsbury enables us to provide an intimate, welcoming and dynamic experience for our students. The opening of our new building Senate House North Block (SHNB) will further enhance that experience and we hope to consolidate our Bloomsbury campus through further development as opportunities arise. We see our overseas expansion taking place through the development of strong collaborations and partnerships with universities and institutions around the world.

We aim to:

• Produce high quality research that shapes global scholarship and learning
• Produce high quality graduates, postgraduates and researchers who understand and engage with the world and the regions in which we specialise
• Develop well rounded individuals who can make a difference in their communities and in the world
• Make an impact in the local and global communities with which we engage

The underpinning elements of this are:

• Attracting, retaining and developing world class academic and professional staff
• An organisational structure which facilitates collaboration and cross cutting work
• Use of cutting edge technology and learning resources
• Financial sustainability
• Staff and organisational capability for lifelong learning and ongoing renewal
• A forward looking estates strategy including development of student accommodation
• A unique and fulfilling student experience
• Developing a mutually beneficial relationship between the School and its alumni.

Our Aims

1. Produce high quality research that shapes global scholarship and learning

As a global university with regional expertise, our aim is to be the world’s leading institution for research on Asia, Africa & the Middle East, based on deep knowledge of these regions, their international and global interconnections, and a wide range of disciplinary approaches. Through innovative work that engages critically with mainstream discourses and promotes a diversity of perspectives, we aim to shape scholarship across the humanities and social sciences, and promote social benefit worldwide.

We have five strategic objectives to help us achieve this aim:

- Recognition of excellence
- Regional engagement
- Disciplinary approaches
- Impact on scholarship and learning
- Benefits for society

There are four underpinning elements for our research strategy:

- Benchmarked research income – with the aim to increase overall research income to £7.5 million by 2020
- High quality early-career training
- Proactive research support
- Research integrity.

2. Produce high quality graduates, postgraduates and researchers who understand and engage with the world and the regions in which we specialise

We aim to produce high quality graduates who are global citizens who can understand and engage with the world. Our graduates should not only be able to interpret and challenge world problems, but also develop solutions to meet them. All graduates should leave SOAS with:

- Subject knowledge informed by research
- Key research, communication, and life skills for success in global careers
- International experience / exposure
- Global perspective (often underpinned by some knowledge of an African, Asian or Middle Eastern language and/or regional expertise)
- Appreciation of the importance of understanding different cultures and contexts
- An inter-connected view of the world
We shall achieve this aim through attracting and recruiting talented students, whatever their backgrounds, and providing substantive research-led teaching and scholarship that is relevant to the world’s needs. We shall continue to offer a rich and distinctive portfolio at foundation, undergraduate and postgraduate level that is based on our specialisms. All students will have the opportunity to study a language, and to engage in multi-disciplinary study, recognising that most world problems are not single disciplinary in nature. In addition, students will gain exposure to the wider environment as part of their curriculum (for example, through guest speakers, case studies, interpreting national and global trends, and interactions with alumni working in relevant fields).

We shall continue to develop our pedagogy – for example building on existing work on the “flipped classroom” and problem-based learning – in order to facilitate participation, debate, critical reflection and exceptionally high levels of student engagement in our rich and distinctive curriculum.

We shall make effective use of technology to support learning, for example distance learning and blended learning.

3. Develop well rounded individuals who can make a difference in their communities and in the world

We aim to develop individuals who think differently and in depth about issues, are well-rounded academically, personally and professionally, and able to make a difference – whether locally or globally. We aim to facilitate the development of our students so that they have the skills and experience to enable them to influence and make an impact in their lives, as well as making them attractive to potential employers. All graduates should leave SOAS with:

- A sense of purpose and responsibility
- Openness to new ideas
- The ability to question and challenge in an effective and ethical manner
- A thirst for life-long learning
- The ability to work as part of a team
- The ability to lead others
- Employment skills and experience
- Transferable skills

We shall achieve this aim through offering students opportunities for personal development and growth through curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Examples include ensuring students have the opportunity to:

- Study and/or work abroad
- Learn a language
- Undertake internships and other opportunities for work experience
- Undertake group projects as part of their curriculum (including with students outside their discipline) thereby gaining teamwork skills that are important for employability
Undertake voluntary work, whether within SOAS, the wider community or overseas

- Develop leadership skills – for example leading a club or society, or becoming a student ambassador
- Engage with the effects of digital technology.

4. **Make an impact in the local and global communities with which we engage**

We aim to use our research, scholarship and teaching to make an impact in the local and global communities with which we engage in the UK and around the world. This includes influencing public debate; informing public understanding; increasing connectivity; engaging with governments, organisations and individuals (including the diaspora); undertaking public and community outreach; and supporting cultural exposure and promotion.

We shall achieve this aim by:

- Deepening knowledge and expertise about Asia, Africa and the Middle East, regions that are home to two-thirds of the world's population
- Increasing academic collaboration and intellectual exchange
- Strengthening our external focus through the development of partnerships, enterprise, knowledge exchange, outreach and networks around the world, and particularly in our regions
- Strengthening our ability to impact policy
- Strengthening our engagement with a wide set of institutions, organisations and movements.

**Underpinning Elements / Supporting Themes**

To achieve our aims, we need to focus on delivering a number of underpinning elements:

5. **Attracting and retaining world-class academic and professional staff**

To ensure the success of the School, we need to attract and retain world-class academic and professional staff. We shall achieve this through:

- Incentives
- Career paths and opportunities for development
- Creation of permanently endowed academic posts
- Offering appropriate opportunities for research
- Offering assistance and support to ensure a smooth transition for staff recruited from overseas
- Aiming to develop an increasingly diverse staffing profile, ensuring equal treatment in the recruitment, development and reward of our staff
- Developing programmes in academic and administrative leadership, and ensuring that those involved in School governance are as representative as possible of the full range and balance of SOAS staff.
Our objectives in supporting world-class staff include:

- Providing staff with a positive and stimulating working environment
- Supporting a fruitful academic experience
- Ensuring that SOAS staff are remunerated appropriately for their contribution, in accordance with Equality and Diversity legislation
- Supporting the Management of Change across the School
- Providing targeted Staff Learning and Development opportunities
- Promoting Equality and Diversity in all aspects of SOAS’ activity.

6. An organisational structure which facilitates collaboration and cross cutting work

It is important that our organisational structure supports our aims through the facilitation of collaboration and cross-cutting work across areas and disciplines. The desired features of the School’s structure include:

- Devolved financial responsibility
- Reflect and stimulate research and teaching groups
- Collaborative
- Linking of areas and disciplines
- Enable innovation
- Transparent to negotiate.

7. Using appropriate and effective technologies and learning resources

It is important that appropriate and effective technology and high quality learning resources are used to support the School’s learning, teaching and research and are accessible to all. This includes:

- Developing a digital vision which recognizes the way our students and staff expect to interact with the online world around them
- Reviewing all on-line student services and streamlining the processes for applying on-line to study, enroll, select courses and check timetables
- Rolling out an enhanced Student Intranet
- Transforming learning environments to create technology-rich, collaborative and social spaces
- Rolling out Lecture Capture to all classrooms and lecture halls so that students can access the material after the event
- Supporting “flipped classroom” initiatives by helping lecturers prepare on-line materials via the Lecture Capture system that students can access before attending
- Ensuring that all Library holdings are fully discoverable on-line and, where digital versions exist, the user can “click through” to the full text
- Developing the SOAS Digital Library to put more of the School’s unique and distinctive collections on-line.
8. Financial sustainability

In order for the School to remain financially sustainable, the achievement of a target surplus of 5% of income by 2017/18 has been agreed. This translates into a position where we not only cover our operating costs but generate sufficient funds for re-investment in the School and for meeting unforeseen adverse changes in our income or cost base.

In an environment of increasing competition, investment is key to attracting future students, particularly in view of ever increasing student expectations for high quality facilities and seamless and effective administrative processes. Competition and the transition from a relatively stable grant-funded environment to a highly volatile fee-funded environment has increased the level of cash balances we need to retain to withstand any income shocks or unexpected changes in our cost base.

We aim to achieve financial sustainability through:

- Growth in new and existing programmes (recognising the constraints of space in our Bloomsbury estate for on-campus delivery)
- Cost savings from staff and non-pay costs
- Maintaining a portfolio of activity across the School that balances our smaller-scale niche specialisms with areas of broader market appeal.

9. Staff and organisational capability for lifelong learning and ongoing renewal

Given both the changing global context and environment of higher education, it is important for the School to be proactive in managing and influencing the external environment and addressing future opportunities and challenges. This will require flexibility and adaptability at both the organisational and individual level.

To be successful, SOAS will need to have organisational capability for:

- Ongoing review of the external environment to identify emerging opportunities and challenges
- Critically reviewing existing offerings and operations to understand performance and test ongoing relevance
- Ongoing review of our offerings and operations against our core mission
- Making timely decisions and implementing any resulting changes (e.g. updating programmes to ensure relevance and attractiveness, improving administrative operations, creating new programmes to respond to new market needs, closing programmes that are no longer relevant).

In addition to the organisational level, at the individual level there is a need for:

- Opportunities for lifelong learning
- Supporting the development of financial literacy and business acumen
Supporting the development of digital literacy and competencies
Supporting innovation and entrepreneurial activity
Equipping staff with the skills to enable them to influence policy-makers and the public
Supporting the development of social and ethical evaluation skills
Strong performance management.

10. Forward looking estates strategy including development of student accommodation

Our aim is to create the best possible physical environment for the SOAS community through safeguarding and developing our listed estate. We will build upon previous good practice and seek to concentrate and expand the estate within Bloomsbury, focusing on six strategic themes:

- Expansion: developing a plan to expand the existing estate in Bloomsbury
- Campus Development Programme: ensuring that the use and layout of our buildings is well aligned with the School’s wider needs and provides a modern, accessible and efficient environment in which to learn, teach and research
- Student Residential Strategy: developing a strategy that determines the best approach to securing accommodation and ensuring management arrangements are effective and deliver a high quality service
- Physical environment: maintaining the estate to an appropriate standard in a financially stable manner
- Facility Management Services: developing and delivering a portfolio of high quality facility management services that are well specified, managed and represent good value for money
- Sustainable and environmentally aware operation: ensuring a base level of environmental standards for any new buildings and a commitment to improving the environmental impact of existing buildings.

11. A unique and fulfilling Student Experience

Our aim is to provide students with a unique and fulfilling experience throughout the student journey, from pre-entry to SOAS through to employment/ further study and lifelong learning. We recognise that university is a transformative experience for students and that students will pass through various stages of academic and personal growth as part of their university journey. We want to ensure that we provide students with the right mix of support and challenge at each stage of their journey.

We want our graduates to leave SOAS with both a positive experience of their time at SOAS and a sense of belonging and life-long association with the School. To achieve this, we need to ensure a high quality experience at each stage of the student journey. For example:

- Pre-entry and Induction – including recruitment, Insight Days, induction and orientation
Progression and Retention – including academic support, assessment and exams, inclusion, administrative processes, support for studying/working abroad

“Out-duction” – including graduation, transition to work or further study, becoming members of the alumni community, lifelong learning

Student Life – including accommodation, clubs and societies, volunteering

Health and Wellbeing – including student welfare and support, pastoral support.

12. Developing a mutually beneficial relationship between the School and its alumni

We recognise that our alumni are a great asset to the School and we are very fortunate to have a strong and passionate alumni community. Our aim is to build on the strengths of our alumni community and areas of existing good practice of working with our alumni to further develop mutually beneficial relationships.

We recognise that alumni can contribute greatly to the school in both financial and non-financial terms, including:

- Contributing to course design, content and delivery (for example as guest lecturers)
- Serving as mentors to current students
- Providing opportunities for (and benefiting from) free student consultancy projects
- Offering internship and/or employment opportunities
- Supporting recruitment activity
- Acting as “champions” for SOAS
- Providing links to a wide range of public and professional bodies and organisations, and to communities in Africa, Asia and the Middle East
- Donating money to the School.

We also recognise that any relationships with alumni should be two-way. For example, alumni could benefit from:

- Networking
- Lifelong learning
- Support for setting up local alumni groups
- Careers advice / mentoring.
Annex A: Initial Environmental Analysis

Political
- Focus on students, not institutions
- Institutions will be allowed to fail
- Encourage new providers
- Further stratification of the sector
- Focus on employability
- Reward/incentivise the best
- Consumer Rights Act – students as customers
- WP agenda
- Removal of maintenance grants
- Visa and immigration debate
- Prevent
- Europe
- TEF and its measurement
- Dual support system
- Emphasis on STEM

Economic
- Opening up of UK markets and removal of SNCs
- PGT loans
- Increased expectations of students paying £9k fees
- Rise of in-country provision in overseas markets
- More welcoming providers on other countries (e.g. USA & Australia)
- Threat of world-wide economic downturn following Chinese slow down
- Rise in staff cost base (pensions, NI, apprenticeships)
- Ring-fencing of STEM research funding – risks for non-STEM research
- Global competition for the best students
- Improved HE provision in many countries in the world

Social
- Questions of value for money by students
- Rise of Russell Group and squeezing of middle ground
- Expanding horizons of students and graduates
- Widening access to HE creates different needs of students and prospective students
- Data publishing requirements
- Increased employer and employee expectations of skills sets of graduates
- Welfare of students with pressure to perform in a more competitive environment
- Diversity, equality agenda
- Creating a culture of tolerance and inclusivity
- Get feedback and act on it

Technological
- Techno-savvy students – desire for slick admin processes; desire for technology in learning
- Demand for 24-hour access
- Technology enhanced learning – both delivery and assessment
- Use of improved data (including “Big Data”) to inform decisions
- MOOCS and advancement of online delivery
- Improved communication and feedback loops

**Legal**
- Consumer Rights Act
- FOI
- Data protection
- QAA reluctance to change
- Freedom of Speech/Prevent
- Equality Act

**Environmental**
- Increasing global focus on environmental sustainability
- Focus on local and create partnerships for growth
Annex B: Initial SWOT Analysis

Strengths

- Niche institution with specialist expertise
- Strong teaching engagement
- Significant areas of excellence in research
- Passionate students
- London location
- National Research Library
- Alternative to mainstream approaches
- Regional focus stresses viewpoints from outside Europe and North America
- Small class sizes
- Experience of year abroad operation
- Existing distance learning capacity
- Strong alumni community
- Focus on areas of increasing global importance
- International student body
- Ability to connect the dots
- Unrivalled expertise and portfolio in Africa, Asia and the Middle East languages
- Diverse staff and student body
- Inclusive approach

Weaknesses

- Current financial position
- League table performance (esp. post REF)
- Proliferation of programmes and confusion around offer
- Reluctance to stop doing things
- Reliance on past glories and reluctance to change
- Low profile for UG in the UK outside South East
- Heterodox approach seen by some as excluding
- London location (cost of living and estates)
- Lack of student accommodation
- Small class sizes (cost)
- Low profile amongst employers
- Different Distance Learning models
- Poor retention rates
- Lowering of tariffs to achieve targets
- Disappointing results in 2014 REF
- Lack of visible strategic goals
- Lack of collegiality at institutional level
- Lack of business acumen and entrepreneurial skills
- Bureaucracy and lack of agility
- Focus on peripheral activities to detriment of bigger picture issues
- Lack of effective performance management
Excessive levels of student assessment
Decline in reputation
Missed opportunities to collaborate and connect within SOAS
Limited use of technology in teaching eg lecture capture

Opportunities

Expansion in Home/EU UG market post removal of SNCs
SOAS centenary
Expertise and historic knowledge
One-stop shop for knowledge of world’s growing economies
Greater use of technology in learning – e.g. lecture capture
Distance learning
Develop areas aligned to Foundation demand to retain IFCELS students
Engagement with employers and alumni to develop and deliver curriculum enhancement, and for career development, internships, etc.
Enhance leadership capability at all levels
Link niche and mainstream (e.g. through joint degrees)
Problem-based learning
Overseas collaboration
SOAS's diversity

Threats

Declining demand for languages
Shift away from Distance learning in some markets (e.g. Far East)
Competitors cherry-picking our specialisms
Lowering of tariffs to achieve targets has negative impact on reputation
Volatility in PGT market
Ill-feeling about sustainability clouding positivity about future
Failure to achieve a surplus
Failure to attract big donors
Trust deficit.
Consolidated Faculty and Professional Services Financial Plans

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background to the Financial Plans

In order for the School to remain financially sustainable, a target surplus of 5% of income (£4.1 million) by 2017/18 has been agreed by the Board of Trustees. This is in line with the mean for the HE sector (of 4.3% reported for 2014-15) and translates into a position whereby we not only cover our operating costs but generate sufficient funds for re-investment in the School, and for meeting unforeseen adverse changes in our income or cost base.

Our current financial projections suggest that unless further action is taken to increase income or reduce costs we will be in deficit of £2.1m by 2017/18 falling £6.2m short of our target surplus of £4.1m (representing 5% of income). This shortfall is projected to increase further to £6.5m by 2018/19.

To address the shortfall and achieve financial sustainability, the Board of Trustees has charged the School with developing plans to increase income and reduce costs.

This document brings together proposals that have been developed in each of the Faculties and Professional Services to address financial sustainability. Initial proposals, based on informal discussions held between October 2015 and January 2016 across the School, were developed and circulated to the School as part of a formal consultation on financial sustainability that was undertaken between 3rd February and 4th March 2016. The proposals outlined below update the original proposals where appropriate to reflect responses to the formal consultation.

The updated proposals have identified a financial improvement in the range of £3.8m to £4.6m by 2018/19, to be achieved through a mix of increased income from growth in new and existing programmes, non-pay cost savings, staff cost savings from attrition, non-replacement, and voluntary severance.

This leaves a shortfall of between £1.9m to £2.7m still to address. The Sustainability Programme Board will continue to develop further plans to address the outstanding shortfall.

1.2 Structure of this document

This document contains the plans for achieving financial sustainability that have been developed by each of the three Faculties and Professional Services and informed by the formal consultation process where appropriate.

Section 2 of this document provides financial context to the Faculty and Professional Services Plans. The individual Faculty and Professional Services Plans are outlined in Sections 3 to 6. They include proposals from each Faculty and Professional Services for addressing the shortfall, and identify any gaps between the level of savings proposed and the target to be achieved.
Additional ideas for addressing the shortfall are provided in the annexes. Further work is needed to quantify and test these ideas before they can be considered for inclusion in longer-term plans.
2.0  Financial context to Faculty and Professional Services Plans

Financial projections prepared post September 2015 enrolment would suggest that SOAS will fall some way short of meeting its future financial targets. A target surplus of 5% of income has been agreed by the Board of Trustees with this to be achieved by 2017-18. This level of surplus has been set in order to remain financially sustainable. This translates into a position whereby we not only cover our operating costs but generate sufficient funds for re-investment in the School, and for meeting unforeseen adverse changes in our income or cost base.

Investment is planned to support delivery of our strategic goals, including new academic developments, improving the quality of buildings and facilities, and enhancing our information technology (see table 2.1 below). Potential new academic initiatives include provision of matched funding for research council scholarships and increasing the number of fully funded research scholarships, each of these costing upwards of £0.5m per year. While historically we have received capital funding to support our investment plans, £1.7m p.a. in the funding round 2008-11, this has now fallen away to £0.3m p.a. hence almost all funding must now be found internally or via external loan finance.

Table 2.1 Planned investments from 01/08/15 to 31/07/19 (excluding Senate House North Block)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned investment to 31/07/19</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Development Plan</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term maintenance</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture replacement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without surpluses we will not have the funds to make these investments.

These plans do not currently include aspirational investments in for example the acquisition and development of the Fourth Quarter of Senate House (the un-built upon area opposite the Main Building) or new student accommodation.

In an environment of increasing competition, investment is key to attracting future students, particularly in view of ever increasing student expectations for high quality facilities and seamless and effective administrative processes. Competition and the transition from a relatively stable grant funded environment to a highly volatile fee funded environment has also increased the level of cash balances we need to retain to withstand any income shocks or unexpected changes in our cost base. In this respect it is worth noting that in the current year actual fee income has fallen short of target by £2.3m.

The surplus to which we aspire, 5% of total income, is modest. It is already being achieved by over half of all universities and they are all, like us, aiming to increase their surplus to fund their plans for capital investment.

There are a number of factors impacting on our ability to improve our financial performance and achieve the target surplus set.
Our current financial projections suggest that unless further action is taken to increase income or reduce costs we will be in deficit of £2.1m by 2017/18 falling £6.2m short of our target surplus of £4.1m (representing 5% of income). This shortfall is projected to increase further to £6.5m by 2018/19.

Table 2.2 below sets out how the shortfall of £6.2m arises, looking at the projected changes in income and expenditure categories between 2014/15 and 2017/18

Table 2.2 Projected change in income and expenditure 2014/15 to 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching income</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist funding</td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE Research funding</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net research contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter- Faculty cross subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty staff costs</td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>(27.9)</td>
<td>(32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty non-pay costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space costs - all</td>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
<td>(14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central costs - excl space</td>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>(24.3)</td>
<td>(29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial position</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus requirement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td>(6.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*positive/negative) impact on financial position. Any small variances in calculations are due to rounding errors

The salient changes in income and expenditure categories are explained further below:

2.2.1 Teaching income includes some growth in undergraduate numbers, however in view of the historical trend of flat-lining postgraduate taught numbers, projections for PGT numbers have been held at actual September 2015 recruitment levels. It is planned to increase all unregulated fees (other than Home/EU PGT fees) by 5% annually over the period of the plan. Home/EU PGT fees which are currently set at the standard £7,260 (2015-16) are projected to increase by 10% annually until 2017/18 when at £8,785 they will be almost in line with Home/EU undergraduate fees, which are assumed to remain at £9,000.

2.2.2 Following a recent decision by the HEFCE Board, SOAS does not meet the criteria set for specialist institutional funding for its minority languages, as such this funding will be withdrawn in 2016/17.

2.2.3 The HEFCE research grant included for 2015-16 now reflects the results of the 2014 REF. Although the impact across the School is less than originally feared, it is unevenly spread across the School with the funding for the faculties of Arts & Humanities and Languages & Cultures falling by £0.6m and £0.5m respectively while that for Law & Social Sciences increasing by £0.5m. A departmental breakdown is included as Annex A.

2.2.4 Staff cost inflation is by far the most significant factor behind the increase in faculty staffing costs accounting for £4.2m of the projected £4.5m increase. While the August 2015 award was settled at 1%, higher awards of 2% then 3% are anticipated for future years, with
incremental drift adding a further 1.25% annually. Pay costs will rise further as employer pension contributions are set to increase by 2% and 3% from April 2016 to address the USS and SAUL funding deficits. Furthermore we are set to lose our national insurance rebate currently given in recognition of our employer pension contributions from April 2016 (increasing staffing costs by a further 2%). Together these factors give rise to staff cost inflation rates of 3.6% in 2015/16, 6% in 2016-17, 4.3% in 2017-18 and 15% over the three year planning period.

2.2.5 Space costs are set to rise considerably (by 64%) over the planning period. Salient factors behind this increase in annual spend of £5.5m by 2017/18 include: the move to Senate House North Block adding £1.6m to our annual depreciation charge and £0.5m p.a. to our building running costs; investment in our current estate adding £1.6m p.a. to building depreciation; investment in equipment, furniture and technology adding £0.5m p.a. to our equipment depreciation charge; lower capital funding from HEFCE reducing the release of funding by £0.4m p.a.; increased investment of £0.2m p.a. in maintaining our current estate. These investments are essential to maintain a high quality of space for staff and students, and facilitate the move to a single campus in which staff and students do not have to travel between Bloomsbury and Vernon Square.

2.2.6 Central costs are set to rise by £4.8m (20%) over the three years to 2017/18. Central costs comprise staffing costs within professional services directorates and all non-pay budgets under the direct control of directorates (e.g. marketing) or those controlled/fixed centrally (e.g. scholarships & bursaries, publications etc.). Staffing costs within professional services are subject to the same inflationary pressures as outlined in 2.2.4 above and as a consequence are expected to rise by £2.6m from 2014/15 to 2017/18. The factors behind the further increase of £2.2m are considered under 2.3.1 to 2.3.8 below.

Table 2.3 sets out how central costs are projected to increase by support area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support area</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial services</td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research services &amp; regional centres</td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR services</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, compliance &amp; Development Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT services</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering loss/(surplus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; student recruitment</td>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral School</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students union</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry and student financial support</td>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>4,548</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>2.3.6</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic development &amp; WP</td>
<td>2.3.7</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,331</td>
<td>29,164</td>
<td>4,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*positive/(negative) impact on financial position. Any small variances in calculations are due to rounding errors
Salient changes in income and expenditure within each area are explained further below.

2.3.1 Within financial services, interest earned is expected to fall by £100k p.a. as our cash balances are used to fund our capital investment plans. A budget of £300k is also set aside to cover contingencies.

2.3.2 Within research and enterprise support annual budgets have been enhanced to better support student enterprise (£50k p.a.) and research systems (£70k p.a.)

2.3.3 Within HR services a further £260k p.a. has been set aside to fund maternity and sickness cover and an additional £30k p.a. for staff development.

2.3.4 Within marketing and student recruitment budgets have already been enhanced by £200k to start to address the increase in effort needed to recruit students in an increasingly competitive environment.

2.3.5 Within Registry and student financial support, recurrent investment of £900k p.a. is being made in scholarships and bursaries covering all levels of study.

2.3.6 Within student services an additional annual provision of £100k has been made to cover the impact of the withdrawal of the Disabled Students Allowance and additional recurrent investment of £60k within the careers service. There was also a one off accounting credit within this areas in 2014/15 which depressed expenditure for that year only.

2.3.7 Within Academic services and Widening Participation annual staff and non-pay budgets have already been enhanced by £400k in line with our OFFA agreement.

Taking all these factors into account our financial projections indicate that unless further action is taken to increase income or reduce costs we will be in deficit of £2.1m by 2017/18 falling £6.2m short of our target surplus of £4.1m (representing 5% of income). This shortfall is projected to increase further to £6.5m by 2018/19.

The shortfall is spread across the School as follows:

Table 2.4 Projected Financial Shortfall by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£'m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Languages &amp; Cultures</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Law &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposals have been put forward by each faculty and professional services to address this level of shortfall. These plans have been drafted bearing in mind the following considerations.
• In light of historical underperformance against PGT targets, any growth plans proposed must be robust both in terms of achieving target numbers and deliverable in the context of resource constraints.

• Current projections already include some growth in undergraduate numbers to be achieved from the introduction of new programmes.

• In light of the 2014-15 underspend against non-pay budget of almost £1m, opportunities must exist for cost reductions and budgetary transfers within this area.

• The increasing competition we face in attracting, recruiting and retaining new students suggests that savings should not be sought from key areas such as marketing, student recruitment and learning support.

• SOAS currently expends a high proportion of its income on staff costs – indeed in 2013-14 it was 5th highest in the sector¹ – hence reducing staff costs must be a key aim in establishing a financially sustainable cost base.

• In terms of academic staff costs as a percentage of income, SOAS is 3rd highest across the sector and in terms of support staff costs is mid-range within the sector (84th out of 160 institutions).

¹ Source HESA 2013-14
3.0 Financial Plan for the Faculty of Arts and Humanities (FAH)

3.1. Introduction

The Faculty of Arts and Humanities is projected to fall short of its financial target by £1.8m in years 2017/18 and 2018/19.

Full financial projections by department together with historic and future student recruitment details is provided within MySOAS. A summary of projected staff and student numbers by faculty is included within Annex B.

Table 3.1 below summarises how the financial position of the faculty is projected to change over the period from 2014/15 (actual result) to 2017/18 (projected result).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in financial position</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching income</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE Research Funding</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net research contracts</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter faculty cross subsidy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty staffing costs</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(7.9)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty non-pay costs</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space costs - all</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central costs - excl space</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus requirement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial position</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(2.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*positive/(negative) impact on financial position. Any small variances in calculations are due to rounding errors

Faculty specific factors impacting on the projected financial position include:

- Fee income growth of £3.2m (+28%)
- A reduction in HEFCE quality related research grant of £0.6m following the 2014 REF exercise and funding settlement
- A planned reduction in the use of fractional staff, saving £0.2m

School wide factors impacting on the projected financial position include:

- Inflationary pressure on staff costs largely arising from external factors (NI, pension contributions, apprenticeship levy etc.). It should be noted that this impacts on both faculty staff costs and central costs (60% of which are staffing costs)
- A significant rise in space costs, reflecting an increased buildings depreciation charge (as investment is made) and increased running costs as our estate is expanded.
- The requirement to generate 5% of income (by 2017/18) in order to fund future investment and provide us with an appropriate level of cash reserves to withstand any future income shocks or unexpected changes in our cost base.
A summary of actions that the Faculty has proposed to address the shortfall is provided in Section 3.2 below. Information on each of the proposed actions is provided in Sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7.

Additional ideas for potential growth in new programmes are provided in Annex C. At the moment, these ideas are conceptual only. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be considered for inclusion in longer-term plans.

### 3.2 Summary of proposed actions in FAH

The Faculty proposes to address part of the shortfall by a combination of income generation and modest reductions in costs, as summarised in Table 3.2 below.

**Table 3.2 Summary of Financial Proposals for FAH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>2017/18 £’000</th>
<th>2018/19 £’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Religions UG numbers (existing BA)</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MA Museums Heritage &amp; Material Cultural Studies (Anthropology)</td>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MA Muslim Minorities (Distance Learning)</td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cost saving achieved via attrition and non-replacement (4.4fte)</td>
<td>3.7.2</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>780</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,020)</td>
<td>(815)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information on each of the proposed actions is provided in Sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7 below.

### 3.3 Existing plans for growth included in Faculty Plan

The Faculty Plan for FAH that was developed in 2015 included targets for undergraduate and postgraduate recruitment, including growth from new programmes that were included in the Plan. The targets for undergraduate recruitment, and revised financial forecasts for taught postgraduate recruitment, are outlined below. It is assumed in this financial plan that the targets for postgraduate research recruitment in the FAH Faculty Plan are met.

#### 3.3.1 Undergraduate recruitment

Undergraduate recruitment against targets between 2011 and 2015 is shown in the chart below. The FAH Plan for 2015 included targets for home and overseas UG students for 2016-18, as shown in the chart. The projected growth in recruitment in the Faculty Plan is
assumed to come from new programmes and recently started programmes that are assumed still to be ramping up:

- BA Liberal Arts (Start date: September 2016)
- BA World Philosophies (Start date: September 2016)
- BA Global Popular Music (Start date: September 2015)

**Chart 3.1 Undergraduate Recruitment against Targets for FAH**

The BA in Liberal Arts is a School-wide initiative and requires no increase in staffing. It is aimed at the North American market, and much more broadly at international students. It was validated in December 2015. Marketing are confident that the programme can recruit for 2016, though perhaps not to the planned target of 17 students for that year. As a major innovation, it has the potential to recruit large numbers. More focussed marketing on USA colleges and international schools overseas could provide significant returns.

**3.3.2 Postgraduate Taught recruitment**

PGT recruitment against targets between 2011 and 2015 is shown in the chart below. Following disappointing PGT recruitment across the School in 2015, a decision was taken to flat line PGT recruitment forecasts for financial modelling purposes based on actual students as at October 2015. The financial forecasts are shown as dashed lines in the chart below, and revised targets for PGT recruitment will be set later.
3.4 New plans for growth in existing programmes

One way to close the funding gap is by increasing the income generated by existing degree programmes. In addition to the UG growth already included in the Faculty Plan, the following existing programme could increase student numbers based on previous trends and application data.

3.4.1 Increased Student Numbers in existing BA Study of Religions Programme

BA Study of Religions currently target 21 new Home/EU students per annum. There is the potential to increase this target to 28, 29 and 30 between 2016/17 and 2018/19, generating new students each year as shown in the table below. Given that BA Study of Religions is a three-year programme, the cumulative effect of these additional students will be 14 in year 2 and 22 in year 3, resulting in net additional income of £100,000 in 2017/18 and £150,000 in 2018/19.

Table 3.3 Increase in Religion UG numbers (existing BA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Add new Students</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Staff costs</th>
<th>Other costs</th>
<th>Overheads</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13,650)</td>
<td>49,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(27,300)</td>
<td>98,700</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(42,900)</td>
<td>155,100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Plans for growth in new programmes

In addition to the growth already included in the Faculty Plan, FAH is planning to introduce a couple of new programmes, one taught and one distance learning. Both new programmes require no new increase in additional staffing.

3.5.1 New MA Museums Heritage & Material Cultural Studies (Anthropology)

FAH plans to introduce a new MA in Museums, Heritage and Material Cultural Studies in 2017/18. The programme will be convened by a former UCL professor who ran a similar successful programme before his move to SOAS. It will be a Faculty-wide programme in collaboration with the School of Arts aimed at the professional market.

The projected student numbers, fees and net income are shown in the table below. The programme has a significant lead-in period to make a major impact on recruitment. It is estimated that 14 new students will be recruited in 2017/18, rising to 20 students the following year. This will result in estimated additional net income of £150,000 in 2017/18 and £220,000 in 2018/19.

Table 3.4 New MA Museums Heritage & Material Cultural Studies (Anthropology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Staff costs</th>
<th>Other costs</th>
<th>Overheads</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fte fte</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>180,495</td>
<td>(27,300)</td>
<td>153,195</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>357,850</td>
<td>(39,000)</td>
<td>218,850</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 New MA Muslim Minorities (Distance Learning)

The new MA in Muslim Minorities builds on a core option of the same title that has been run successfully by distance learning over two cycles and is to be repeated for the third. This option was fully subscribed. Given the global interests in Muslim issues and Muslim minorities at the present, CSID have indicated that it will recruit successfully. Student feedback on the core option, plus feedback from Marketing, have also supported the case for the MA’s strong potential.

The projected student numbers, fees and net income are shown in the table below. It is estimated that the new programme will recruit 23 new students in its first year, rising to 49 new students in 2018/19. The cumulative effect of these students, adjusting for assumed attrition, will be 62 in year 2 and 103 in year 3, resulting in net additional income of £75,000 in 2017/18 and £160,000 in 2018/19.
### Table 3.5 New MA Muslim Minorities (Distance Learning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students fte</th>
<th>Total students fte</th>
<th>Fees £</th>
<th>Staff costs £</th>
<th>Other costs £</th>
<th>Overheads £</th>
<th>Net income £</th>
<th>Include £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>(58,800)</td>
<td>(34,763)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(18,563)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>256,875</td>
<td>(68,165)</td>
<td>(111,611)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,099</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>410,625</td>
<td>(72,630)</td>
<td>(178,605)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159,390</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Non-Pay Cost Savings

The Faculty recognises that there are limited options for reducing non-pay costs.

### 3.7 Staff Cost Savings

#### 3.7.1 Fractional Staff

Over the last four years significant savings have been achieved in the Faculty’s fractional budget. Further reductions are projected in the Faculty Plan. The Faculty remains committed to employing GTAs in order to provide training opportunities for our PhD students and supporting the development of early career researchers. In this context, savings in fractional contracts would be through reducing reliance on short-term fractional Teaching Fellow contracts.

#### 3.7.2 Permanent Staff

There is the potential for modest savings in permanent academic staff expenditure achieved via attrition and non-replacement of 4.4 fte. It is estimated that this would result in savings of £455,000 per annum.

It is recognised that staff savings achieved via attrition only will not be sufficient to address the financial shortfall and that further staff cost savings will be needed. The process of reduction in staffing needs to be carefully managed as there are small units within the FAH e.g. Media and Music that could become unsustainable. At the same time, there is significant overcapacity in some units in terms of very low student:staff ratios. Additionally, there is need to improve the REF performance of Anthropology and History. The process will require a significant effort to balance the needs of the curriculum in key strategic areas while simultaneously achieving a reduction in staffing and an improvement in the performance of the REF 2020.

### 3.8 Other potential areas for growth / savings

There are ideas for further areas of growth in FAH, as outlined in Annex C. These ideas are currently in early stages of development, and so have not been included in the financial plans for consultation outlined above. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be considered for inclusion in longer-term plans.

### 3.9 Conclusion
As Table 3.2 indicates, notwithstanding the revised estimates of student growth on existing programmes, new programmes, additional income from distance learning, and the projected staff savings, there is still a significant shortfall against financial targets. The Faculty will need to make a net saving of £1.02 million in 2017/18 to address the overall shortfall of £1.8 million. In order to meet this target a further reduction of staff in the region of 12.5 FTEs is required, should no further growth opportunities or non-staff cost savings be identified.
4.0 Financial Plan for the Faculty of Languages and Cultures (FLC)

4.1. Introduction

The Faculty of Languages and Cultures is projected to fall short of its financial target by £3m in years 2017/18 and 2018/19.

As part of the School’s consultation on financial sustainability a number of proposals for generating income and for cost savings were discussed within the Faculty and across the School. The current plan incorporates comments from the responses on the consultation document, from discussion at an all-Faculty meeting on 17 February 2016, and from individual departments and colleagues.

Full financial projections by department together with historic and future student recruitment details is provided within MySOAS. A summary of projected staff and student numbers by faculty is included within Annex B.

At present the Faculty is also the home of the Language Centre. The Language Centre makes a strong contribution to the School’s mission to provide tuition in African and Asian languages to a wide range of learners through offering non-degree language teaching in evening classes, intensive and summer programmes, bespoke language courses and certificate and diploma courses. However, the financial and administrative contexts in which the Language Centre operates are different from the contexts of the academic departments of the Faculty, and require a separate sustainability strategy. The on-going review of the Language Centre will feed into such a strategy, which will then be embedded in wider School strategies.

Excluding the Language Centre from the projections reduces the shortfall against financial target to £2.2m in 2017/18 and 2018/19.

Table 4.1 below summarises how the financial position of the faculty is projected to change over the period from 2014/15 (actual result) to 2017/18 (projected result).

Table 4.1 Change in financial position for FLC, 2014/15 to 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Languages &amp; Cultures</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in financial position</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching income</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist funding</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE Research Funding</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net research contracts</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter- Faculty cross subsidy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty staff costs</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty -non pay costs</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space costs - all</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central costs - excl space</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td>(6.8)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus requirement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial position</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*positive/(negative) impact on financial position. Any small variances in calculations are due to rounding errors.
Faculty specific factors impacting on the projected financial position include:

- Fee income growth of £2.3m (+20%)
- The loss of specialist institutional funding supporting minority languages (of £0.7m) from 2016/17
- A reduction in HEFCE quality related research grant of £0.5m following the 2014 REF exercise and funding settlement
- A planned reduction in the use of fractional staff, saving £0.2m
- Inflating the inter-faculty cross-subsidy by 4.25% p.a.

School wide factors impacting on the projected financial position include:

- Inflationary pressure on staff costs largely arising from external factors (NI, pension contributions, apprenticeship levy etc.). It should be noted that this impacts on both faculty staff costs and central costs (60% of which are staffing costs)
- A significant rise in space costs, reflecting an increased buildings depreciation charge (as investment is made) and increased running costs as our estate is expanded.
- The requirement to generate 5% of income (by 2017/18) in order to fund future investment and provide us with an appropriate level of cash reserves to withstand any future income shocks or unexpected changes in our cost base.

A summary of actions that the Faculty has proposed to address the shortfall is provided in Section 4.2 below. Information on each of the proposed actions is provided in Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.7.

Additional ideas for potential growth in new programmes are provided in Annex D. At the moment, these ideas are conceptual only. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be included in the consultation as concrete proposals.

4.2 Summary of proposed actions in FLC

The Faculty proposes to address part of the shortfall by increase in income and by cost savings, as summarised in Table 4.2 below.
Table 4.2 Summary of Financial Proposals for FLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Languages &amp; Cultures</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA English</td>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year MA programmes</td>
<td>4.4.2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cost saving achieved via attrition and non-replacement (7 fte)</td>
<td>4.7.1</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through streamlining and increasing the efficiency of course delivery, leading to reductions in teaching hours</td>
<td>4.7.3</td>
<td>245 to 886</td>
<td>245 to 886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through merging of courses, leading to reductions in teaching hours</td>
<td>4.7.4</td>
<td>49 to 193</td>
<td>49 to 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>787 to 1,572</td>
<td>787 to 1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>955 to 1,740</td>
<td>1,080 to 1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td>1,245 to 460</td>
<td>1,120 to 335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information on each of the proposed savings is provided in Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.7 below.

**4.3 Existing plans for growth included in Faculty Plan**

The Faculty Plan for Languages and Cultures that was developed in 2015 included targets for undergraduate and postgraduate recruitment, including growth from new programmes that were included in the Plan. The targets for undergraduate recruitment, and revised financial forecasts for taught postgraduate recruitment, are outlined below. It is assumed in this financial plan that the targets for postgraduate research recruitment in the FLC Faculty Plan are met.

**4.3.1 Undergraduate recruitment**

Undergraduate recruitment against targets between 2011 and 2015 is shown in the chart below. The FLC Plan for 2015 included targets for home and overseas UG students for 2016-18, as shown in the chart below. The projected growth in recruitment in the Faculty Plan is assumed to come from new programmes and recently started programmes that are assumed still to be ramping up:

- BA Global Cinema and Film Studies (Start date: September 2015)
- BA Korean Studies (Start date: September 2017)
The Faculty’s financial situation gives reason for concern. UG recruitment targets have not been met in both 2014/15 and 2015/16. Furthermore, UG applications data from April 2016 show only a very modest increase of 2.4% against the same time the year before (and overseas applications down by -18.2%). These early data indicate that the tide has not yet turned, and the Faculty has to prepare for at best very slow growth in 2016/17.

The overall financial and recruitment data are slightly unevenly distributed across the Faculty. In terms of 2015/16 UG recruitment CIA and JK exceeded their targets, while Africa, Linguistics and NME under-recruited against targets. Low recruitment in Africa, SA and SEA appears to be a long term trend, and student numbers in the three units are comparatively low.

### 4.3.2 Postgraduate Taught recruitment

PGT recruitment against targets between 2011 and 2015 is shown in the chart below. While PGT recruitment in 2014/15 was more positive compared to previous years, FLC PGT under-recruited in 2015/16.

Following disappointing PGT recruitment across the School in 2015, a decision was taken to flat line PGT recruitment forecasts for financial modelling purposes based on actual students as at October 2015. The financial forecasts are shown as dashed lines in the chart below, and revised targets for PGT recruitment will be set later.
Application data from April 2016 show a modest increase of 2.3% in PGT applications. However, application data for the new two-year MA programmes combining a language with a discipline has been encouraging, especially since these programmes are not easy to find on the website and are offered in different forms and through different units. Given this, we assume that there is potential for growth in 2-year MA programmes (see 4.4.2).

### 4.4 New plans for growth in existing programmes

The financial consultation document contained a number of proposals for growth which at the time had been at a conceptual stage and not yet been fully developed. As a result of the consultation, some of these proposals have been developed further and are included in the revised plan. These include growth in BA English (4.4.1) and growth in 2-year MA programmes (4.4.2) (as well as a new programme BA Intercultural Communication (4.5.1)).

In view of the Faculty’s significant projected shortfall against target it was felt that the Faculty’s strategy should not be based wholly on cost saving, but also include proposals for growth, which are thus included here, even though they are not as robust as growth proposals in the other two faculties. A number of other ideas for growth remain in early stages of development, and so have not been included in the financial plans at present. Instead, these initial ideas are included in Annex D. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be included in the financial plans as concrete proposals.

#### 4.4.1. BA English

The BA English was launched in 2014/15 and student numbers on the programme are still growing. Applications for 2016/17 are up by 16% (est.) (incl. o/s students). Increasing combined-degree options coming on stream in 2016/17 and 2017/18 will potentially lead to more applicants and the Faculty is developing the infrastructure for English to make our
work more visible and provide more support for students and staff, for example through the recently launched Centre for English Studies. Based on this, we assume that a modest increase above targets in BA English enrolments can be achieved. Current students on the BA English are largely home/EU students, so this has been assumed as fee basis in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3 Increase in BA English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students fte</th>
<th>Total students fte</th>
<th>Fees £</th>
<th>Staff costs £</th>
<th>Other costs £</th>
<th>Overheads £</th>
<th>Net income £</th>
<th>Include £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>(11,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>(21,450)</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,550</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>(31,200)</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,800</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions: 1) Home/EU fees only at £9,000

**4.4.2. 2-year MA programmes**

The new PG programmes MA xxx and Intensive Language (two-year MAs) have shown positive recruitment this year, despite rather diffuse presentation on the website. Currently available languages include Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean and South Asian languages. The possibility to offer additional language options is being investigated at the moment, as well as increasing options for Chinese (which at present is only available as part of the MA Advanced Chinese Studies). Current discipline options include programmes in FLC and FAH, but initial discussions have taken place about the possibility to extend 2-year MAs to some programmes in FLSS. Applications in April 2016 stand at 130, translating into 40 new students in 2016/17 (assuming the same conversion rate of about 31% as in 2015/16). In both 2015/16 and 2016/17 Arabic is the highest recruiting language. Based on the increase in applications, we assume modest growth due to increased offerings, better visibility, and positive feedback from student having completed the programme. The figures in Table 4 assume that about 50% of students are fully in FLC, and 50% shared across two faculties (providing total income of 66% for FLC). We also assume, conservatively, that the students will be home/EU students.

**Table 4.4 Increase in 2-year MAs (with intensive language)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students fte</th>
<th>Total students fte</th>
<th>Fees £</th>
<th>Staff costs £</th>
<th>Other costs £</th>
<th>Overheads £</th>
<th>Net income £</th>
<th>Include £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73,781</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>(18,018)</td>
<td>52,163</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>126,482</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>(30,888)</td>
<td>91,994</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105,402</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>(25,740)</td>
<td>76,062</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions: 1) home fees only at £7,985, 2) 66% fee income to FLC; 3) 66% of overhead costs from FLC

**4.5 Plans for growth in new programmes**

**4.5.1. BA Intercultural Communication**
The Faculty is planning to introduce a new BA programme in Intercultural Communication (IC). There is an international market offering IC degrees as premium, high-end programmes, and SOAS is excellently placed to offer an attractive curriculum based on modules in linguistics, pragmatics, and translation, in addition to possible combinations with other modules across the School (for example from Management), as well as a wide range of African and Asian language options. We assume that the programme will be available in 2018/19 and recruit an initial intake of 15 students. Here, also, we assume home/EU fees.

**Table 4.5 BA Intercultural Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Staff costs</th>
<th>Other costs</th>
<th>Overheads</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>(29,250)</td>
<td>105,750</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions: 1) home fees only at £9,000

4.6 Non-Pay Cost Savings

The Faculty has not identified the potential for any non-pay cost savings at this time.

4.7 Staff Cost Savings

4.7.1 Non-replacement of staff

Although non-strategic, staff savings through non-replacement of staff leaving is a natural way to reduce costs. At present, about 7 FTE positions could be saved through this mechanism, resulting in savings of £493,000. These positions are located throughout the Faculty. However, the Faculty is aware on the potential negative effect on the ability to deliver high-quality teaching programmes and on research capacity, which will have to monitored closely.

4.7.2 Reduction in fractional staff budget

Over the last years significant savings have been achieved in the Faculty’s fractional budget, and a further 0.2m savings are included in the Faculty’s financial plan, which are likely to be achieved in 2016/17. However, the Faculty remains committed to employing GTAs in order to provide training opportunities for our PhD students and supporting the development of early career researchers.

4.7.3 Staff savings through streamlined module delivery

Savings in this area result from a critical review of all the Faculty’s modules and a process of alignment of teaching hours along a recommended Faculty norm of 2-5 weekly contact hours for language modules and 2-3 weekly hours for thematic modules. In addition, savings could be made by the reduction of parallel and duplicating language streams in some areas,
for example in the language provision of degree and option students, and of UG and PG students.

Saving in teaching hours per week (hpw), based on exercises in JK, NME and SEA would be at least in the range of about 90 hpw. The annual financial value of these savings in teaching hours will depend on the type of posts which result from staff savings. Table 6 shows a range of annual financial values for the savings in teaching hours, based on four different scenarios:

I. Teaching hours saved are found fully from Lector posts, who are assumed to teach on average 18 hours
II. Teaching hours saved are found from a mixture of Lector posts (75%) and from teaching and research posts (25%)
III. Teaching hours saved are found from a mixture of Lector posts (50%) and from teaching and research posts (50%)
IV. Teaching hours saved are found fully from teaching and research posts, who are assumed to teach on average 8 hours per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.6 FLC Staff Savings through streamlining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through streamlining and increasing the efficiency of module delivery, leading to reductions in teaching hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it can be seen that savings of 90 teaching hours per week could result in staff cost savings of £245,000 per annum (if it is assumed that hours saved are found fully from Lector posts) up to £886,000 per annum (if it is assumed that savings are found fully from teaching and research posts).

Reviews of further programmes might result in additional savings.

### 4.7.4 Staff savings through the merging of modules

It is projected that staff savings can be achieved through the merging of modules, for example the creation of a small number of joint core or introductory modules aimed at students in a range of different programmes and from different departments. Current discussions of this idea involve smaller programmes in the first instance – located in the departments of Africa, South Asia and South East Asia as well as Linguistics. Any changes would be based around a clear academic rationale (e.g., providing essential study and research skills focussing on the study of languages, literatures and cultures) and would support the maintenance of distinctive, regionally focused, and language-based programmes of study. Potential savings from merging modules are in the range of 20 hours per week.
As with the streamlined module proposal above, the annual financial value of these savings in teaching hours will depend on the type of post on the type of posts which result from staff savings. The table below shows a range of annual financial values for the savings in teaching hours, based on the same four scenarios.

**Table 4.7 FLC Staff Savings through merging of modules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff savings through merging of modules</th>
<th>Hours saved pw</th>
<th>Scenario I (£'000)</th>
<th>Scenario II (£'000)</th>
<th>Scenario III (£'000)</th>
<th>Scenario IV (£'000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through merging of modules, leading to reductions in teaching hours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it can be seen that savings of 20 teaching hours per week could result in staff cost savings of £49,000 to £193,000 per annum, depending on the types of posts which result from staff savings.

### 4.8 Other potential areas for growth / savings

There are ideas for further areas of income growth and cost savings in FLC, as outlined in Annex D. These ideas are currently in early stages of development, and so have not been included in the financial plans for consultation outlined above. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be included in the financial plans as concrete proposals.

### 4.9 Conclusion

As Table 4.2 indicates, notwithstanding the projected staff savings, there is still a significant shortfall against financial targets. The Faculty will need to make a net saving of £0.4 million to £1.3 million (depending on the type of posts impacted by the savings) to address the overall shortfall of £2.2 million in 2017/18. In order to meet this target a further reduction of staff in the region of 6-17 FTEs is required, should no further growth opportunities or non-staff cost savings be identified.
5.0 Financial Plan for the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences (LSS)

5.1. Introduction

The Faculty of Law and Social Sciences is projected to fall short of its financial target by £1.1m in year 2017/18 and by £1.4m in 2018/19.

Full financial projections by department together with historic and future student recruitment details is provided within MySOAS. A summary of projected staff and student numbers by faculty is included within Annex B.

Table 5.1 below summarises how the financial position of the faculty is projected to change over the period from 2014/15 (actual result) to 2017/18 (projected result).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in financial position</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching income</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFCE Research Funding</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net research contracts</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter- Faculty cross subsidy</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty staff costs</td>
<td>(13.4)</td>
<td>(15.5)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty non-pay costs</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space costs - all</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central costs - excl space</td>
<td>(12.8)</td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus requirement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial position</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*positive/(negative) impact on financial position. Any small variances in calculations are due to rounding errors

Faculty specific factors impacting on the projected financial position include:

- Fee income growth of £7.8m (+25%)
- An increase in HEFCE quality related research grant of £0.6m following the 2014 REF exercise and funding settlement
- Inflating the inter-faculty cross-subsidy by 4.25% p.a.
- Increasing the amounts set aside with non-pay budgets for supporting academic research, scholarships and distance learning development (by £0.9m)

School wide factors impacting on the projected financial position include:

- Inflationary pressure on staff costs largely arising from external factors (NI, pension contributions, apprenticeship levy etc.). It should be noted that this impacts on both faculty staff costs and central costs (60% of which are staffing costs)
- A significant rise in space costs, reflecting an increased buildings depreciation charge (as investment is made) and increased running costs as our estate is expanded.
• The requirement to generate 5% of income (by 2017/18) in order to fund future investment and provide us with an appropriate level of cash reserves to withstand any future income shocks or unexpected changes in our cost base.

A summary of actions that the Faculty has proposed to address the shortfall is provided in Section 5.2 below. Information on each of the proposed actions is provided in Sections 5.4 to 5.7.

Additional ideas for potential growth in new programmes are provided in Annex E. At the moment, these ideas are conceptual only. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be considered for inclusion in longer-term plans.

5.2 Summary of proposed actions in LSS

The Faculty proposes to address the shortfall by a combination of income generation and modest reductions in costs, as summarised in Table 5.2 below.

Table 5.2 Summary of Financial Proposals for LSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Law &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Law PGT numbers - overseas partner institutions</td>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Development Studies UG numbers</td>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MSc in Finance (DeFIMS)</td>
<td>5.5.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CISD based MSc Distance learning programmes</td>
<td>5.5.2</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Law LLB - 4 year extension</td>
<td>5.5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pay Faculty budgets</td>
<td>5.6.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning cost base</td>
<td>5.6.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cost savings via VS and attrition</td>
<td>5.7.2</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A crucial aspect of the proposed savings is the assumption of burden-sharing across the Faculty—we are all in this together. Thus the savings will be contributed by all departments and centres within the Faculty, whether in the form of savings or income generation. Only Politics is not directly involved in this, and that reflects the massive contribution the Politics department is already making to income generation within the Faculty via undergraduate recruitment on their new International Relations programme.

Further information on each of the proposed actions is provided in Sections 5.4 to 5.7 below.
5.3 Existing plans for growth included in Faculty Plan

The Faculty Plan for Law and Social Sciences that was developed in 2015 included targets for undergraduate and postgraduate recruitment, including growth from new programmes that were included in the Plan. The targets for undergraduate recruitment, and revised financial forecasts for taught postgraduate recruitment, are outlined below. It is assumed in this financial plan that the targets for postgraduate research recruitment in the LSS Faculty Plan are met.

5.3.1 Undergraduate recruitment

Undergraduate recruitment against targets between 2011 and 2015 is shown in the chart below. The LSS Plan for 2015 included targets for home and overseas UG students for 2016-18, as shown in the chart. Although LSS student numbers have grown significantly, the scope for expansion is still substantial. This is reflected in the projected increase in student numbers and income already incorporated into the LSS Plan, which includes growth in recruitment from new programmes and recently started programmes that are still assumed to be ramping up:

- BSc International Management (Start date: September 2017)
- BA International Relations (Start date: September 2015)
- BA Development Studies (Start date: September 2015)
- BSc Management (Start date: September 2014)

There is no cause for pessimism regarding undergraduate recruitment. Applicant numbers as of 8 January were 1,859 for undergraduate programmes, well up on the 1,532 applicants received at the same time last year. Most of this is due to an increased number of applicants for Law, though it would be unwise at this stage to assume that it marks the beginning of a trend.

Chart 5.1 Undergraduate Recruitment against Targets for LSS

Sources: Actuals from HESES reconciled enrolments as of 1 Dec; Targets from previous Faculty Plans; 2016/17 Faculty Plan Targets.
Although there is an acute shortage of teaching rooms across the School, it is expected that the projected increase in student numbers built into the LSS 2015 plan can be accommodated without any increase in staff. For that reason, the number of academic staff in LSS is projected to remain at 180 FTEs over the 2014/15 to 2018/19 period.

5.3.2 Postgraduate Taught recruitment

PGT applicant numbers are running in January 2016 at around the same level as in January 2015, but it is probably too early in the cycle to draw any clear conclusions about likely recruitment for 2016/17. Certainly, however, there is no evidence of deterioration.

PGT recruitment against targets between 2011 and 2015 is shown in the chart below. Following disappointing PGT recruitment across the School in 2015, a decision was taken to flatline PGT recruitment forecasts for financial modelling purposes based on actual students as at October 2015. The financial forecasts are shown as dashed lines in the chart below, and revised targets for PGT recruitment will be set later.

Chart 5.2 Taught Postgraduate Recruitment against Targets for LSS

One way to increase numbers further on our PGT programmes is by increasing the conversion rate, and discussions are well-advanced in this respect between departments and Marketing. The rates are not high by UK standards and in principle there is scope for a significant rise in recruitment through this means. However, the PGT market remains volatile, with the impact of both changes in the jobs market and changes in the fees/loan regime difficult to predict. It would therefore be unwise to expect a surge in PGT numbers in the immediate future on existing programmes.

5.4 New plans for growth in existing programmes
Despite the expectation of growing student numbers already built into the plan, and the volatile nature of recruitment, we believe that there is scope for growth on our existing programmes over and above planned increases. We have two specific areas where we expect to increase income from student recruitment. These are outlined in the next two subsections.

### 5.4.1 Increased Student Numbers on PGT Law Programmes

The Law department has developed a proposal for income generation based on existing PGT programmes (LLM). This involves the negotiation of specific agreements with overseas institutions, which will bring in additional income from overseas students taking the LLM degree. Offering students a discounted fee makes this attractive, and so far agreements are in place with two institutions (Bergen; Thammasat).

The projected new students and associated revenues and costs are shown below. Conservative estimates for new students have been used. The expectation is that these two programmes will together generate additional income of £175,000 by 2018/19 (even after the fee discount) with little or no increase in staff costs because there is spare capacity on the existing LLM programme.

**Table 5.3 Increase in Law PGT numbers - overseas partner institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Staff costs</th>
<th>Other costs</th>
<th>Overheads</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14,625)</td>
<td>86,875</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29,250)</td>
<td>173,750</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4.2 Increased Student Numbers on Development Studies UG Programmes

The number of applicants for Development Studies UG courses as of early January 2016 is 45 per cent up on January 2015. This reflects increasing awareness of the new single honours Development Studies degree thanks to the work done by the department itself, and by marketing.

It is assumed that some of this increase in applications translates into enrolments. The table below shows a conservative assumption of an additional five new students in 2016/17, rising to an additional seven students in subsequent years. This translates into an additional 18 students on the programme by 2018/19 (taking into account potential attrition), equating to an increase in net income of £150,000.

**Table 5.4 Increase in Development Studies UG numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Add new Students</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Staff costs</th>
<th>Other costs</th>
<th>Overheads</th>
<th>Net income</th>
<th>Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9,750)</td>
<td>42,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>132,822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(23,400)</td>
<td>109,422</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>203,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(35,100)</td>
<td>168,270</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5 Plans for growth in new programmes
LSS also has a number of costed new programmes which are expected to generate significant income streams over the next two to three years. All these programmes have been discussed with Marketing and Finance, and are either approved or a long way down the formal approval process.

5.5.1 New MSc in Finance (DeFIMS)

A new MSc programme in Finance is due to start in 2016-17. It involves the creation of six new half modules, and the recruitment of new staff (1.5 FTE).

The income and cost projections for 2017/18 and 2018/19 are shown in the table below. The programme was originally projected to recruit small numbers in 2016/17, rising to a steady state of 40 FTEs per annum in its fourth year. Given the limited advertising of the programme, however, it is now assumed to start recruiting from 2017/18. This results in projected net income of £20,000 in 2017/18 and £50,000 in 2018/19.

There are risks here in terms of both student numbers and the recruitment of high calibre staff. However, it is important to recognize that other UK MSc Finance programmes recruit up to 130 students per year and therefore the assumption of steady state recruitment at SOAS of 40 students is by no means unrealistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5 New MSc in Finance (DeFIMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add new Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: staff costs in the table relate to the salaries of the chair and a 0.5 lecturer, partially offset by assumed endowment income of £85,000 per annum..

5.5.2 New CISD based MSc Distance Learning programmes

The table below summarises projected income and expenditure for the new Distance Learning programmes over the next few years. Conservative projections of student numbers (taking into account higher attrition rates for Distance Learning programmes) have been used in the forecasts, resulting in assumed net income of £150,000 in 2018/19.

The staff costs assume 1.5 senior lecturers in 2016/17, rising to 3 senior lecturers from 2017/18 onwards. The costs also assume 1 lecturer in 2017/18, rising to 2.5 in 2018/19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.6 New CISD based MSc Distance Learning programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add new Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These income and expenditure projections are relatively conservative. The existing CISD Global Diplomacy model generates a net income of £500,000 per annum, so the income streams assumed for the new programmes are rather modest. It is of course important to recognize that the CISD model of teaching, which is heavily reliant on web-based activities, is probably inappropriate for the delivery of more technical subjects (such as econometrics).

5.5.3 Law LLB (Four year programme)

The Law department is launching a new four year LLB programme which will involve an additional year spent abroad. During the year abroad, our students will pay 15 per cent of the fee to SOAS, and we will receive (discounted) fee income from incoming exchange students on to the programme. In total, this is expected to generate an income of about £100,000 per annum by 2017/18, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.7 Increase in Law LLB – 4 year extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add new Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Non-Pay Cost Savings

In a Faculty the size of Law and Social Sciences, there is inevitably some scope for non-pay savings. Such savings cannot be dramatic without deleterious effects upon the research environment and the student experience. However, there are some obvious areas where scope exists for savings.

5.6.1 Reduction in Faculty Non-Pay Costs

LSS generates significant income from research overheads and there is potential to make modest savings – assumed to be in the region of £100,000 per annum. For example, LSS currently part-funds two Leverhulme fellowships; halting that would save around £40,000. This does assume that research overheads are retained at a Faculty level. If the funds are handed over to departments, there will be little scope for saving (unless departments do not spend the money). The implications for research of these sorts of cuts also need to be considered.

5.6.2 Reduction in Distance Learning Cost Base

The School operates three DL models offered by CeFIMS, CeDEP and CISD respectively. The first two models rely very heavily on sending out books, course packs and printed materials to students - so heavy costs are incurred in printing and carriage.

This hardcopy approach is a very old-fashioned way of delivering distance learning teaching. If CeDEP were to adopt the CISD model of distance learning delivery—which relies far more upon webinars and electronic materials—much of this expenditure could be avoided. It is estimated that £100,000 per annum could be saved by CeDEP adopting the CISD model. [There is probably little scope for savings in this area in respect of CEFIMS; it is not easy to
teach more technical subjects (like econometrics) via the sorts of online discussions (‘etivities’) led by course tutors in CISD. Moreover, cutting the supply of printed materials may well have implications for the fee that can be charged.

5.7 Staff Cost Savings

5.7.1 Fractional Staff

Reductions in the fractional budget have already been incorporated into the Faculty plan. These are predicated on the assumption of some increase in the number of tutorials taken by permanent staff. However, there is little scope for further savings beyond those planned both because of the large size of core courses in Law and Social Sciences, and because we remain committed to employing GTAs in order to provide training opportunities for our PhD students. Tutorials on core modules which have 100 or more students enrolled on them—and there is a significant number of such modules at undergraduate and PGT levels—cannot be taken by permanent staff without adverse consequences for research. The main constraint here is the burden of assessment (whether formative or summative); permanent staff cannot provide the level of feedback required without sacrifices in other areas.

5.7.2 Permanent Staff

Although annual student recruitment has fallen below the target set for 2014 and 2015 in LSS, the scope for staff savings is limited because student-staff ratios have increased over time. This is because the type of student recruited has changed. As the proportion of undergraduates recruited has risen (to 44 per cent of the LSS annual intake in 2015, compared with 27 per cent in 2011), so the total student population has risen by more than implied by the annual recruitment numbers. In consequence, the ratio of students to staff rose from 14.3 to 15.4 between 2008/2009 and 2014/15, and is projected to rise to 16.8 in 2018/19.

In the light of the rising staff-student ratio, it would be unwise to conclude that significant staff cuts can be made. There are two other considerations which need to be borne in mind. First, recruitment numbers are very volatile and there are good reasons to expect the PGT market to revive somewhat compared with 2015 given the introduction of PGT loans. As the cost of recruiting new staff is considerable, it would be short-sighted to reduce staff numbers unless there is clear evidence that the student recruitment shortfall in 2015/16 is permanent. Second, the shortfall in student recruitment does allow research-active staff to spend additional time on research, which is likely to have favourable effects on research income.

This does not mean that there is no scope for efficiency-led staff savings. By teaching students on larger courses, by making more use of distance learning technologies, and by making some reductions in the burden of student assessment, it is possible to reduce staff numbers somewhat.

It is estimated that there is scope of modest cuts in staff numbers – say 8 FTEs – generating long-term savings of around £650,000 per annum. However, there is a need to proceed cautiously. If staff savings lead to cuts in contact hours, the impact on the student experience will be adverse and that will lead to recruitment problems.
5.8 Other potential areas for growth / savings

There are various ideas for further areas of growth in LSS, as outlined in Annex E. These ideas are currently in early stages of development, and so have not been included in the financial plans for consultation outlined above. More work is needed to quantify them and test their robustness before they can be considered for inclusion in longer-term plans.
6.0 Financial Plan for Professional Services

6.1 Introduction

Professional services costs are considered to be a sub-set of central costs (excluding space costs) comprising staff costs within Directorates and non-pay expenditure under the direct control of the Directorates (£17m in 2015/16). This excludes other significant central costs (£10m) which are either fixed or centrally controlled and therefore outside the scope for consideration of professional services saving. Examples include scholarships and bursaries (£2.6m), OFFA spend (£1.8m) and published materials (£1.9m).

Professional Services is in the process of conducting reviews across specific areas, in particular the Distance Learning administration and academic administration across both faculty and central academic services with a view to identifying further savings. Additionally, plans to better coordinate work, in particular between Professional Services and the faculty teams, will be undertaken to ensure Professional Services are clear in their role to support the academic mission and reduce the administrative burden on academic colleagues.

At the same time as seeking savings we are facing ever increasing demands, in particular in relation to marketing, student recruitment and other student services. We will continue to look for efficiencies across all of our services and aim to address the areas of demand by moving resources from other areas. This will allow us to both offer up savings as well as continue to invest in services that are critical to the on-going success of the School.

6.2 Professional Services Priorities

To support the faculty plans and strategic aims of the School, Professional Services need to support a range of academic activities including marketing and student recruitment, student experience and increasing research income.

The priorities for Professional Services over the next three years are:

**Student Recruitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Areas</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase impact of marketing</td>
<td>• CRM to support communications with students from initial enquiry to enrolment and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support growth in student recruitment,</td>
<td>• Increase use of social media to improve impact of marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with particular focus on conversion activities</td>
<td>• Additional resources to improve web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional resource in Admissions team to improve turnaround of applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student experience**

Improvement of student satisfaction in the main areas of well-being, employability and better administrative support is in line with a survey by the Students Union, and feedback through the Student Barometer and NSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Areas</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support transition and retention with</td>
<td>• Support for internships and micro placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved teaching and learning support</td>
<td>• Support for curriculum review and implementation of new credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support student health and wellbeing</td>
<td>framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate engagement in student life</td>
<td>• Support for SHNB multimedia facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support transition to work and further study</td>
<td>• Investment in student experience and support for study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support the curriculum review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Areas</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve effectiveness of administration processes, including</td>
<td>• Regularise capital investment for improving IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT systems development</td>
<td>systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop support for increasing research income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To achieve this we plan to transfer resources of approximately £700,000 across Professional Services, in particular from Estates and LIS, to allow us to invest in the priority areas.

**6.3 Professional Services Savings**

Benchmarking SOAS professional services costs would suggest there to be limited further scope for savings across professional services in totality. Savings of £500,000 have already been made in 2015/16, including £120,000 on printer leasing costs and £120,000 in energy costs (as a consequence of projects to reduce our carbon footprint). However, reviews have recently been carried out across various Professional Services areas, and a review of the library and the management structures of the converged service across LIS is in the process of being commissioned.

In terms of support staff costs as a proportion of income, SOAS is mid-range within the sector (84th out of 160 institutions, HESA 2013-14).
Professional services are seeking to save £300,000 and identify a further £700,000 of resources to focus on priority areas by 2017/18 via a combination of staff and non-staff costs, predominantly from Estates and LIS.

6.4 Professional Services Income Generation Ideas
Since the 2012/13 academic year, over £40 million has been secured in new funds from trusts, foundations, alumni, friends, staff and students. The School will launch a major fundraising campaign in September 2016 which will build on this success. The fundraising objective is to secure support for the School's strategic priorities.

A review of the enterprise function with a view to developing further income sources is underway. Increasing external research funding allows further opportunities for growth. The new grant application review and approval processes, as well as the research information system currently under procurement, will provide a more strategic approach to external funding, ensuring that support is dedicated to those projects particularly promising and high on the School's strategy.
### ANNEX A – Impact of REF 2014 on QR grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>2014/15 £'000</th>
<th>Var £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Anthropology and Sociology</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Art and Archaeology</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Centre for Media and Film Studies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>-371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H</td>
<td>Study of Religions</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>-576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>China and Inner Asia</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Japan and Korea</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Language and Cultures of Africa</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Language and Cultures of Near and Middle East</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Language and Cultures of South Asia</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>-144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Language and Cultures of South East Asia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;C Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>-520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Centre for Development, Environment and Policy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Centre for Financial and Management Studies</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Centre for Gender Studies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Centre for Internat'l Stds and Diplomacy (CISD)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Department for Financial and Management Studies</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS</td>
<td>Political Studies</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SS Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>IFCELS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>SOAS China Institute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>South Asia Institute</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>-509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B – Academic staff and student number projections by Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate taught</th>
<th>Postgraduate research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate taught</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate research</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>3,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                         | fte           | fte                 | fte                   |
| Student:Staff ratio     | 11.3          | 12.0                | 13.5                  |

**Languages & Cultures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff*</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>102.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate taught</th>
<th>Postgraduate research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate taught</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate research</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>3,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                         | fte           | fte                 | fte                   |
| Student:Staff ratio     | 10.8          | 11.2                | 12.1                  |

* excludes Language Centre staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff**</td>
<td>161.1</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>162.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate taught</th>
<th>Postgraduate research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>4,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate taught</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>2,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate research</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>7,575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                         | fte           | fte                 | fte                   |
| Student:Staff ratio     | 15.1          | 15.3                | 16.4                  |

**excludes staff supporting distance learning**
ANNEX C – Additional ideas for FAH

1. Also during the Plan period, Religions and Philosophies and the Centre for Media Studies are planning to develop a series of new distance learning programmes that include:

- PG Certificate - On-line Course
- Religious Literacy (Teacher Training)
- MA World Philosophy
- MA Religions in Development
- MA Yoga and Meditation
- MA Religion & Global Politics
- MA Media and Religion
- MA Global Media

At this stage the business cases for these proposals are to be developed. Accordingly, recruitment numbers for these programmes have yet been calculated. It is unlikely that all the programmes will reach the stage of full development.

2. Other proposals include

- Charge higher fees for the Music Summer School
- Teaching certificate in Hip-hop Studies
- Music: short courses and master classes
- A HAA Summer School in Japanese Art
- Reducing duplications and overlap within departments and across the Faculty
- 2-year MA programmes
- 4-year under graduate degrees ending with a MA
- Review of teaching loads to increase research and grant applications
- Elimination of double marking
- Given the Faculty has been relatively successful in securing endowments, increase efforts to raise further endowment funding for core posts

3. Additional Proposals derived from Responses to Consultation on Financial Sustainability:

Department of Anthropology and Sociology:
- Potential for collaboration with Media Centre
- Potential for developing distance learning MA programmes
- Potential for increasing part time UG student numbers

Department of Study of Religions and Philosophies:
- Potential for developing major MA programmes
- Potential to develop additional MA distance learning programmes (some outlined above)
ANNEX D – Additional ideas for FLC

The Faculty of Languages and Cultures has had a number of ideas for income growth and cost savings. These ideas are outlined below under several broad headings. Further work is needed to develop and quantify the ideas before they can be included in the financial plans.

Increased recruitment – existing programmes

1. The newly developed MA Arabic/Chinese/Japanese/Korean Language Learning and Teaching programmes in part address potential demand through collaboration with BFSU, and possibly from a wider constituency in China. The programmes are a development of the previous MA in Applied Linguistics and Language Pedagogy and enrolment was planned to increase from 5-10 to about 20 students.

2. We are currently revising the MA in Translation to make it more attractive and more competitive with similar programmes offered by other London/UK HEIs. The programme has historically recruited well, and we hope that student numbers will increase further when the new structure is launched. Here, as well, collaboration with partners in China may lead to further interest in the programme. In the medium term we are also planning to look into adding an interpreting strand to the MA. However this would require more marketing research and a better understanding of the potential costs involved.

Increased recruitment – new programmes

3. There is potential for growth in the PG provision for English, building on our successful BA English. PG courses may include an MA in English (or possibly dedicated programmes for English literature and English language), as well as a more specialised programme in MA in Teaching English in Africa and Asia, combining elements of English, language pedagogy and African and Asian languages.

4. Based on the success of the two-year MA programmes, there might be scope for further integrated PGT degrees, combining a discipline and a language. There is also scope to look at this for one-year PGT programmes, following the successful integration of language learning, e.g. in the one-year MSc International Management.

Improved retention

5. In addition to recruiting more students into existing programmes, we are also looking at ways to increase progression rates and student retention. This is largely an academic and pedagogical issue, but also has financial implications, as students stay in the School longer. It will also increase the educational success of the School and in turn its attractiveness for prospective students.

Grow internal student market

6. The Faculty is also working with colleagues across the School to increase uptake of languages across the School. This is driven by academic and pedagogic considerations, but there is a financial aspect to this, too, as it would increase the Faculty’s share of the
‘internal student market’ – more students would be taking courses in the Faculty and so part of their fee income would come to the Faculty. However, more and better language learning opportunities would also potentially increase enrolment overall, and so lead to genuinely new students joining SOAS. There are a number of relevant issues which need to be addressed in relation to this – including the immanently high cost base of language teaching (since contact hours rise proportionately to student numbers), the shape of our curricula (e.g. PG credit framework, UG open options), the Language Entitlement Programme, pedagogical issues (e.g. in terms of communicative and life-skill based language learning), as well as timetabling and space issues. Some of these have been addressed in the review of languages at SOAS.

7. A specific aspect of increasing student numbers in our current programmes is the option of a study abroad period. While currently this is mainly offered in the form of a year-abroad in four-year degrees, we could also offer shorter periods abroad (one term, or during the summer) available in three-year degrees. We are currently developing this for a number of languages for two-year MAs, but the resulting infrastructure could also be used for UG programmes. This might make our three-year area studies degrees more attractive, but periods abroad could also be included in discipline degrees across the School, where students might then well be advised to take a relevant language module before the period abroad, thus increasing uptake of languages.

Grow Summer School

8. There might also be a market for more language teaching at the SOAS Summer School, including teaching of higher-level languages classes, for which there might be demand, for example, from students from the US.

Increased use of ICT

9. In terms of delivery, we are looking at the possibility of developing further ICT support for our programmes and, based on this, blended learning and distance learning options. In this we are collaborating with and drawing on the extensive DL expertise available at SOAS.

Increased research income

10. The Faculty has an extremely strong track record of attracting external research funding, with current large projects funded by the ERC, AHRC and Leverhulme. The Faculty is currently looking into the financial implications of this, with the hope to increase the role research funding plays in its overall finances.

Increased income through fundraising

11. The previous Faculty Plan identified Hausa and Bengali as targets for philanthropic funding, and the Faculty hopes to work closely with the Development Office to take these plans forward, and/or develop further academically attractive projects.
Curriculum restructuring

There is the potential for larger curriculum restructuring to create and make use of areas of academic overlap across different programmes and departments and so deliver more comprehensive curricula.

12. One option in this area would be the reduction of full (UG) degrees in some areas to half degrees, so that these would be offered as joint degrees only. Depending on course units, any other students (from other programmes, PG students) taking courses, and potential impact in other areas, savings would be about up to 30% of teaching hours on the programme.

13. There might also the option of creating joint higher level courses, following the model of the SEA department, where examples of this have been tried.

14. At MA level, poorly recruiting programmes could be withdrawn, or their delivery streamlined by merging different programmes into larger, more comprehensive, and more attractive ones.

15. More comprehensively, the Faculty could consolidate a range of Faculty programmes into a few comprehensive programmes, with joint foundation and core courses, and specialist courses at a higher level. These programmes could be designed as, for example, 'BA in African and Asian Area Studies', 'BA Modern Languages', or 'BA World Literatures', etc. However, this would mean a reduction of distinctiveness which might have negative effects on the School’s identity and attractiveness. It is also noteworthy that some of these programmes might end up looking quite similar to the newly developed BA Liberal Arts. Since the aim of this change would be both to save in terms of provision, but also to make a more attractive programme, these plans would need input from Marketing to assess student interest and the best way to package such a programme, to see whether this would lead to an increase in recruitment. Implementation of such a change might be gradual, including in the first instance ‘smaller’ programmes e.g. from Africa, SA and SEA, and at a later stage optional integration of larger programmes.
ANNEX E – Additional Ideas for LSS

Medium Term Plans for New Programmes

There is considerable scope for the development of new programmes in LSS, both on-campus and distance learning. Areas such as finance, international relations and political economy (broadly defined) are obvious candidates. There are various ideas which are in early stages of development.

One idea is for a four year dual degree (BA Law and...) in which students will study only law modules in years 3 and 4; this should help recruitment in other Faculties as well as LSS.

A second example is an MSc in Economics to replace/supplement the existing MSc Development Economics, for which the market is declining. In addition, the Economics department is considering the launch of an MSc on Emerging Economies, perhaps delivered jointly with Development Studies.

A third example involves the development of distance learning programmes in the Politics department.

Fourthly, Development Studies is considering the launch of a Master's degree in Humanitarian Assistance, as well as the possibility of launching degree programmes in Geography.

Fifth, the Politics department is considering whether to take online their MSc degrees in Politics of the Middle East; Conflicts, Rights and Justice and International Politics.

Sixth, there may be scope for the development of new programmes within the area of Gender Studies, where the number of applicants as of January 2016 is significantly up on January 2015.
**Next Steps**

Further consultations will take place across the School on the strategy which is a dynamic document.

With respect to financial sustainability we anticipate that the curriculum review will also generate additional savings although these will not be realised in the short term. We will also be looking at structures and roles across the School in line with key strategic priorities to identify where further savings can be made.
CONSULTATION ON FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

EXECUTIVE BOARD RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES

12th April 2016

Introduction

The following paper provides a response from the Executive Board to comments that were made in the submissions to the School’s consultation on financial sustainability.

The consultation period ran for a period of 30 calendar days from 3rd February to 4th March 2016. Twenty-nine responses were received and were shared with the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board on 21st March 2016. In addition, a paper was developed for the Programme Board that summarised the responses and categorised them into broad themes.

The Sustainable SOAS Programme Board acknowledged that considerable thought and effort had been put into the responses. It was agreed that the submissions made by individuals and groups (including Departments, teams and UCU and the SOAS Students’ Union) would inform the proposals to be presented to the Board of Trustees on 22nd April. In addition, it was agreed that the Executive Board would provide an overall response to the main points raised in the consultation submissions to ensure transparency and help improve understanding across the School.

The following paper provides a response from the Executive Board to the main themes that emerged from the individual and group consultation submissions. The themes have been categorised as follows:

A. Comments on the overall document
   1. Vision and strategy for SOAS
   2. 5% surplus target and timeframe for achieving savings
   3. Vernon Square
   4. Philanthropy

B. Comments on specific areas of SOAS
   5. Research and Enterprise
   6. Languages
   7. Language Centre
   8. Professional services, central costs and administrative support
   9. Library and Information Services
  10. Distance Learning

C. Comments on School-wide areas
   11. Restructuring
   12. Staffing
   13. Portfolio
   14. Planning and Financial Model

D. Ideas for the future
   15. Suggestions for growth
   16. Suggestions for savings

E. Specific comments on detailed proposals
For each theme, a high-level summary of the responses received is shown in italics, followed by the Executive Board’s response. For reference, a summary of the consultation responses received, including quotes from the individual submissions, is included in Annex A.

A. Executive Board Responses to comments on the overall document

1. Vision and strategy for SOAS

Many of the responses commented on the lack of a shared vision and strategy for the School in the consultation document, saying that it is hard to consider financial sustainability without understanding the School’s strategy.

A draft updated strategy document has now been developed. A number of comments have been received and the document amended. The revised document will be considered by the Board of Trustees at their meeting in April. The document is available on MySOAS and Moodle.

2. 5% surplus target and timeframe for achieving savings

Just under a quarter of the responses referenced the 5% surplus, with a number questioning the level of the surplus to be achieved (thinking that a smaller surplus would be sufficient). Several responses questioned the timeframe for achieving savings.

The target of 5% is indeed above the sector mean (of 4.3% reported for 2014-15) and reflects our aspiration to perform ‘above average’ on all measures of performance.

While in previous years the sector have reported a slightly lower average surplus of 3.9%, we have only achieved or surpassed this level once in the last five years. This would suggest that we need to set a higher than sector average to catch up in generating reserves for future investment.

HEFCE have, in their latest annual review of university and college finances, warned that ‘in the medium to long term, institutions will need to generate larger surpluses to make progress towards covering the full economic costs of their activities and thus securing their long-term sustainability’. They also go on to conclude that ‘Without increased surpluses and continued government support, there is a risk that the sector will be unable to deliver the scale of investment required to meet rising student expectations, build capacity for growth and ensure that the sector can remain internationally competitive’.

HEFCE do not specifically recommend a target level of surplus, however reference is often made to guidance (issued back in 2002) which suggests institutions should consider targets of 3-5%. It should be noted that this was issued 14 years ago. In the intervening period HEFCE capital funding has decreased significantly (we have seen our grant fall from £1.7m annual to £0.3m annually), volatility of income has increased significantly as grant funding has been replaced with fees and competition for students has intensified. It is recognised all of these factors call for higher rates of surplus to be generated.

In the current environment, the target of 5% is felt to be the minimum level that would allow SOAS to remain financially sustainable.

While we have been tasked by the Board of Trustees to achieve this 5% surplus by the financial year 2017/18, it is possible that this timeline may be reviewed if sufficient progress in moving towards this target can be achieved by October 2016. Progress will be impacted
by the success of the recently launched VS scheme and enrolment numbers for the next academic session.

3. **Vernon Square**

   A number of responses commented on the omission of Vernon Square from the consultation document, and wanted to know about the future plans for the building and the impact this may have on financial sustainability.

   The initial intention was to dispose of Vernon Square to contribute to the funding of Senate House North Block (SHNB). Philanthropic donations have allowed us to review this position. Retaining this building would allow us to preserve some Freehold interest within our Estate (all our other buildings are held on long leases) and allow us to pursue our ambition to grow our student accommodation offering. We expect plans to take up to two years to develop, so in the short-term, we aim to generate income through a conferencing offering and other rental options to offset the costs of holding on to this building.

   It should be noted that the funding for SHNB was based on a business plan and growth trajectory. It is a failure to meet these growth targets that have contributed to the current financial shortfall. It is inaccurate to claim that SHNB has been developed to the detriment of the School's operations including teaching and research jobs.

4. **Philanthropy**

   A number of responses suggested that there were opportunities to raise money through philanthropy, thereby reducing the need to cut costs.

   Since the 2012/13 academic year, over £40 million has been secured in new funds from trusts, foundations, alumni, friends, staff and students. The School will launch a major fundraising campaign in September 2016 which will build on this success.

   The fundraising objective is to secure support for the School's strategic priorities. As SOAS has a unique offering it is in a strong position to raise significant levels of income. In line with other institutions, however, fundraising targets are excluded from the School's financial forecast. Whilst some donations support core costs, the majority of major gifts support initiatives such as endowed academic posts, scholarships or capital building projects.

   SOAS has invested heavily in Development in recent years, and sees a very good return on investment which is above average for the sector.

B. **Executive Board responses to comments on specific areas of SOAS**

5. **Research and Enterprise**

   Some responses to the consultation commented that the financial proposals focused on growth through new teaching programmes without considering research and enterprise.

   A number of useful points were made about the importance of research, research and enterprise income, the effects of research reputation on other sources of income, and the need for investment in supporting the generation of research income and high quality research outputs. Specific responses to the comments made are provided below.

\[1\] Note that approximately £2.5m is required in order to fund a starting-salary professorial post.
Growing research income is an important part of forward plans, and the School has an aspiration to grow research income to £7.5m (from £4.5m) by 2020. However this phased growth in research income is already included in faculty plans. Student numbers are also premised on the maintenance of the school’s reputation as a research-intensive university. It is not considered realistic to increase these targets beyond those already agreed.

The faculty plans do not currently include enterprise income. A separate working group has been examining plans to grow enterprise income, and is looking also at investments that might be necessary for this income to be realised. This includes growth of the SOAS summer school and short courses. That working group will report to Academic Board in the summer term 2016, and will set out a business plan that could lead to moderate growth in surplus income from this source.

Support for improving research performance is outlined in the separate Research Excellence plan. This includes investment in a new Research Information System, a Research Excellence Manager, and expanded post-award support. These are factored into existing financial forecasts but are primarily orientated to sustaining research reputation rather than income.

The importance of external partnerships is recognised, and some new partnerships have already been developed, for example with the British Library. A more systematic approach to partnerships is being developed by a separate Strategic Partnerships working group, which will report to Academic Board in Summer 2016. However, this will not include predictions for income growth in the short-term.

There are no plans at present to develop higher level degree apprenticeships. However, the School would welcome proposals for such apprenticeships from academic departments and would consider whether any particular proposal might represent a useful way forward.

The desirability and value of post-doctoral centenary fellowships is recognised, and such fellowships will be included in the centenary fundraising campaign. However, unlike many other universities, the School does not at present generate a sufficient surplus to allocate funding to such an initiative.

6. Languages

Some responses commented on the importance of languages, whilst recognising that language study should not be made compulsory for all students. Some responses included suggestions for more joint programmes, and there were also suggestions for increasing "internal growth" for language study.

A high number of relevant and constructive comments on the consultation document on financial sustainability relate to languages and their role for the School. Many of these comments will inform the School’s overarching strategy, revised financial plan of the Faculty and future strategies based on it. There is also some overlap between comments received on the consultation document and the findings of the recent Language Review which was presented to Academic Board on 9 March 2016, and which in part informs further School-wide strategies on languages.

Across the consultation response, there was strong support for languages, and the feeling that languages are ‘central to the academic vision of the School’ and that languages and culture are key ‘differentiators for SOAS’. There was also a strong sense that a loss of regional and linguistic specialisation might lead to a loss of identity and attractiveness. These comments will feed into the revised faculty plan, as well as into the revised SOAS Strategy which is currently being developed.
7. **Language Centre**

A number of responses questioned the omission of the Language Centre from the financial consultation document, feeling that it should be considered as part of an overall plan for the sustainability of languages at SOAS. Some responses felt that the Language Centre could be further integrated into the School and developed further.

The rationale for keeping the sustainability strategy for the Language Centre separate from the Faculty strategy was in part related to the on-going review of the Language Centre. Results of this review were originally scheduled to be available in time for inclusion in the revised financial sustainability plans. However the review has been delayed, and results are not yet available. A new chair has been appointed to lead the review and it is back on track, with revised terms of reference and time scale. Findings of the review will result in a revised strategy for the Language Centre which will be included in the School's overall strategy.

8. **Professional services, central costs and administrative support**

A number of responses commented on the imbalance between Faculties and Professional Services in the document, with only two pages for the latter. Some responses questioned the growth in "central costs" and felt that the increase in estates costs was at the expense of staff jobs. Other responses believed that the conflation of central non-staff costs and professional services costs creates misunderstanding. Some responses felt that professional services should also make savings, while others agreed that there was limited scope for further savings in support staff across the School. Some responses agreed with the professional services priorities outlined in the document, whereas others felt that the additional investment in marketing would be better spent on research and teaching to attract high quality students. Some responses commented on the relationship between Professional Services and academics, and some questioned the relationship of Faculty administration staff to Professional Services. Some had questions about the resourcing of Faculty administration to meet the proposed growth in student numbers, and whether there would be a shift away from Faculty administrative staff to a more central provision for student support.

We note the concerns over the perceived imbalance in the Professional Services section of the document. This is in part due to limited capacity in Professional Services to generate income and the fact that significant savings were made in the previous financial year. This is against a backdrop of increased demand for professional services, in particular with reference to marketing, conversion and activities impacting on the student experience. To redress this, Professional Services has specifically looked to reallocate resources to allow for investment in these areas, as well as making a further contribution to savings.

In addition, Professional Services is in the process of conducting reviews across specific areas, in particular distance learning administration and academic administration across both faculty and central academic services with a view to identifying further savings. This will take into account the new Student Hub and new ways of working that this will facilitate.

We note that while some responses raised concerns that further savings had not been identified, there was also general support for the principle that there was limited scope for further savings in Professional Services and general agreement with the priority areas identified for investment.

We acknowledge the clear message that work needs to be better coordinated, in particular between Professional Services and the faculty teams, and that Professional Services need to be clear in their role to support the academic mission and to reduce the administrative burden on academic colleagues.
In addition, the Directors of Professional Services have started a piece of work on culture across services, with an emphasis on creating more accountability and moving decision-making down the management structure.

9. Library and Information Services

There was some concern about savings from LIS being used to fund other areas of Professional Services and a desire to see more detail about the proposed cost savings. Concern was expressed about the level of savings required from the Library and the impact that this would have on both the student experience and the School’s NRL status. There was some feeling that the role that LIS could play in future growth and development was not taken into account in the sustainability plans. Concern was raised about potential cuts to IT, while some responses felt that there should be further investment in LIS, not cuts.

For clarification, we confirm that the £700k savings does not fall solely to LIS and are also to be found from other areas of Professional Services, particularly Estates. We recognise the crucial role that the library plays in both the student experience and in support of the research mission of the School. However, given the challenging financial environment we have been facing, we have recently reviewed various areas of Professional Services and it seems only appropriate to also review the position of the library. To that end, we are in the process of commissioning a full review of the library and the management structures of the converged service across LIS. It is essential that the Library and information services generally are able to enhance their service provision and respond swiftly and effectively to increased demands from across the School.

10. Distance Learning

Several responses commented on Distance Learning and made suggestions for improvement.

A number of key strategic decisions need to be made about Distance Learning (DL), primarily with regard to the model of delivery and the organization of distance learning administration. These decisions will be made following the April 2016 DL external review. This apart, there seems to be general agreement that there is scope for cost-cutting and income generation. As set out in the consultation document, and as two of the responses to the consultation rightly point out, there is scope for reduced use of hard copy materials to DL students. As for income generation, the UCU response highlighted the ‘extremely conservative’ growth targets and this is entirely correct; that is because the DL market is untested by SOAS in these areas and we need to be cautious. Nevertheless, even these conservative projections suggest considerable scope for income generation.

C. Executive Board responses to comments on School-wide areas

11. Restructuring

There were a number of comments about the need for restructuring, especially related to the abolition of Faculties. Some of the responses suggested that there were tensions between individual Departments and Faculties, with the Departments feeling that the Faculties were ignoring their needs and aspirations.

In 2015 a number of options were presented for possible restructuring of the School. Once the current discussions on the revised draft strategy and financial sustainability document
are concluded, the next step will be to reopen discussion on the best structure for the School going forward.

12. Staffing
Some responses raised concerns about the impact on both academic and professional staff workloads from growth and staff savings.

In terms of voluntary severance (VS), the VS Scheme launched in March makes clear that the staffing implications of any proposed departure must be taken into account within the business case for the severance, and that this will be a key consideration for the VS Panel that deciding whether the business case is to be supported. It will be necessary for the business case to set out how the various elements of the work that was formerly undertaken are to be distributed or ceased, and the implications of this for other staff and the School more generally in terms of research and teaching excellence and efficient administration.

In relation to growth, concerns were expressed that the planned growth in academic activities will have implications for professional services, and that this will need to be built into the School's future planning. This is accepted. The financial sustainability plan for Professional Services, set out in the consultation document, talks about achieving £700,000 of efficiency savings from across Professional Services, in order to invest in the identified priority areas. These include: supporting growth in student recruitment; supporting transition and retention with improved teaching and learning support; and, supporting student health and wellbeing.

Some responses raised concerns about the impact on GTAs and fractional staff.

The faculty financial sustainability plans for both FAH and LSS include references to maintaining an ongoing commitment to the employment of Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), in order to provide training opportunities for PhD students and support the development of early career researchers. These commitments were broadly welcomed.

Some concerns were expressed about the possibility that the GTA budget may be cut completely and the implications of this on a very important element in the development of PhD students. It is assumed that these concerns relate to the FLC. The financial sustainability plan for FLC did not make specific reference to GTAs but it can be confirmed that FLC does propose to maintain an ongoing commitment to the employment of GTAs.

Concerns were also expressed about the intention set out in the faculty plans to reduce budgets for fractional staff. These reductions are consistent with the School’s desire to be less reliant on fractional staff, which has been raised as an issue by the trade unions in terms of the casualisation of the workforce. The intention is to reduce overall reliance on fractional staff while at the same time continuing to apply the School’s policy regarding the individual employment rights of fractional colleagues (which reflects the relevant legislation).

Some responses made suggestions about shifting the School’s culture and improving HR and HR Practice sustainability.

Some of the issues raised were quite high-level and related to shifting the School’s culture, for example, towards staff taking more responsibility and accountability or adopting a more commercial approach. Colleagues may want to note that Professional Services will be shortly commencing a piece of work on creating more accountability and moving decision making to more appropriate points (generally lower) within line-management structures. Additionally, the School intends to undertake a staff survey this summer, which will seek views from all staff about the working culture at SOAS.
A number of the specific areas of HR policy where it was suggested that a review might be appropriate will be considered, including: the reimbursement of costs relating to interviews; reducing advertising and recruitment agency costs; relocation allowances; a tighter process for external course funding; performance management; and succession planning.

13. Portfolio

A number of responses to the Financial Sustainability Consultation recognised the need for curriculum reform, while concern was also expressed about the risk of losing the distinctiveness of SOAS.

The draft Learning, Teaching and Student Experience places at its centre the overall SOAS Strategy, and it is clear that any decisions made about programmes and modules should be focused not only on financial sustainability but also on the core mission of SOAS. The SOAS Strategy sets out several key features of what our teaching portfolio should focus on, including the kinds of students we aim to produce and the types of information and experience we hope to impart.

More specifically, it is clear that we must be aware of our distinctiveness and competitiveness – what makes SOAS different to other institutions and what makes it attractive. This is a key part of the on-going curriculum review process.

Detailed issues were raised about:
- Languages and regional specificity in the first year curriculum – this will be looked at through our on-going curriculum review process.
- The need for careful decision about developing new programmes and the calculation of the opportunity cost of new programmes - this will be looked at in our on-going review of the programme proposal process.

14. Planning and Financial Model

Several responses commented on the School’s planning processes, both in terms of the financial sustainability plans, the planning process in general and suggestions for improvement.

In view of the urgency in addressing the projected future financial shortfalls against target, the usual faculty planning process has been superseded by the development of faculty and PS plans put forward as part the financial sustainability consultation document. The development of these plans has very much been a ‘bottom up’ process with considerable input from Academic Departments and Directors of Professional Services. The consultation exercise offers an opportunity for such plans to be revised in light of responses received.

The School’s (financial) planning process is largely based on the resource allocation model (RAM), developed some years ago. While the key principles underlying this model are still relevant (the most important being that income follows the student or staff member generating that income), a working group has been set up to advise on improvements that may be made to the model to ensure that actions/activities aligned with our overall objectives are appropriately incentivised. Any agreed amendments to the model will be reflected in the next iteration of the RAM.

In recognition that Faculty plans may have been based on overly optimistic student recruitment targets, the plans now incorporate more realistic forecast numbers. Departments
and faculties are still encouraged to set aspirational recruitment targets however financial planning and resourcing decisions will be based on the forecast numbers.

The planning process has been criticised for departmental plans being altered upon their inclusion within faculty plans. Given our current organisational structure this moderation is deemed necessary to address imbalances in financial performance across departments within facilities. Such imbalances may be as a result of temporary factors such as a one off dip in recruitment or as part of strategy of investment to advance growth or improve research performance. Moderation at a faculty level can therefore be used to ease transition and avoid knee-jerk actions that could be detrimental to the sustainability of individual departments. Such inter-departmental cross subsidies are not unique to SOAS. Feedback would however suggest that the rationale behind them needs to be made more transparent and better understood within faculties.

In view of the criticism addressed at our method of allocating research overheads, a working group is to be set up to review our current model and suggest how we better incentivise and motivate our academics to engage in research and enterprise projects and contracts.

D. Executive Board responses to ideas for the future

15. Suggestions for growth

A number of ideas were suggested for potential growth. These included building on existing programmes, expanding into new markets, and exploring other commercial opportunities.

The responses to the consultation suggested that SOAS should focus on developing 'big' programmes in order to exploit economies of scale. In Law and Social Science, this makes good sense, and the Faculty will focus on developing and marketing new programmes in Economics (Msc), Finance (MSc) and, though this is more tentative, Geography (BA). Nevertheless, smaller regional and niche courses are key elements in what makes SOAS distinctive. We will consider some rationalization during the curriculum review process, but our commitment to offering a wide and diverse portfolio of courses will remain.

We also agree that two year Masters' programmes are worth considering and we will encourage departments to develop proposals along those lines.

We note the useful suggestions around the development of executive education and particularly the focus on the Summer School as a route to grow income. We are in the process of reviewing the enterprise function with a view to developing further income sources.

Increasing external research funding also allows further opportunities for growth. A more strategic and pro-active approach to supporting funding applications would maximise benefits to the School. The new grant application review and approval processes, as well as the research information system currently under procurement, will provide a more strategic approach to external funding, ensuring that support is dedicated to those projects particularly promising and high on the School's strategy.

Additionally, there are opportunities to support the School's ambitious savings agenda by recovering existing in-house costs, like academic salaries or research infrastructure costs, through externally funded projects.
16. Suggestions for savings

A number of ideas were suggested for savings.

We note the useful suggestions which we will consider with the relevant budget holders. Most of the suggestions identified are of marginal impact and short-term in nature and do not address the longer-term challenges.

E. Executive Board responses to specific comments on detailed proposals

In addition to the main themes outlined above, a number of specific comments were made on the detailed proposals. Below are Executive Board responses to these comments, including Faculty-specific responses. Comments on the Professional Services plan have been addressed in Section 8 above.

Overall

There needs to be an Equality Impact Assessment conducted on the proposals, which is necessary in upholding the School’s commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion.

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is a tool to help institutions ensure that their policies, practices and decisions are fair and meet the needs of their staff and students. They help ensure that we are not inadvertently discriminating against any protected group. The School will undertake equality impact assessments on any final proposals or recommendations in line with the recently revised guidance and support for this activity will provided by the School’s Diversity Office:

https://mysoas.sharepoint.com/directorates/qcd/edi/eia/Pages/default.aspx

Faculty of Arts and Humanities

The Faculty welcomed all of the responses to the financial sustainability consultation received from individual colleagues and academic departments. The Faculty recognises the contribution made by staff who engaged with a range of consultation activities including discussion sessions, focus groups, email exchanges, meetings with Directorate staff and others, etc.

It is recognised that a number of ideas and suggestions have come out of these activities but many of these have turned out to be difficult to express as tangible savings or additional income. A number of the responses did not make significant contributions to new income but rather focused on existing activities or provided minimal changes to existing activities. Overall the responses to the consultation were insufficient in terms of making a significant impact on the projected deficit.

The following points are responses to comments made by academic departments in reply to the financial sustainability paper where they provide suggestions for increasing income or cutting costs.
• The School of Arts suggests that the BA Global Music should provide some additional income. Clearly this is dependent on meeting or exceeding recruitment targets.

• The School of Arts indicates that PGT recruitment is an area of growth. Based on the current recruitment (offers accepted) figures this is likely with firm acceptances running at over 100 over target.

• The School of Arts suggests that the Diploma in Asian Arts is an income generator but according to the RAM model overall the Diploma makes a marginal loss every year and breaks even in 2018/19.

• The Department of Anthropology and Sociology raised the issue of increasing UG/PT student intake due to increased demand. This has been included in ANNEX C of the sustainability paper but it is not clear where the increase in applications/students will come from because recent HECFE data suggests a massive turn down in PT applications across the sector. It is possible that the department might buck the trend though.

• The Department of Religions and Philosophies have listed a number of suggestions in their submission. Many of these have already been incorporated in ANNEX C but the Faculty has not included any of the more 'radical' suggestions such as creating accommodation for staff and students at VS or creating an in-house hotel or the endowment campaign - these are beyond the scope of the Department and Faculty to implement but could be considered at School/Estates level.

• The Department of Study and Religions and Philosophies mentions their potentially strong student recruitment but these put the focus on raw applications rather than offers or acceptances so there is a risk of overestimating conversion. At this stage it is necessary to stay with a prudent view for UG recruitment.

• The Department of Study and Religions and Philosophies mentions overseas UG recruitment (page 88) and staff raise concerns that the UG overseas target is too high at 12 which they claim is may not be achieved. The Department suggests it would like the number reduced to a more reasonable figure and say they the department did not endorse the figure of 12 OS students. On the other hand the latest recruitment data seems to suggest that the department is likely to recruit 13.5 OS UG students - so the Faculty suggests waiting for a few weeks and then reviewing in the light of further recruitment data.

• The Department of Study and Religions and Philosophies raises some other issues which are outside of the scope of the Faculty to action for example freezing pay, reducing central costs and for the School to develop a long term vision.

• The response from the School of Arts does not include any additional items for inclusion as innovations or developments.

• There was no response from the Department of History.

**Faculty of Languages and Cultures**

Comments on specific plans for FLC were overall positive and noted that a number of the actions proposed in the consultation document were already being implemented. A specific point of criticism mentioned was the absence of a statement on GTA positions in the Faculty, and this will be addressed in the revised version, where a statement on the commitment of the Faculty to providing GTA positions will be included.
General comments with relevance for languages and FLC include comments on the absence of overall vision and strategy, philanthropic funding, research and curriculum reform. These will in part be addressed in the revised version of the Faculty’s sustainability plan, but also by other School-wide strategies, e.g. on research, curriculum, or overall vision. With respect to philanthropic funding, the Faculty is working closely with the Development Office on a fund raising strategy for languages. While it is too early to include potential income from this in the revised plan, the Faculty anticipates that philanthropic income will make a discernable contribution to the long-term sustainability of language scholarship at SOAS.

**Faculty of Law and Social Sciences**

*Unambitious Plans?* It was suggested that the plan for LSS was 'realistic but unambitious.' There is some truth in this; the plan is relatively cautious. However, some of the ideas for future growth are very ambitious. For example, the decision by the Economics department to develop a new MSc in Economics is ambitious because that MSc will be very different to the orthodox Economics MSc peddled in other universities across the world. It will require effective marketing and careful course design/delivery for it to be successful, but it is being launched at an opportune time given the movement to re-think Economics that has enthused many students across the UK. And the proposal to launch a BA degree in Geography is even more ambitious given that it will require the creation of teaching capacity in physical geography from scratch, or the development of an innovative degree firmly centred around human geography. It is also worth noting that Politics and Economics are keen to venture into uncharted territory in the sense of developing new distance learning programmes, a type of pedagogy with which they are unfamiliar.

*Fractional budget:* One of the savings commented upon was the fractional budget, which is projected to fall by in 2016/17. Although not part of the sustainability proposal (it was already incorporated into the Faculty Plan agreed in the summer and autumn of 2015), it is useful to consider this in the context of staff savings to be made via voluntary severance.

The sustainability proposal looks to cut total staff numbers by 8 FTEs in Law and Social Sciences. By contrast, the projected cut in the fractional budget (in terms of FTEs) is only 0.9 in 2016/17 and 0.3 in 2017/18. This relatively modest cut is possible to achieve without adversely affecting the student experience by reduced second marking, by some reduction in the number of courses with small student numbers, and by reduced use of market rate supplements - and we are in no doubt that departments need to realize these gains. However, there are two factors working in the opposite direction. First, LSS staff have been very successful in winning prestigious external research grants in the last few months. These grants will require the diversion of permanent staff to work on delivering project outcomes. Accordingly, it is necessary to increase our spending on fractional staff to provide teaching cover. Second, student numbers are expected to rise in 2016-17 at both ug and pgt levels for a number of departments, in some cases (notably Law) dramatically so. These numbers may not be realized, but it is prudent to budget for an increase. Accordingly, the fractional budget will need to rise in some departments. Taking all this together, it seems appropriate to assume that the LSS fractional budget needs to rise in 2016-17 in those departments where (a) significant grant income has been received and (b) where significant increases in enrolments are expected.

*Politics:* The Politics department's response suggests that the School has not followed through on its previous commitments to the department. Two things need to be said by way of response. First, the financial position of the Department has deteriorated because of the need to generate a 5% surplus, and the department must recognize that it needs to play its part in achieving that surplus for the School to be sustainable. Second, the inability of the Department to generate a surplus, after transfers to Languages and Culture and surplus
adjustment, does partly reflect its comparatively modest research record in terms of both the REF and external research funding. Politics has certainly not failed in either respect, but its research income is far less than one would wish from a top-ranked Politics department. Having said all that, we recognize that the Politics department has delivered on most indicators, perhaps most impressively so in respect of the International Relations BA. It is therefore appropriate that the School should respond sympathetically to any staffing requests from the department. We cannot reasonably expect the Politics department to provide an outstanding student experience or to improve its research record without appropriate levels of investment.

Economics: The Economics department has set a detailed explanation as to why it should not be merged with Development Studies. We understand the concerns of the department, and its students. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to rule out any departmental mergers at present. The School will return to the issue of restructuring later in the year; it is not part of the financial sustainability agenda.

DEFIMS: DEFIMS notes the absence of a substantive discussion of research in the sustainability proposals. We agree. There are two reasons for this. First, research is addressed in detail in the Research strand of the broader Sustainability programme; there is therefore little to be gained by repeating that important discussion in the financial sustainability proposals. It does, however, deserve repetition that one of the School's primary goals is to create a world class research-led university, and that nothing in the financial sustainability document should be read as a deviation from that goal. However, and second, a focus on research will not address the School's acute financial position in the short term, which is the operative horizon for financial sustainability. Only in the medium term (and especially after the 2021 REF) can research income be reasonably expected to play a major role in meeting the shortfall. Research overheads will help us to meet our goals, and we are no doubt as the utility of such funding applications for all sorts of reasons. Nevertheless, such overheads will not solve the sustainability problem in the short run.
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Introduction

The following paper summarises the responses that were received to the School's consultation on financial sustainability. The consultation period ran for a period of 30 calendar days from 3rd February to 4th March 2016.

A total of 29 responses were received. Of these:

- 10 were from individuals and 19 were from groups (teams/departments/unions)
- 12 were from academic staff/teams, 15 were from professional staff/teams, and 2 were from unions (UCU and the SOAS Students' Union)
- 5 were from FAH, 5 from FLC, 4 from LSS, 12 from PS, and 3 were "other" (institutes and unions)

Responses varied in length from a few lines to 16 pages. A copy of all the responses has been shared with the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board.

This paper provides a summary of the main themes that were covered in the responses. (Further detail is provided in the full set of responses shared with the Programme Board.)

The responses have been categorised as follows:

A. Comments on the overall document
   1. Vision and strategy for SOAS
   2. 5% surplus target and timeframe for achieving savings
   3. Vernon Square
   4. Philanthropy

B. Comments on specific areas of SOAS
   5. Research and Enterprise
   6. Languages
   7. Language Centre
   8. Professional services, central costs and administrative support
   9. Library and Information Services
  10. Distance Learning

C. Comments on School-wide areas
   11. Restructuring
   12. Staffing
   13. Portfolio
   14. Planning and Financial Model

D. Ideas for the future
   15. Suggestions for growth
   16. Suggestions for savings

E. Specific comments on detailed proposals
A. Comments on the overall document

1. Vision and strategy for SOAS

Many of the responses commented on the lack of a shared vision and strategy for the School in the consultation document, saying that it is hard to consider financial sustainability without understanding the School's strategy.

- There is no overarching vision of SOAS to inform these plans
- We desperately need a shared academic/intellectual vision for the whole School.
- The sustainability of SOAS as an independent institution must depend in some measure upon the extent to which it has a distinctive profile and mission. If this continues to be eroded and diluted, as it has been over the past 15 years or so, questions will inevitably arise about its raison d'etre.
- Staff and students alike are concerned about a broader vision for the school, in which the role of regional expertise based on linguistic competence remains at the core of our activities, and political, economic and other (national and global) strategic considerations drive our academic choices.
- 'Financial Sustainability at SOAS' omits a strategic vision and this is a flaw. Sustainability has to be seen in a wider context, with teaching and research central to any financial strategy.
- I understand the document was a working document, intended for consultation, but it came across as a collection of ideas rather than the unified vision that I understood it was to be. For many years now I have seen Executive Board and Senior Management confused about the direction the school was to take. Should we be 'small and specialised' or grow and drop admissions standards in order to attract more students? The school is being held back by an inability to answer this question and articulate a clear vision for the future.
- The proposals set out in the 'Consultation on Financial Sustainability' are not framed by an assertion of the School's academic mission that underpin efforts to ensure the School's long-term sustainability. It is not possible to achieve financial sustainability in isolation from academic sustainability, or without a strong sense of the School's wider purpose.
- The document needs to have a clearer idea where the School is heading strategically. The Dept. would like to have strategic indications and asks the following questions: What is it that the vision that the sustainability plan is planning to implement? What is the strategy to implement it? What do we expect our students to come out with after their degrees? The Sustainability plan only addresses financial considerations.

2. 5% surplus target and timeframe for achieving savings

Just under a quarter of the responses referenced the 5% surplus, with a number questioning the level of the surplus to be achieved (thinking that a smaller surplus would be sufficient).

- We agree with the need to achieve a 5% surplus
- The 5% surplus the school seeks is a recommendation, but not a requirement, from national bodies. A 2 or 3% surplus would suffice for our needs and put less pressure on cutting essential things that would weaken our “product"
• The rationale for setting 5% surplus target was noted [by the Departments]… but in view of the fact that this does not represent the sector’s average, and that setting this target may result in staff cuts to limit the shortfall, it was perceived to be relatively harsh and potentially damaging in the long term

• We feel that the insistence upon the achievement of a 5% surplus within a short period of time is not necessary and is ultimately damaging… To generate surpluses of 5% may be desirable, but also too ambitious, and a more modest target would be reasonable, achievable and consistent with the sector mean of 3.9%.

• In the absence of a clear and consistent rationale, a target surplus of 5% seems arbitrary; why, for instance, not set our target in line with the sector average?

• Several members of the Department have queried the assumption that 5% surplus is ‘industry standard’. It is suggested that the North Block / Vernon Square investments and revaluations should be excluded from the calculations…As a small institution SOAS should be expected to remain below surplus average.

Several responses questioned the timeframe for achieving savings:

• Taken in the context of lower surpluses across the sector and the School’s recent financial performance, it would seem wise for the School to consider extending the period over which a larger surplus is achieved and to set more modest surplus targets for 2017/18. The stated timeframe does not provide meaningful opportunities for growth given the time it will take to design, resource and market new degrees and courses, or to improve the attractiveness of existing offers. Moreover, achieving this in the context of staff cuts, with increased workloads for those remaining, makes this look even more ambitious and less achievable.

• Even if a 5% surplus is desirable it is highly ambitious considering surpluses achieved in recent years and we consider the timeframe for achieving such a surplus highly unrealistic given the time taken to design, resource and market new degrees and courses.

3. Vernon Square

A number of responses commented on the omission of Vernon Square from the consultation document, and wanted to know about the future plans for the building and the impact this may have on financial sustainability.

• The plans make no mention of plans for the future of the Vernon Square campus. Presumably this is because we are not dealing with the capital budget in this document. But this silence begs many questions, and the current situation should be explained

• There has been a lack of foresight in the School’s planning given that we are less than six months away from the move to SHNB and there still appears to be significant uncertainty about whether VS will be kept, if it will continue to be used for teaching, etc.

• Why is there no talk about generating money from Vernon Square, either as short-term office lets, or (better) as student and visiting academics accommodation? What is the plan for Vernon Square?

• We were verbally reassured that negotiations on a productive utilisation of Vernon Square are under way, but the document made no mention of this, which raised concerns. The potential for income generation from VS should perhaps be considered as one strategic priority.
• The fate of Vernon Square needs clarification and it would be helpful to brief staff as to the possible outcomes under consideration.

• The omission Vernon Square from the document was a mistake. The fact that Vernon Square will not bring in the significant cash injection that was at one time envisioned should at least have been mentioned.

• Where does Vernon Square fit in? Why are the costs for developing VS and the anticipated profit not calculated in the Sustainability plan? Student accommodation is a major issue in being able to take advantage of our London location.

4. Philanthropy

A number of responses believed that there were opportunities to raise money through philanthropy, thereby reducing the need to cut costs.

• The plans contain no financial targets or goals for philanthropic fundraising, which is a key activity of the Institutes, working in close collaboration with the Development Office.

• Why is there no talk of philanthropy? What are the fund-raising objectives for the centenary?

• Fundraising targets are lacking in the document. Challenges to fundraising in the present global and local context were noted by the director, but their absence in this strategic document is in stark contrast to the setting of targets for equally difficult-to-control factors such as overseas or PG recruitment.

• With the decrease in government HEFCE funding that SOAS will experience, there is a growing need for private funding of courses and positions in order to secure their permanency. Private funding is a strategy that SOAS should embrace vigorously. Our Dept. already has several posts, endowed by various communities.

B. Comments on specific areas of the School

5. Research and Enterprise

Some responses commented that the financial proposals focused on growth through new teaching programmes without considering research and enterprise.

• Is research income not part of the picture?

• I don’t see any investment for the item on "support for increasing research income" - is that covered by the IT systems already set up? What about support for academics in forthcoming REF to secure future research funding?

• There is no mention of enterprise as a potential source of additional income for the School – this should be included and refer to the ongoing enterprise review and resulting business plan / strategy which will set key objectives and financial targets.

• The emphasis of the Financial Sustainability Consultation document is on Faculty Plans that have been constructed around projections of student numbers and associated staffing requirements. As such the emphasis is slanted towards teaching. This emphasis is understandable given that fee income is the largest source of revenue and the planning process is designed to ensure that we have enough staff.
to cover our teaching obligations. Yet, SOAS has always been a research-intensive university and we rightly aspire to being world leading in our research areas.

- It would be good to see mention of enterprise developing things like the summer school, short courses and consultancies to generate income for SOAS and raise the profile of the school. The short courses and summer schools are mentioned in individual faculty plans, so REO support could be mentioned (under faculty support?)
- Although research output will not immediately impact on the Sustainability programme, its benefits in the long-term are inestimable and thus this aspect of strategy cannot be ignored…Successful research funding projects have the potential to bring significant finances to the Dept.
- Given the large share of fee income in total income, it is easy to overlook the key role that research plays in helping us generate revenue from 4 sources (the last of which is via teaching): 1) Research income from the REF and research grants; 2) Research and enterprise income – leading universities in terms of research income are also leading in terms of consultancy and enterprise income; 3) Research reputation and standing has a positive impact on development income and donations; 4) Research reputation feeds into league tables and these rankings affect our ability to recruit the best students and staff, and our ability to charge enhanced fees
- No mention is made of improving the school's REF performance under 'academic support'. This is clearly a priority that should be added.

Responses included ideas for growth in the areas of research and enterprise:

- There is scope to increase income from the growing Summer School, both directly from enrolments but perhaps more importantly from recruitment onto Masters courses as a direct result of positive Summer School experiences
- Increasing relevant partnerships with key institutions should be a really important part of a growth plan. Those partnerships should be carefully selected and have their own 'business plan' with clear objectives.
- Partnering with employers or external organisations when designing and developing courses would help ensure courses are relevant and also provide useful links for placements, internships etc. Opportunities such as Higher Level Degree apprenticeships could also be a way of increasing student numbers on specific degree courses and also building partnerships with leading organisations.
- We should consider strategic options to enhance our research activity, such as the creation of one 3-year SOAS Centenary Post-Doctoral Research Fellowship (6 hours per week tutorial teaching and no admin) for each Department in our Centenary year.

6. Languages

Some responses commented on the importance of languages, whilst recognising that language study should not be made compulsory for all students.

- We welcome the emphasis on language learning as being central to the academic vision of the school. We also recognise that it is impractical and probably undesirable to make language learning compulsory for all students.
- We recognise that languages and culture are differentiators for SOAS, and agree with the cross-subsidy, however we feel that there should be limits to the level of subsidy provided. We believe that language skills are very important for
employability, and that students should have an opportunity to study modern culture and language, not just ancient texts.

- Compulsory language training for all students is obviously not feasible, but on the other hand SOAS should not be producing too many monolingual graduates. Language skills have been shown time and again to greatly enhance student employability. Perhaps basic proficiency in a SOAS language could be established as a third ‘desirable’ UG key skill. This need not involve language training, if it could be something the student brought with them to SOAS, assessed internally along the lines of the late lamented ‘asset language’ schools programme.

Some responses included suggestions for more joint programmes:

- I suggest that all UG students entering SOAS should be offered the choice between a three-year degree or a four year variant of that degree that includes language study and a period of study abroad.

- One area for growth is providing better structuring and support for joint ‘language and another subject’ programmes. Students can currently take language + another subject joint degrees, however many combinations have very low numbers and others which are more popular are not very well organised (e.g. difficulties students face in belonging to two different departments). Growth could be encouraged by streamlining the more popular options, providing better administration and support, and marketing these more effectively.

- When the School goes into clearing, should we consider offering combined degrees with languages rather than places on single subject degrees that are already over-subscribed?

There were also suggestions for increasing “internal growth” for language study:

- The proposal lacked a fully costed plan demonstrating how ‘internal growth’ (i.e. creating a market for language courses internally within the School, for example through the new PG credit framework) might be financially successful

- We feel that a school policy is necessary to ensure that the opportunity to study a language is available to PGT and UG students. We have long felt that while many of our degrees are purposefully constructed to encourage students to take options from across the school, this is not the case with all departments. If the School is to fully embrace the importance of the study of the region in its academic mission, we would appreciate a definite policy, which encouraged cross department/faculty cooperation rather than discouraging it. A simple device like a webpage listing all region-specific modules available would make a difference.

- We would welcome the opportunity to cooperate more with other departments in the School to think about how our language provision meets the needs of the widest possible cohort of students, with their variety of learning backgrounds and needs. We also teach non-language region specific courses which make a necessary contribution to the diversity of the School’s interdisciplinary curricula and have the potential for growth across faculties with infrastructural input toward greater visibility.

Other comments about language provision at SOAS include:

- Language specific degree titles should be maintained and not replaced with a generic title;
• The Language Entitlement Programme should be discontinued as of next session. The presence in the class room of students who often do not have the time to be fully committed to the course, who do not hand in home work and attend irregularly is detrimental to the whole. The LEP also doesn't seem to help our recruitment as some student now take languages ‘on the cheap' when they might have registered for them. With the reduction in class contact hours in our language modules, all available time and effort by the teachers should be devoted to those students who are registered and provide us with income.

• There is little student support for decreasing language provision.

7. Language Centre

A number of responses questioned the omission of the Language Centre from the financial consultation document, feeling that it should be considered as part of an overall plan for the sustainability of languages at SOAS.

• The absence of discussion on the future of the Language Centre and/or Ifcels was raised as a glaring omission from the proposal. There was general disbelief that a document purporting to discuss the School’s sustainability could do so effectively without including what were seen as key components of this discussion.

• We are particularly concerned about the excision of the Language Centre from financial planning, given that it was created precisely to spread the teaching of languages to a wider public and strategically protect the teaching of languages at SOAS through a wider market. As such, the absence of consideration of the centre in this planning process is emblematic of the wider issues with the present lack of a clear institutional vision and strategy. We also have a significant number of members in the Language Centre in various states of contractual precarity, a fact which should be addressed as part of the School’s commitment to anti-casualisation. These members deserve recognition as contributing strongly to the School’s historic mission.

• We are alarmed that the Language Centre has been excluded from discussion within this consultation document; not only because of the need to assess its impact on the School’s finances but also to consider its importance to the School’s academic mission of language learning, teaching and research

• There is no clarity on differences between the language courses provided by the Language Centre and those provide by the LCU Faculty

• I understand the Language Centre plan will be released in the coming months but feel that an opportunity was missed to discuss a vital part of the school's identity in conjunction with the sustainability document.

• Is the Language Centre review tackling sustainability?

Some responses felt that the Language Centre could be further integrated into the School and developed further:

• We believe that the Language Centre could be a great asset to SOAS, and there should be a strategy for the Language Centre that is integrated with the School’s strategy. This strategy should include teaching SOAS students who want exposure to a language outside of their degree programme, and also teaching external language learners as part of out-of-hours provision.
• Bring the language centre into the University, with language centre units counting as half-units that students from L&SS can do as “language-lite” options.
• Language Centre to work with Marketing – remove Language Centre ‘Multiplier’
• Could Vernon Square, as it is for education only, be used for an expanded Language Centre, offering short and longer courses as well as using the SOAS name overseas to undertake English Language teaching? Bringing scores of teenagers in from overseas to take Summer School English courses might bring in some revenue. IFCELS offer some of this already but with some backing could be expanded.

8. Professional Services, central costs and administrative support

A number of responses commented on the imbalance between Faculties and Professional Services in the document, with only two pages for the latter.

• In this document faculties and departments are subjected to detailed financial scrutiny while the financial plan for Professional Services runs to a total of 2 pages in a 42-page document, and contains very little specific information, despite the fact that the cost of Professional Services amounts to roughly 50% of the costs of the whole School.
• The professional services section of the consultation document is only two pages long and has been described as an ‘afterthought’. As the section is minimal, members found it difficult to engage with the three very broad questions that end the section.
• I am concerned that professional services are seen as taking very little “hit”, in comparison with the faculties…This will not help with the perception that management and PS are growing at the expense of other crucial sections.
• The Professional Services plans do not mention growth and are notably less detailed than the Faculty plans.
• Members in professional services are aware that they are seen as a ‘cost’ and in a sense the sustainability document does not improve that image.

Some responses questioned the growth in “central costs” and felt that the increase in estates costs was at the expense of staff jobs. Other responses believed that the conflation of central non-staff costs and professional services costs creates misunderstanding:

• It was a matter of general frustration that the only area targeted for cost savings is academic salaries, while central costs are set to soar.
• There was considerable concern over the projected increase of £4.8 million in central costs over the 3 year period. Furthermore it seems to be the only segment of SOAS that is set to be ring-fenced.
• The Dept. queries the need for what appears to be a very top-heavy administrative structure.
• The increase in costs for central services at 20% appears very generous, when placed against a 16% increase in the wage bill for academic staff.
• The high central costs are predicated on estimates of the move to Senate House North block. Though we are aware of the need for a campus fit for excellence in
teaching and research, we take issue with an approach that prioritises physical capital over human capital. Surpluses generated for present estate projects and aspirational investment should not come at the expense of teaching and research jobs.

- Conflation of rising central costs and professional services wages creates misunderstanding. It was pointed out that in IT, Library and Student Services non-staff costs can result in increased central costs and this can result in misunderstanding. A clear exposition of increased central costs would clarify that those in professional services are not ‘benefiting’ at the expense of faculty members.

Some responses felt that professional services should also make savings.

- The professional services make no attempt to identify savings. This is ridiculous and disrespectful toward the other sections. It is not good enough for the cost of professional services to be average for the sector in a time of belt tightening.

- We recognise the important role that Professional Services play and will continue to play in the functioning of the school. Marketing, Fundraising and Recruitment, working for all departments in the School is obviously of crucial importance if we are to meet aspirations for growth. However, the document is notable for its emphasis on the academic side of the school, with comparatively little attention to how the Professional Services can also operate more efficiently, with resultant saving.

- The Dept. recommends that there be a strategic overview of many of these services. It does recognize the fundamental roles played by services—and does not endorse a ‘them and us’ attitude to administration– but asks that further review be implemented for streamlining administrative staff.

Others agreed that there was limited scope for further savings in support staff across the School.

- It does not come as a surprise to read that there is limited scope for further savings in support staff costs across the institution.

- Page 8 of the document states that SOAS is 84th out of 160 in terms of support staff costs. How does this correlate with student satisfaction? Is being mid-table in an institution of our size desirable? If feedback for the level of SOAS admin and support is generally bad then surely investments should be made.

Some responses agreed with the professional services priorities outlined in the document, whereas others felt that the additional investment in marketing would be better spent on research and teaching to attract high quality students.

- We agree that investment is needed in Professional Services in order to improve the student experience, and we like the priority areas identified under Student Recruitment.

- As the majority of our income is from student fees, then marketing, conversion and student experience should be prioritised.

- There was broad agreement that the key ‘priority’ areas for investment in professional services did need extra support (Student Recruitment; Student Experience; Academic Support; IT/Systems). Timetabling and Advice and Well-being were also mentioned specifically. It would be useful to have further clarification on what is included within the broad term ‘IT/Systems’.
The priorities laid out in the Professional Services proposals do not align closely with the investment we feel needs to take place (including in mental health services, accommodation and financial support), and it is not clear how the identified ‘priority areas’ correspond to the ‘investment’.

No mention is made of improving the school’s REF performance under ‘academic support’. This is clearly a priority that should be added.

S responses commented on the relationship between Professional Services and academics:

- We are constantly having increased demands placed on us as academics and the new professional services departments and directorates do not take work away but add more work. Members feel they are near to breaking point already before any new cuts come into effect.

- Many of the activities identified in the Sustainability paper as Professional Services priorities over the next three years – including work on marketing, student recruitment and retention, the student experience, curriculum reform and the revision of administrative processes – to which, the paper says, further resources will be transferred, are things that academic staff are already doing, with the support of a Project Officer.

- Appropriate and sustained administrative support is considered to be an indispensable condition to the realisation of these plans [for growth]. This has been intermittent in the past, and academic staff have borne the brunt of unexpected changes in administrative assistance.

- Academics are increasingly being asked to take responsibility for tasks for which there is a central budget (e.g. marketing and recruitment, IT, pastoral care), yet this is not recognised in the financial planning.

- Members in Professional Services would like to have more effective liaison and co-ordination with academics which can vary from department to department. It was recognised that Student Recruitment, Careers, Human Resources and other Professional Services can increase academic workloads rather than alleviate them. More work needs to be done to ensure that any strategy that emerges does not exacerbate any tensions that have emerged through the ‘sustainability’ dialogue.

Some responses questioned the relationship of Faculty administration staff to Professional Services:

- Are Faculty Office staff considered as ‘Professional Services’?

- Many of the activity areas identified as Professional Service priorities over the next three years are things that the Faculty Administration Team is heavily involved in.

Some had questions about the resourcing of Faculty administration to meet the proposed growth in student numbers, and whether there would be a shift away from Faculty administrative staff to a more central provision for student support:

- It was noted that there is no mention of administrative staff anywhere in the document. If growth in student numbers/programmes/courses is planned, how will this growth be supported without also increasing administrative staff? What are the extra costs in terms of workload, and what effect will this have on student experience in the long term?
- If growth [from new programmes] is to be achieved while simultaneously improving the student experience, further demands are going to be placed on the Faculty Administration Team…The question of resourcing of the Faculty administration will need to be carefully considered.

- The potential impact of the HUB on Faculty administration is currently unknown. We wait to see what effect the HUB will have on Faculty staffing and workload.

- Will there be a shift away from recruiting Faculty administrative staff in favour of new appointments in ‘Central Services’? What are the implications of this for the workloads of existing admin staff?

- There is an opportunity to improve Student Services by bringing the Student Support staff currently distributed around the Faculties, into Academic Services in a “central provision, local delivery” model.

9. **Library and Information Services**

There was some concern about savings from LIS being used to fund other areas of Professional Services and a desire to see more detail about the proposed cost savings:

- The plans for PS savings seem disproportionate to LIS/Estates.

- Stating that the investment [in PS priority areas] will be funded by transferring funds from other service areas without any detail about how that is proposed, or assessment of the impact, is not a viable plan and is divisive.

- I think cutting 700k from LIS in 2-3 years would have a horribly detrimental effect on our services to all of SOAS, that's thousands of people, students and staff, and badly affect external users as well, for which we have a mandated duty. I think we need smarter people in marketing and recruitment and not necessarily more.

- I think we can make some savings over a longer time frame but the figure should be much less, like 200-300k.

Concern was expressed about the level of savings required from the Library and the impact that this would have on both the student experience and the School’s NRL status:

- The Library is clearly a priority for students and therefore we are deeply concerned by proposals to transfer up to £700,000 from LIS to fund the Professional Services priority areas. Not only do we believe that this would risk damaging the academic experience of students, but it could also threaten the Library’s research status, which we understand to be worth £650,000 as well as having an obvious reputational benefit.

- If services or staff are cut in LIS this will negatively affect ALL staff and students in the school as well as external users of our services. If we cut it will make it harder to recruit students, especially in today's age when news of negative effects of cuts will spread fast and easily through social media etc. If we cut in LIS the 'quality of student experience' will suffer and affect ALL students not a much smaller number if we, for instance, cut a course (sad as that may be it would affect far less people).

- To [make significant cuts to the LIS budget] in the next 2-3 years would have a detrimental effect on services to all of SOAS. It would jeopardize the National Research status of the School Library and the substantial funding linked to it. It would be better if savings were made over a longer time frame.
• Responses to the NSS and the Library Vision & Strategy consultation indicate that access to high-quality learning resources, library materials and study spaces are a major element of the student experience, for which LIS is largely responsible and has good scores. The proposal to transfer funds from the LIS budget will place primary functions at risk, leading to a loss of services and service quality with the consequent impact upon student satisfaction. Improvement of the Student Experience cannot be a zero-sum game.

• It is unclear how transferring funds out of the LIS budget is necessary to invest in priority areas, given the number of these areas that are already LIS responsibilities for which activities (and budgets) are planned and allocated. There are considerable risks associated with cuts on this scale, as the LIS budget has few areas of discretionary spend. We have attached a budget analysis which includes a discussion of what might be available as quick wins, medium-term and long-term savings.

There was some feeling that the role that LIS could play in future growth and development was not taken into account in the sustainability plans:

• The Professional Services plans do not mention growth. LIS for example generates cash income and is considering plans to increase this income. The HEFCE National Library Grant (£650,000) does not appear to have been taken into account.

• It is unclear whether SOAS values the status that derives from hosting the National Research Library for Asia, Africa and the Middle East and the benefit this asset delivers to students, staff, and visiting researchers. There does not appear to be an appreciation of the potential that the Library and associated services have in attracting students to SOAS and supporting the Student Experience; nor any mention of the strong relationship between the SOAS Library and the Brunei Gallery.

• The School is looking to LIS to deliver its digital future in the form of new digital platforms, storage, management and preservation of its digital resources. Cutting resource to this extent will not enable us to deliver this agenda.

Concern was raised about potential cuts to IT:

• We are very worried about Outsourcing our IT services. Outsourcing has already happened in Estates/Post Room and we don’t want to see this trend continuing. It was mentioned in a meeting that we should think of ways of saving money and that perhaps there were some services or software that could be scrapped or replaced? Our IT department has always invested well and we always seem to operate on a tight budget.

Some responses felt that there should be further investment in LIS, not cuts:

• I think we should invest much more in LIS, so we can do a lot more for those paying a great deal. Like having some staffed services on sundays, like having a professional librarian on the enquiry desk till 7pm in the evening term-time. Like building an offsite store nearby. Like having full cataloguing on all our holdings.

• The Dept. endorses boosting funding for IT, given the role assumed by www.soas.ac.uk in acting as the ‘Face of SOAS’ to the outside world. IT needs additional investment, which would have ramifications for recruitment and outreach for the Dept. and SOAS.
Some responses made suggestions for savings:

- SOAS employs professional full time staff members to re-shelve library books and staff the library circulation desk. At many of the best universities internationally (e.g. Harvard and UC Berkeley) these routine library roles are carried out by undergraduates. Not only are undergraduates cheaper, but by making funding available to undergraduates in this way we improve the undergraduate experience, chances of successful completion, etc.

- Some improvement could be made in regard to charging for Multimedia and Print Services. A large proportion of technician time and department resources is spent providing a variety of support and services to customers who occupy a graduated grey space between “Internal” and “External” customers. There is no guidance or clear charging procedure for the team to follow, our own (historical) hourly flat rate needs to be reviewed, and there is no official way to grade how much is fair or appropriate to charge a client or customer (if at all).

10. Distance Learning

Several responses commented on Distance Learning and made suggestions for improvement.

- The Department recognises the potential of Distance Learning programmes
- We agree with the proposed savings for distance learning identified in the consultation document.
- The cost savings plans for Distance Learning are completely flawed. Course materials are never provided in hard copy alone. All materials are provided electronically and in hard copy.
- Devolving DL student support to DL Centres would reduce the cost of DLA. The cost of running DLA via registry could be reduced by devolving it to Departments/Centres thus streamlining a dual and overlapping governance structure and improving its efficiency.
- We note there are a number of proposals in the Faculty sections for more distance learning. It would be helpful to adopt a single model for Distance Learning that is compatible with the wider School so that distance learning is not operating in a silo. The School also needs to ensure that the distance learning models are able to produce a surplus before expanding distance learning provision further. Robust business cases should be developed for future distance learning.
- When students defer Distance Learning modules (which happens often) we pay DHL a lot of money to send them new sets of course material; but we do not receive any extra income as a result of deferrals.

C. Comments on School-wide areas

11. Restructuring

There were a number of comments about the need for restructuring, especially related to the abolition of Faculties. Some of the responses suggested that there were tensions between
individual Departments and Faculties, with the Departments feeling that the Faculties were ignoring their needs and aspirations.

- I’m astounded to see no mention of the abolition of Faculties. This would simultaneously reduce our costs and get rid of an intolerable academic burden, which contributed greatly to our poor REF results. I cannot understand why this is not being treated as an absolute priority.

- We need to know how much Faculties are costing the School, including indirect costs, such as light teaching loads and special leave for Associate Deans.

- The Faculty system has sometimes created something of a silo culture – defensiveness of individual budgets rather than thinking about how cooperation and team-teaching across faculties might generate more growth for the school generally.

- There is often limited knowledge of what the other departments really do, particularly in other faculties. Would a system of large schools help to overcome this rather unfortunate and entrenched culture? As Departments based on Area Studies, we have long regretted the difficulties and obstacles the School’s structures and Financial models pose to cross-departmental Area Studies.

- Some members argue that the restructuring or abolition of faculties should be part of any strategic plan for cost savings.

- It is well-known that proposals are circulating for a move from the current Faculty/Department structure to six or eight large departments. The potential efficiency gains through the abolition of the Faculties has not been addressed

- A shift from Faculties to strong Departments would lead to savings in Faculty costs.

- Getting rid of the faculty structure would enhance effective collaboration in teaching and research across the School.

- Staff [at the department level] do not feel that their proposals and activities are always recognised and supported by the Faculty. The fact that planning and activity is mediated by the Faculty before it reaches the level of the School means that (i) getting things done is harder and (ii) things that have been accomplished or are ongoing [at the department level] are overlooked at School-level.

Some responses made suggestions for any future restructure:

- It’s vital that Faculties be not replaced by Schools, as this would simply add the costs of transferring from one dysfunctional structure to another.

- From my experience on two RAE assessment panels, I can assure you that we need to have a departmental structure as closely aligned as possible with the REF 2021 structures. For example, to turn the Faculty of Languages and Cultures into one large Department might well make sense from this perspective, whereas some of the suggested mergers between existing Departments would be to court disaster.

- Because they stand outside the faculty structure, Institutes are the logical homes for cross-faculty PGT Area Studies programmes. Any discussion of future structures should consider the possibility of the Institutes providing convenorship/ intellectual leadership for these programmes.
12. Staffing

Some responses raised concerns about the impact on both academic and professional staff workloads from growth and staff savings:

- While the departments accept that growth in student numbers is desirable overall, increases in the staff-student ratio in the larger language departments, due to the labour-intensive nature of language training and already large numbers in our programmes, are not without their challenges. This applies to staff workloads but it also affects the student experience, NSS results, student retention, and has additional potential implications for the impending TEF.

- The document does not recognize that demand by both students and academic staff on professional services will increase rather than decrease over the coming years and that Professional Services play a key role in meeting student satisfaction criteria.

- We expect there to be growth across Learning and Teaching Development as demand for our services grows and with the introduction of the TEF. A SOAS Institute for Innovation, Learning and Teaching would have modest cost implications, but would address some of these issues and could really put SOAS on the map for its excellent learning and teaching within our distinctive subject areas.

- For both Summer School and enterprise activity growth generally there are staffing implications and the teams looking after these areas would need to increase in order to manage the increasing workload, while still ensuring a good level of profitability.

- Any loss of job or position through voluntary redundancy or severance will have implications for the working conditions of staff that remain.

Some responses raised concerns about the impact on GTAs and fractional staff:

- We welcome protection for GTAs but are also seeking suitable permanent contracts for teaching and senior teaching fellows with fractions that accurately reflect the work carried out over a number of years (four being the legal maximum for conversion to becoming permanent).

- We recognise the need for saving, but there is a concern that if the GTA budget is reduced completely, then PhD students will cease to receive a very important aspect of their training, which is in the end essential to their future employability.

- Proposals for cuts to fractional budgets, especially teaching and senior teaching fellow positions, are especially worrying. We would welcome the replacement of such positions with secure and permanent posts. However, proposals put forward as part of sustainability could result in the termination of the contracts of a large number of already precariously employed staff with little prospect of redeployment. Furthermore, proposals to reduce fractional budgets by consolidating tutorials into hybrid lecture/seminar arrangements, already under way in several departments, have the potential to add to the unpaid work of fractional staff. The implications of these proposals for teaching quality, casualisation, and the financial precarity of staff must be carefully considered.

- The strategy outlined entails widespread cuts to fractional budgets, which will result in more crowded classrooms and increased marking burdens for individual teachers. What are the risks associated with this, given the need for student retention and satisfaction especially in the context of the imminent Teaching Excellence Framework?
• Several of our smaller languages have been taught by contract staff in the absence of established positions, thus already running on a shoestring; if further cuts target the contract staff, then entire languages will disappear at one stroke, not necessarily in the most strategic fashion.

Some responses made suggestions about shifting the School’s culture:
• Culture shift – academics accepting responsibility and accountability and being held to account
• Accept SOAS is a commercial business and require business/commercial acumen skills for all staff especially managers, academics and budget holders
• Think with the head and not with the heart, e.g. J4C and catering. Generally apply a more business like professional approach
• Design and deliver business/commercial acumen skills development

Some responses made specific suggestions for improving HR and HR Practice sustainability:
• Cut spending on catering, flights, hotels and other travel costs relating to attendance at interviews
• Cut spending on recruitment agencies and adverts
• Use Agencies to recruit instead of managers
• Review market rate supplements/Review terms and conditions e.g. do we still need retention allowances?
• Relocation review
• Improve succession planning to inform workforce planning
• Tighter process for external course funding
• Get the most and best from staff through effective and meaningful performance management
• Introduce performance related pay
• Be proactive about problem solving using HR data, e.g. turnover issues
• Review the need for consultants
• Leave managers out of salary assessments
• Review academic sick leave

13. Portfolio

Several responses mentioned the School’s portfolio of programmes and curriculum reform. While some responses recognised the need for reform, concern was expressed about the risk of losing the distinctiveness of SOAS:
• From a strategic perspective, it is important for the School to focus on the things that it does best (which also means stopping doing other things) so that finite resources such as marketing can be used to best effect. We believe that any proposed new programmes should be reviewed in light of existing programmes, and that decisions should be taken to close programmes instead of just opening new ones. The total cost (including opportunity cost) of new programmes should be calculated, and a required minimum recruitment target agreed to ensure that the new programmes are cost effective.
• We need to ensure that the distinctiveness of SOAS is not lost through cost savings (e.g. by merging modules in FLC).
• While recognising the need for some rationalisation of the course portfolio to make better use of existing resources, I think we must also be extremely cautious about homogenising our offering to too great an extent. This runs the risk of reducing our institutional distinctiveness and losing yet another competitive edge.

• In the context of an increasingly volatile higher education market, it seems absurd to erode one of SOAS’ key unique selling points [regional expertise and languages]. Doing so would surely make SOAS degree programmes less attractive to prospective students and would significantly weaken our reputation and standing within wider academic and research focused communities.

• We recognise the need to curriculum reform. However, we are also aware of the possible damage that might be done to our reputation and also the appeal of our degrees if the curriculum becomes too general and the regional specificity is removed. The negotiation of this for 1st year curriculum still needs thought.

14. Planning and Financial Model

Several responses commented on the School’s planning processes, both in terms of the financial sustainability plans and the planning process in general.

• The framing of the discussion as a question of “financial sustainability” and the tripartite, faculty-specific account of plans, growth projections and saving measures, along with the notion of ‘cross-subsidy’, effectively constrains and distorts the discussion on possible future plans.

• The relationship of Sustainability planning to departmental and Faculty annual planning needs clarification. It seems now that at School level Sustainability planning has superseded the regular planning cycle, which means that actions in the [Department] and Faculty Annual Plan Updates for which the support of other parts of the School was requested have been neglected.

• The failure to follow plans and honour resource commitments is systemic and routine. Moreover, increased numbers and workloads do not produce even the resources already planned-for and agreed. On the contrary, the department is instead told that in order to secure needed and previously planned-for resources we must agree to further increases, effectively punishing us for our success.

• Evident over time is a pattern of failure on the part of the School to keep its commitments to us, or indeed to itself, in the form of sticking to plans once agreed. The result, unsurprisingly, is that colleagues have become increasingly sceptical about the School’s planning processes, with the consequence that willingness and motivation to undertake further entrepreneurial efforts is undermined. Lack of planned-for and agreed support risks deterring staff from proposing other ideas that might generate increased revenue in the future.

• Consistently unclear management and financial structures have put [our programme] in an unnecessarily precarious position, and dangerously compromise its existing and future contribution to the School’s sustainability.

• I feel that the direction for setting student recruitment targets is currently wrong. At the moment it appears that we predict a future budget; give Faculties the task of planning how to plug any shortfalls in this budget by proposing increased student numbers; and then pass on to Marketing/Student Recruitment the problem of how to implement this plan. I would have thought the direction of the drivers in this decision process should be reversed. Firstly, Market Research should be undertaken to
decide what recruitment targets are viable, and in what areas; these should then be
passed to the Faculties for the implementation of the necessary courses; and then a
budget be established based on these figures. Past years have shown there is little
correlation between student targets predicted by Faculty Plans and actual
recruitment targets. While these figures remain at variance any anticipated budget
(and all the activities the School can either do, or not do, based on it) must remain
largely guesswork.

Some responses commented on the financial model:

- **Within three years [our successful] department is projected to be in deficit. This
  reversal of financial fortune is attributable to factors mostly beyond our immediate
  control, in particular increased space costs, central services costs, inter-faculty
  cross-subsidy, and ‘target surplus adjustment’ (the latter two of which are not a cost).
  We are thus being told, in effect, to run faster in order to go backwards.**

- **Income generated from our degree is being used to cross-subsidise a range of other
  programmes. Diverting student fees [from our programme] is not a sustainable
  solution to poor recruitment for these programmes, and is a flawed model both for
  burden-sharing and growth.**

Suggestions for improvement include:

- **We recommend (1) the development within the School of a functional planning
  environment, one geared to fostering innovation across departments and other units;
  (2) a formal commitment from the School management to follow through on plans for
  new and established programmes once agreed; (3) greater budgetary autonomy at
  the departmental level; (4) an agreed formula for revenue-sharing between
  departments and the School, such that some proportion of surplus income generated
  comes back to departments in a form other than previously planned expenditure; (5)
  a commitment from the School to invest in those areas of the School with a
demonstrated capacity to grow; (6) transparency regarding space costs and central
  costs in each directorate and unit. In particular, these should be predictable in the
  medium term.**

- **Change the structure of the resource allocator, so that faculties or departments
  which have poor BA enrolment, but high course enrolment are not left so exposed.**

- **If enterprise overheads / surplus could go to departments rather than Faculties/ the
  School it would create a more meaningful incentive. Academic staff could also be
  encouraged to waive consultancy fees and allow their departments to receive this
  income to help them build up their financial resources**

- **Provide budget holders with regular spending breakdowns to include things like
  catering costs so they are aware of their spend and challenge unreasonable spend.**

**D. Ideas for the future**

**15. Suggestions for Growth**

A number of ideas were suggested for potential growth. These included building on existing
programmes:
• 2 year Masters programmes with language and a term abroad at a partner institution (similar to our BSc International Management programmes with a year abroad). These could be built on our existing MSc International Management degrees or other subject areas e.g. Law, Economics, Politics, etc.

• Identify opportunities for students to volunteer overseas as part of their degree programmes to help improve employability and attract more students – e.g. providing legal advice, helping with construction projects

• Introduce “big programmes”, especially in the PGT area

• It is better to focus on unit costs and realising economies of scale via investment in one or two large programmes per Department where market size allows

• Another way to change revenue is to vary fees and target high fee revenue. Courses/Departments with the highest fee earning potential should be placed in the best accommodation, as the ability to charge enhanced fees is dependent on the quality of facilities, especially accommodation

Ideas for expanding into new markets were suggested:

• Executive Education

• Expand into new markets such as offering evening classes and/or summer programmes for people who are in employment or retired and who are interested in learning more about Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Some of these courses could be linked to a study trip overseas that is accompanied by an academic.

• Possible areas of growth include capturing the Part Time student market (by scheduling evening lectures) or thinking about compressed teaching such as intensive teaching concentrated into a week

• Run outreach programmes with sixth-form students to raise awareness of SOAS.

Other commercial opportunities were also suggested:

• Senate House North Building. There must be commercial opportunities with the central space outside term time / evenings. Café open to the general public

• A SOAS University Press. Oxford University Press had a turnover of £767m in 2015 and made £91m profit in the same year – more than SOAS’s revenue, thus making a major contribution to Oxford University’s finances.

• The conversion of Vernon Square into subsidised accommodation for PGT and PGT students (and their families) would be an initiative that would have considerable potential and have financial by-products for SOAS. Similarly, affordable accommodation for academic staff could act as a major incentive in attracting world-class staff who are discouraged by the high cost of rental and housing in London. In conjunction with accommodation for PGT/PGT students and academic staff, an ‘in-house’ hotel could be established in Vernon Square to accommodate academic visitors to SOAS.

16. Suggestions for Savings

A number of ideas were suggested for savings:
• Operating costs for the estate are the correct area within professional services to seek savings

• Consider reducing the staffing accommodation requirement by moving to hotdesking and more home working as appropriate. For example, many government departments and indeed commercial companies have enough desks for between 6 to 8 out of 10 staff that works very well.

• Consideration be given to more shared services with the other London colleagues and Universities, eg corporate services like operation finance and HR and facilities as a longer term goal.

• I notice that some high level meetings take place on non-SOAS premises. I suggest consideration be given to moving to a situation where all SOAS business meetings take place on its premises to reduce costs.

• I suggest consideration be given to wine not being served at [induction] events.

• Is there scope for more costs control? I’m thinking of expenses / catering (‘business lunches’) / entertaining / newspaper subscriptions / travel costs. Some of these may be quite trivial, but ‘look after the pennies…’.

• Cut teas, coffees, food from SOAS meetings and events

• Second marking and external marking occurs to me as an obvious place for savings.

• Since we are all strongly in favour of the elimination of double marking, why can this not be implemented for 2016/17 as part of a viable sustainability package?

• Getting rid of SupportWorks (and it’s expensive replacements) installing instead a free replacement Open Source alternative such as ‘OTRS’

• Northgate refund – the modules are not being used

• Temporarily cutting our training budget and putting that towards the shortfall

• Taking a close look at all our Contractors and save on the very high agency costs

• Reduce waste, e.g. paper, time and repeating activities

• As a last resort I’m sure many of us (me included) would take a cut in pay, if such an action guaranteed Job security for the foreseeable future. In this case, how about we add up all of our salaries (school-wide) and take a percentage reduction to cover the £2.2 to 3 million still to address (if these figures are correct)?

E. Specific comments on the detailed proposals

In addition to the main themes outlined above, a number of responses were made to the detailed proposals in the consultation document.

Comments on the overall proposals include:

• There needs to be an Equality Impact Assessment conducted on the proposals, which is necessary in upholding the School’s commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion.

Specific comments on the FAH proposals include:
It was unclear whether the growth outlined in the documented was realistic / achievable or not. Are current plans simply ‘tinkering around the edges’? Have real attempts been made to identify areas which could be decisively cut?

The proposals of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities are unrealistic. Students are not banging down our door for admission, so only a compromise in standards will lead to higher enrolment. New programmes will only dilute the number of applicants to any one programme and will add new administrative burdens.

Something that really stands out is the disparity of student /staff ratios between Faculty of Law and the other two. Yet from Arts & Humanities there is little or no recognition of this, let alone plans to address.

Are the recruitment targets [for new programmes] realistic?

Specific comments on the FLC proposals include:

- The proposals of the Faculty of Languages and Cultures are generally wise, but the efficiencies the FLC proposals identify will only turn into financial savings if they communicate into staff cuts (e.g. letting go of senior teaching fellows). The Faculty should be more realistic about this implication. The department overall supports the proposed areas for growth identified in Annex D, and is indeed engaged in ongoing discussions on their implementation.

- I believe a huge opportunity was missed by the Faculty of Languages and Cultures to place themselves at the centre of the school’s future. I have heard many times that languages should be made mandatory/it should be made easier for any student to take a language as part of their degree programme but now, when the Faculty of Languages and Cultures has a chance to make a proper costed case and attach it to the change in the degree credit framework all that the document contains about it is a mention in the appendices. I feel that this plan should be looked into more closely.

- The staff savings outlined in 5.7.3 to create “more comprehensive” modules would result in a significant transformation in the scope and format of degrees and academic output within the Faculty of Languages and Cultures. It is our contention, that said ‘rationalisation’ would have the effect of producing generic modules that lack the specialism for which SOAS is renowned.

- From the perspective of our Departments many of the changes [identified in Annex D] are already underway. We have already begun the reform of our curriculum, though we recognise that there is more still to be done, and we need to reflect further on the changes already put in place.

- The LSS and A&H faculty make a commitment to employing GTAs in order to provide training opportunities for PhD students and supporting early career researchers. The faculty of L&C section does not have such a commitment which could be an oversight as SOAS has made such a commitment in previous communication.

- The proposals in Annex D on “Curriculum Restructuring” could potentially have a significant impact on the School’s language provision, and consequently student recruitment. Alternating the availability of a language from year to year would have a particular negative effect on the attractiveness of the School to Postgraduate Taught students, which would be ill considered given recent PGT recruitment performance.
The plans are realistic but they are unambitious. We need to think about a “high case” and what is required in terms of investment to get there. There needs to be a feasibility and risk analysis of the plan. Can it be implemented? What are the risks?

Specific comments on the Professional Services proposals include:

- In terms of estates, careful planning of class sizes matched against existing facilities needs to be undertaken in a structured manner to ensure that the estate is capable of accommodating increases in student numbers
- An innovative use of the estate must be considered as part of the Campus Development Programme.
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Executive summary

As part of the wider agenda on sustainability at SOAS, and in the wake of the results of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework, this paper sets out the following draft vision and strategy for research excellence in the School, drawing on the School’s existing Vision and Strategy:

“Our aim is to be the world’s leading institution for research on Asia, Africa & the Middle East, based on deep knowledge of these regions, their international and global interconnections, and a wide range of disciplinary approaches. Through innovative work that engages critically with mainstream discourses and promotes a diversity of perspectives, we aim to shape scholarship across the humanities and social sciences, and promote social benefit worldwide.”

From this core vision, five strategic objectives are identified, together with four underpinning elements. Progress to date on each of these is as follows:

**Strategic objectives**

- **Recognition of excellence**: A REF steering group has been established, including research leads for each discipline; interviews have been scheduled for a new research excellence manager; and a league table working group re-established with research included within its remit. Together, it is hoped that this should provide strong strategic oversight of research excellence in the School, with a focus on REF2020 but also paying attention to other external avenues through which research excellence is formally recognised.

- **Regional engagement**: Our approach to the field of area studies has been reviewed, and a new and more focused engagement is under development, led by our regional institutes. In addition, a strategic partnerships working group has been established to align engagement with each of our regions across research, teaching and outreach. It is hoped to align a bottom-up process of formalizing links involving individual academics and departments with a strategic approach that promotes consistency and coherence.

- **Disciplinary approaches**: Every Unit of Assessment has produced a research strategy and revised this in light of comments in early 2016, and in the case of History and Development Studies, in the light of comments received in an external review. There are examples of ‘good practice’ both in research strategy, and new strategies have been written from scratch for Modern languages & linguistics and Culture & media studies (as well as Area studies, noted above). Each of these units is expected to submit either new or substantially altered groups of staff.

- **Impact on scholarship and learning**: Our impact on scholarship is primarily delivered through research outputs, for which working group has been established to monitor progress. So far, all Departments have proposed mechanisms for review of outputs that include external oversight. The working group will agree a process to be implemented in each discipline by May 2016. A review of outputs currently on SOAS Research Online suggests three-quarters of staff have already produced items for assessment, although not all Departments have yet uploaded all of their publications. However, in disciplines where monographs are important, the number of monographs produced in 2014 and 2015 falls somewhat short of what is needed. It is more difficult to measure our impact on (teaching &) learning, although this is in part delivered through training of PhD students (see below). This is an area we aim to develop over the coming year.

- **Benefits for society**: Over the past year, a newly appointed Impact Officer has developed a School-wide impact strategy, including an Impact Acceleration Fund, impact lunches, and a school-wide impact repository. Most Units of Assessment have
identified a good range of potential impact case studies, although work is needed on unit-level impact strategies, and monitoring of impact. The School’s response to the HE Green Paper has also made clear our commitment to research-informed teaching.

Underpinning elements

- **Benchmarked research income:** Research income has risen ahead of target in 2014-15, with a three-fold increase in the volume of grant applications since the second half of the last REF period, and a 40% increase in the volume secured. Nonetheless, concerns remain about potential future income in some Departments, and the fact that a minority of staff are not currently engaged with external funding activity.

- **High quality early-career training:** Data on PhD completions was still awaited at the time of compilation of this report. There are some concerns around a lower than expected intake of new PhD students in 2015-16 (perhaps reflecting the REF poor results and loss of AHRC funding). However, evidence suggests we remain on track with PhD completions, whilst efforts are ongoing both to secure a continuation of ESRC funding, and to develop one or more international doctoral training partnerships.

- **Proactive research support:** We have improved the quality of support in the research office, introducing universal access to Research Professional with tailored profiles, hosting funder visits, impact lunches, academic staff training, research coffee mornings and drop-in sessions and attendance at Department and Faculty meetings. Whilst work is required to encourage greater engagement with this support, feedback so far is positive and constructive. We have also introduced a new research leave policy. A next key step is the introduction of a Research Management System, for which we are currently considering tenders.

- **Research integrity:** We have worked to roll out a new research ethics policy, and have begun (in early 2016) the roll-out of online training in research integrity.

Across each of these areas, an action list has been developed, which is outlined in section 4.

Richard Black and Silke Blohm

April 2016
Research excellence at SOAS

1. Introduction

This is an exciting time for the School: as we approach our centenary in 2016-17, we aim to make a positive difference in a changing world, through excellent research and teaching and through our profound engagement with Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

In many respects, SOAS research is first rate. Over the past year alone, four of our scholars were elected as Fellows of the British Academy, we secured three prestigious new research awards from the European Research Council totalling over £4 million, and we rose over 50 places in the QS World Rankings. Our work has contributed to positive change, whether amongst the Dalit communities of India or African migrants, or through improved understanding of world religions from Islam and Christianity to Jainism and Zoroastrianism, and world music from the kora to the gamelan.

In particular, we are known around the world for our deep knowledge of the languages, cultures and histories of the regions in which we work, regardless of whether our research is in the humanities or the social sciences. Our researchers engage with original sources whether in archives or in the field; our students are taught to do so too.

Crystalising this desire for research excellence, in 2015 the School’s Academic Board approved a framework strategy around research excellence that included three key strands: world-leading research; a vibrant research environment; and high quality partnerships (see box 1). However, given a disappointing REF result in 2014, Academic Board also specifically asked for a process which would monitor progress towards REF goals (publications, impact, research income) on an annual basis in the Spring, overseen by a School-wide REF steering group chaired by the Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise).

This report constitutes the first report on progress towards research excellence following REF 2014. At present it is impossible to provide some key detail on progress, as our attention has of necessity focused on putting in place essential personnel and mechanisms for such a detailed review to take place. Instead, the following section sets out a core research vision and a series of specific objectives and underlying elements that are broadly aligned with the REF which, if approved, could form the basis for robust monitoring in the future. Following presentation of this vision and strategy in section 2, progress to date is summarised where possible in section 3 and key actions identified in section 4. Annexes provide the reviews provided to date by each Department/UoA, separately for outputs and the wider research and impact strategy.

2. Research excellence vision and strategy: a draft for consultation

An initial difficulty in reviewing progress in the delivery of research excellence is the absence of an accepted vision for what research excellence means at SOAS, and how we believe we can achieve this. For example, although the School’s vision and strategy published in 2012

Box 1: Core research objectives, 2015

1: Produce world-leading research accessible to, and used by academic communities across the world.
   1.1 Produce research publications that demonstrate a major contribution to all of the School’s disciplines
   1.2 Promote research at all levels, including staff, postgraduate and undergraduate students

2: To create a vibrant research environment, including strong engagement in international networks
   2.1 Retain and attract world-leading researchers, producing world leading research and impact

3: High quality partnerships to enhance the School’s strategic research priorities
   3.1 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
   3.2 Develop multi-institution, multi-disciplinary, multi-year research collaborations, with external funding
and looking forward to 2020 contains references to research, talking of our aim to provide a ‘distinctive coverage of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences’, to ‘build high quality undergraduate programmes that are informed by research’, and ‘have an impact on the world’, this vision and strategy does not contain specific reference to a research vision or strategy. In particular, it lacks reference to research excellence, even though the School’s academic reputation is in many respects dependent on the excellence of its research.

To fill this gap, and as a starting point for monitoring in the future the following is suggested as a core research vision for the School:

“Our aim is to be the world’s leading institution for research on Asia, Africa & the Middle East, based on deep knowledge of these regions, their international and global interconnections, and a wide range of disciplinary approaches. Through innovative work that engages critically with mainstream discourses and promotes a diversity of perspectives, we aim to shape scholarship across the humanities and social sciences, and promote social benefit worldwide.”

If accepted, this vision can be distilled into five more specific strategic objectives, as well as four underpinning elements. These are outlined below, together with a brief explanation as to why they have been chosen, and what they mean for the School in practice. Where possible, they are expressed in terms of a quantitative indicator that can be monitored (see box 2); however, the key issue of importance is less the detailed quantitative target, where mentioned, but the overall thrust that each area is core to our research reputation, and in turn for the overall reputation of the School.

**Strategic objectives**

2.1 **Recognition of excellence**

At the core of research excellence is our ability to demonstrate, externally, that our research is excellent. In this context our strategy should be to ensure our research is internationally recognized as outstanding not only for the School as a whole, but also across a range of social science and humanities disciplines, including a focused contribution to Area studies. At present, the School has 13 academic departments, and submitted work for assessment across 10 units in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework, with the second largest submission in the UK respectively in Area studies and Development studies.

It is proposed that we should continue to engage in research in all of these areas, but also develop further areas within the social sciences and humanities if a strong intellectual and business case can be mobilized. Our aim in each sub-panel will be to ensure that we are ranked in the top 25% of all submitted units in REF2020, or within the top five in units where there are less than 20 institutions submitted. In REF 2014, only one Department (Music) met this objective. We also aim to improve our ranking in the QS and THE world surveys, ensuring that greater research excellence contributes to a top-200 position internationally in QS and THE for the School as a whole. In 2014, we were ranked at 331st in QS, and did not appear in THE as we fell below the threshold for publication volume (see below).

2.2 **Regional engagement**

Following a disappointing result for our Area studies submission in REF 2014 (one of the largest submissions in the School, and nationally in this unit of assessment), we have conducted a comprehensive review of our approach to Area studies. An independent review by Simon Dixon (UCL), highlighted a number of issues, including that we had produced too few monographs (26 from 46 staff); did not double-weight any; had too long a ‘tail’ of staff with weak outputs, including too little work that had been subject to rigorous peer review in academic journals. This review also noted the School’s lack of clear strategy – either for research or impact – with poorly written documentation that was too defensive, with too little
attention was paid to the headings set out by HEFCE, and too much focus on individuals, rather than our collective aims or purpose.

In response, a new and more focused strategy for Area studies is under development, led by two new regional institutes that were established in the wake of the last REF submission. In addition, a strategic partnerships working group has been established to align engagement with each of our regions across research, teaching and outreach. It is hoped to align a bottom-up process of formalizing links involving individual academics and departments with a strategic approach that promotes consistency and coherence, and ensures **at least one strategic partner in each of the School’s regions**.

### 2.3 Disciplinary approaches

**Essential to research that has an impact on scholarship and wider society is a need for an ambitious collective strategy.** Yet feedback on the School’s REF2014 submissions – not just in Area studies – commonly cited the lack of a clear strategy for research, or for research impact: as a result, only two Departments (Linguistics and History of Art) were ranked in the top quartile for their ‘research environment’.

The significance of research and impact strategies goes beyond REF performance: only through maintaining an up-to-date strategy at discipline level can the School plan for how it will support Departments and their researchers to deliver excellent research and wider public benefit in line with our institutional vision. On this basis, our objective is that **every Unit of Assessment should have a research & impact strategy**, which is reviewed and updated on an annual basis, and evidenced through the production of case studies of our research impact that can be showcased both within and beyond the REF framework.

### 2.4 Impact on scholarship and learning

We need to be producing enough research outputs, of sufficient quality, to ensure these contribute to setting research agendas internationally. In practice, this means, firstly, producing **at least 200 articles in peer-reviewed academic journals each year**, since both the QS and THE world rankings rely in part on citation rates linked to Scopus, an online database, and these set a minimum cut-off of academic articles at this level for inclusion. We currently fall above this threshold for QS, but below it for THE (the two adopt different methodologies). It is of considerable reputational importance that the School is ranked by both measures – indeed, failure to appear in these rankings means that we have been removed from lists of UK institutions that qualify for state-funded bursaries in some countries (e.g. Norway, Pakistan), with a significant impact on our student body.

In addition, evidence from the 2014 REF showed that top 25% institutions had at least **25% of outputs ranked ‘world-leading’ in the social sciences, and 33% in the humanities**. Six Departments met this threshold in REF2014 (Anthropology, Law, Linguistics, Music, Religions, History of Art) – our aim is that all should do so in REF2020.

---

**Box 2: Key indicators for each strategic objective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/element</th>
<th>Key indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of excellence</td>
<td>Top 25% overall ranking for every unit in REF 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top 200 position in QS and THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional engagement</td>
<td>One strategic partner per region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary approaches</td>
<td>An updated research strategy for every UoA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on scholarship</td>
<td>At least 200 peer reviewed journal articles published each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% research outputs ranked world-leading in the social sciences; 33% in the humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research impact</td>
<td>One new ‘outstanding’ case of research impact for every 100 staff per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to impacts of our research on teaching, we are yet to develop a metric or measure to encapsulate how we can monitor progress. This is a key task for the coming year.

2.5 Benefits for society

A final element of our vision is that our research should be of wider societal benefit, contributing to positive global change. Yet although this expectation of active engagement with the wider world is core to the self-identity of many in SOAS, and the School is involved in numerous activities to promote and disseminate its research, evidence from REF 2014 suggests that we have at best been unable to articulate how this has translated into broader societal change. Specifically, top quartile institutions were producing on average one ‘case study of outstanding’ impact for every twenty members of academic staff – which would require SOAS to produce around three new outstanding case studies of research impact per year. Over the past REF assessment period, the School produced only four such case studies, with the result that only two units of assessment (Management and Politics) were in the top quartile for their discipline for research impact.

The School should also take steps to ensure that excellent research informs its teaching. There is no question that this is the case at present; however, we do not currently have a systematic way for ensuring that this is the case, or to demonstrate it. This may become more important at the Teaching Excellence Framework is introduced.

Underpinning elements

2.6 Benchmarked research income

A benchmarking exercise conducted in 2014 and repeated in 2015 showed that although our research income performance matches that of other top institutions in some subjects, it is significantly lower in others, such that overall our income is only half that of a comparable university focused on the humanities and social sciences. Our aim is therefore has already been set through Faculty plans to raise research income overall to £7.5m by 2020. It is critical that research income is generated, both to facilitate excellent research and to minimize the extent to which research needs to be cross-subsidized from student fees.

External research income won in open competition from research councils or otherwise through a process of peer review is also an important indicator of the prestige of our research and the extent to which it is aligned with cutting edge thought in each of our disciplines. In this context, the School’s Academic Performance Framework approved in 2015 already sets the expectation that all staff will be involved in externally-funded research, or have sought external research income, within a three-year period.

2.7 High quality early-career training

In a number of sub-panels in REF 2014 the School was praised on the quality of its PhD supervision, with the volume of completions on a par with benchmark comparators and meeting a target of 80% completion within 4 years (full-time, or 7 years part-time). In this context, our objective is now to maintain the overall volume of PhD completions, ensuring at least 80% completion within 4 years (FT) through delivery of high quality training for PhD students and other early career researchers. The School’s Academic Performance Framework also sets an expectation that all academic staff will be engaged in PhD supervision. We will also focus on increasing the availability of PhD scholarships, including through active engagement with doctoral training partnerships both in the UK and overseas.

2.8 Proactive research support

A Research & Enterprise Office was only created at SOAS in 2009, and over the last REF period provided only basic support to the School’s researchers, with minimal IT infrastructure and a largely reactive approach to grant opportunities. Evidence suggests that not only in other UK HEIs, but also in HEIs across Asia, the Middle East and parts of Africa, a much
more systematic approach is taken to research support, backed by state-of-the-art research information systems and proactive engagement with funders.

In this context, our aim is both to build our in-house capacity, and to engage directly with research support offices in Asia, Africa and the Middle East to enhance internationally-facing research support for the humanities and social sciences. Our objective is to improve the quality of support provided for research, including a pro-active approach to external funders that ensures **at least six (£1m+) grant applications are submitted each year**, a high quality research infrastructure, well-trained staff and excellent post-award support.

### 2.9 Research integrity

It is core to SOAS values, and to values within the sector as a whole, that our research should be carried out in an ethical manner that respects principles such as non-coercion, integrity and quality, independence and impartiality, avoiding harm, and confidentiality and anonymity. Whilst these principles are widely accepted across the School, we have in the past lacked detailed processes that ensure compliance, exposing the School to significant institutional risk. Our aim is to build such processes, including ensuring **all researchers complete ethics training by 2020**.

#### Box 3: Key indicators for underpinning elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research income</td>
<td>Raise income to £7.5m by 2020, based on subject-specific targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-career training</td>
<td>Maintain volume of PhD completions within 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All academic staff to be engaged in PhD supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td>At least six £1m+ grant applications submitted per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research integrity</td>
<td>All staff to have completed research ethics training by 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Each of the above strategic objectives and underpinning elements represents an area in which it should be possible to measure progress on the development of research excellence across the School. Section 3 below provides an initial assessment of progress in each of these areas, highlighting achievements over the period 2014-15 (i.e. since the 2014 REF submission) but also outlining areas in which improvements are required or actions need to be taken.

### 3. Progress towards research excellence: a review of 2014-15

This section reviews progress towards research excellence in each of the eight strategic areas identified in section 2. It is accepted that these areas are at present somewhat arbitrary and have not (yet) been endorsed as key areas of focus for research excellence across the School. Nonetheless, they align with some of the key elements of the Research Excellence Framework and other external measures of research quality, and provide a useful basis for an initial assessment. It is anticipated that a more robust assessment will be made at the end of 2016 / start of 2017 once core criteria and indicators are agreed.

#### Strategic objectives

**3.1 Recognition of excellence**

As the Research Excellence Framework is an exercise conducted once every six years, it is impossible to demonstrate actual improvement in this until 2020. However, over the past year, we have taken significant steps towards preparing for REF 2020, including:

- We have established a REF steering group, with all Departments represented, as well as sub-groups on outputs, environment, impact, data and research integrity. All of these groups have met and are active.
• We have appointed a new Research Excellence Manager, who is due to start work in May 2016;
• We have identified leads for all units of assessment, including Area Studies (to be led by a regional institute chair), Media & Cultural Studies (to be led jointly across the Faculties of Arts & Humanities and Languages and Cultures) and Modern Languages & Linguistics (to consist of two parts, one on linguistics, and one on world literature).

In addition, we are in the process of re-establishing the School’s league table working group to focus not only on national league tables such as GUC and CUC, which are driven by REF and the Guardian, which does not include research at all; but also on QS and THE, which are driven by a research reputation survey, and citation rates for journals abstracted in Scopus. So far, this strand of work has included measures to identify and prioritise Scopus journals, encourage editors of non-Scopus journals to get them abstracted in Scopus, and encouragement of academic staff to use online repositories such as Research Gate and Academia.edu. Although not specifically related to these measures, our QS ranking rose to 275th in 2015-16, whilst we were 45th for Arts & Humanities and 215th for Social Sciences.

3.2 Regional engagement

Our approach to the field of area studies has been reviewed, and a new and more focused engagement is under development, led by our regional institutes. At present, a draft research strategy has been written, but the next key step is to take a decision about which staff will – in principle – be included under Area studies for research planning purposes, and which will be submitted in disciplines. It is intended to draft a tentative allocation of all staff to UoAs, and seek agreement of Academic Board in the summer term of 2016 for this to be used for planning purposes until the precise configuration of panels becomes clear.

In addition, a strategic partnerships working group has been established to align engagement with each of our regions across research, teaching and outreach. It is hoped to align a bottom-up process of formalizing links involving individual academics and departments with a strategic approach that promotes consistency and coherence.

3.3 Disciplinary approaches

Beyond Area studies, all units of assessment were asked to produce a new 5-year research strategy in 2015, and these have been updated and peer-reviewed within the School in October-November 2015 and then revised again for this review in January 2016. Although some of these strategies remain ‘work-in-progress’, two of the three units that lost significant amounts of QR income as a result of REF2014 (Anthropology and History) have produced strategies that reflect on the results of REF 2014 and produce clear forward visions. Drafts have also been completed for Modern languages & linguistics and Culture & media studies, two areas in which it is anticipated that significant groups of staff submitted in Area studies in 2014 would be submitted in 2020.

3.4 Impact on scholarship and learning

For each Unit of Assessment (and in FLC, for each Department), we have reviewed progress on research outputs in 2014 and 2015, as well as asking Departments to return templates about their engagement with key issues, including processes for monitoring the quantity and quality of publications, advice and mentoring on publication destinations and types of publication, and compliance with Open Access requirements. Departmental responses are provided in Annex 1.

By the end of 2015, the vast majority of staff in the School had deposited at least one research output on SOAS Research Online, although a total of 54 (or one in five of all academic staff) had not, although in some cases (e.g. Politics) this appears to be because SOAS Research Online has not been updated, rather than because there is a lack of material published.
At present, it is difficult to be clear about precise progress towards targets for research outputs, because agreement has not yet been reached about an appropriate process to be used in each Unit of Assessment to measure quality, and external reviewers have not yet been appointed. However, it is clear that whilst in 2014 and 2015 we narrowly failed to achieve the target for volume of articles (Figure 1), the number in 2015 was 20% higher than in 2010 at a similar point in the REF cycle. With continued encouragement to target ‘top’ journals, reaching the target of 200 articles per year is eminently achievable. It should be noted that Research Associates can be included as individuals contributing to this target, so long as they use their SOAS affiliation.

Meanwhile, one proxy for output quality is to count the number of monographs completed in those disciplines – notably Anthropology, History, Politics and Religions – where REF panels have indicated that these are important and where most or all staff members would be expected to have completed a monograph within a six-year period. Based on this measure, only seven monographs were completed in 2014 and 2015 amongst some 90 staff – an even distribution over the six year period would imply that around 20 monographs should have been completed at this stage within these four Departments. This is less promising, although these Departments have set out strategies to promote monograph delivery moving forward.

In terms of methodology for reviewing the quality of outputs moving forward, some departments have proposed using metrics (journal rankings, citations) allied to some form of internal review and sparing use of externals (Management, Economics, to some degree Development Studies) whilst others have proposed more complex internal review processes. These processes, together with arrangements for mentoring, inclusion of ‘non-traditional’ outputs (websites, exhibitions, scholarly editions) and Open Access will be the subject of...
further discussion by the Academic Outputs Working Group, with a target for mechanisms to be agreed for all Departments by May 2016.

As noted above, we will work on measurement of impacts of research on teaching and learning in the coming year.

3.5 Benefits for society

In relation to research impact, it is not yet possible to identify progress towards the production of new and ‘outstanding’ case studies. Nonetheless, the Impact Officer has met all departments and over 120 academics, and has identified 51 potential impact case studies. In turn, most units of assessment have identified a sufficient number of potential impact case studies in their plans. These do not yet align directly as the sharepoint-based filing system developed for recording impact is still in the process of roll-out – it is currently being used by 17 academics. It has not yet been possible to develop an impact strategy or identify case studies specifically in Area studies pending a decision on which staff will be included in this UoA.

Overall there are a number of promising areas of impact identified by Departments, backed up support to academic staff in developing ‘pathways to impact’ statements for their research, and significantly enhanced engagement with external users of research (including through a new series of ‘impact lunches’). There have been six successful applications for the Impact Acceleration fund, with 3 more under development. A focus in the coming year needs to be on clear identification of the specific impacts being claimed in each area, through targeted sessions with each department; closer attention to impact deriving from large externally-funded research grants; and further development of systems for measuring and recording evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UoA</th>
<th>Number of staff (approx.)</th>
<th>Number of impact case studies needed</th>
<th>Number of impact case studies identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development / Economics</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area studies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages &amp; Linguistics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Media</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underpinning elements

3.6 Doubling research income

Total research income for the last financial year, reported to HESA, grew by 12% from £4.3m in 2013/14 to just under £4.8m in 2014/15, slightly above target. Income has grown for the third successive year and the upward trend in both research volume and overheads is encouraging, although it should be noted that the percentage of overheads has decreased slightly as volume has increased.
The largest volume of funding in 2014-15 came from Leverhulme Trust (£1.05m), with European Commission (£549k) and ESRC (£546k) next. In total, funding came from over 50 different funders. Whilst the portfolio of funders will be similar in 2016, the European Research Council will become more significant following the award of two ERC grants that started in 2014/15 (in Linguistics and Anthropology) with three more due to start in 2015/16 (in Religions, Area Studies and Languages), as well as AHRC, with two large grants (in Linguistics and Religions). This also reflects a significant increase in research grant applications – a total of £38m in grants was applied for in 2015, or nearly three times the average total for 2011-13 of £13m. This led to £4.7m being secured in income in 2015, up nearly 40% compared to 2011-13.

There are some notes of caution. First, some Departments appear to lack a ‘pipeline’ of significant future grant applications, suggesting some concern that all will meet income targets that continue to rise in the future. It is also the case that the income currently secured represents activity from a relatively small percentage of the School’s staff. This is an area that will be explored further in early 2016, including addressing concerns that the current RAM model creates perverse incentives for staff applying for some types of grant.

3.7 High quality early-career training

Data on PhD completions was still awaited at the time of compilation of this report. There are some concerns around a lower than expected intake of new PhD students in 2015-16 (perhaps reflecting the REF poor results and loss of AHRC funding).

However, evidence suggests we remain on track with PhD completions, meeting our target for 80% of FT students to complete within 4 years. The Doctoral school and a number of Departments have also been actively engaging with a bid led by UCL for a Doctoral Training Partnership, including new thematic strands in Linguistics and Gender Studies, which should as a minimum protect existing scholarship provision. Discussions have also taken place over possible international training partnerships focused on Buddhist studies; and with institutions in Senegal, as part of broader effort to diversity scholarship income.

3.8 Proactive research support

During 2014 and 2015, significant efforts have been put into improving the quality of support to academic staff provided by the research office. This has included the introduction of universal access to Research Professional with a tailored profile for each academic; the hosting of visits by funders including British Academy, European Union and DFID; the hosting of impact lunches involving individuals and organisations that are significant potential ‘users’ of SOAS research; academic staff training focused on research income, publication strategies, REF, etc.; research coffee mornings and drop-in sessions and attendance at Department and Faculty meetings.

Internally within REO we have also revised responsibilities and created a dedicated post award function. This is to provide designated support for on-going research projects and ensure compliance with funder terms and conditions. This transition has been hindered by difficulties appointing a Post Award Officer: the position is currently re-advertised and is anticipated to be filled by spring. In addition, the change of chart of accounts within SOAS has also absorbed some resources and caused some delays in transitioning to the new structure.

Whilst work is required to encourage greater engagement with this improved support, feedback so far is positive and constructive. In particular, targeted support has enabled a total of 11 grants over £1m to be submitted in 2015, with four currently pending, although this reflects a level of applications to the European Research Council that cannot be easily sustained in 2016. The next step is implementation of a research information system which should not only significantly increase efficiency of application management but also provide essential management information both with regards to strategic opportunities as well as
research performance. This system has been the subject of an external tender process, and tenders are currently being considered.

Finally, a major resource for SOAS research is its Library, which provides important special collections of importance across the School. The Library has recently undertaken a consultation exercise on its future, but it is not yet clear how the Library’s strategy is to be aligned with the wider School research strategy. One way to achieve this would be to conduct an independent review of the Library in the coming year.

3.9 Research integrity

The research office has worked closely with a number of departments (including LIS, planning, portfolio management) to develop and implement new procedures and workflows including a new external grant application procedure, a new Open Access APC procedure, and a revised ethics policy and procedure. The latter includes the rolling out of new research ethics approval forms first to PhD students in 2014-15, and now to all academic staff in 2015-16. From early 2016, we are also rolling out an online- training programme covering all aspects of research integrity. This learning tool is available not only to academic staff but also all students and professional services staff.

However, this area remains a work in progress, and we continue to seek engagement with academic departments in ensuring that all research in the School is conducted in conditions of safety, and in accordance both with general principles of research ethics, but also specific codes of conduct in particular disciplines. Deteriorating conditions for researchers and for academic freedom in some of our countries of focus – notably in the Middle East – are a particular cause for concern.

4. Actions

Vision and Strategy

- Approval of vision and strategy at Academic Board
- Incorporation of research vision and strategy into School’s wider strategy
- Profiling of the School’s research within the Centenary

Recognition of excellence:

- Continue to hold REF steering group meetings and working group
- Agree allocation of staff to Units of Assessment, notably Area studies, Media & Cultural studies; and Modern languages & linguistics (by May 2016)
- Convene League Tables Working Group and design strategy for improved QS and THE ranking

Regional engagement

- See above on allocation of staff to Area studies
- Develop partnership strategy by May 2016

Disciplinary approaches:

- Feedback to Departments on latest research and impact strategies by April 2016
- Next iteration of strategies complete by end 2017

Impact on scholarship:

- Departments to ensure 100% uploading of research outputs to SOAS research online
- Academic outputs working group to agree a process for peer review of outputs in each discipline by May 2016.
- Further promotion of Open Access rules and support for APCs in key areas
• Units of Assessment to begin review of outputs for report to Academic Board in Spring 2017
• Some Departments to develop strategy to promote monographs

Benefits for society
• Further development of monitoring system for research impact
• Continue to implement Impact Acceleration Fund
• Ensure research excellence plays a role in curriculum review

Benchmarked research income:
• Ensure research income planning fully integrated into Faculty planning round
• Ensure research input into review of RAM
• Continue targeted support for high value grants
• Roll out training for staff in research income application process.

High quality early-career training:
• Chase data on PhD completions for 2014 and 2015
• Develop approach to BGP3 (AHRC DTP, assumed with CHASE partnership)
• Develop one or more international doctoral training partnerships.

Proactive research support:
• Introduction of a Research Management System
• Consider external review of the Library

Research integrity:
• Continue roll-out of online training in research integrity, and consider options for future training
SAFETY AT SOAS

The Board is asked to note the report

Executive Summary

The Audit Committee considered an internal audit report on the School’s safety arrangements in October 2015, for which the Board has overall legal responsibility.

The attached report updates the Board on progress against the recommendations. The full internal audit report is also attached.

Recommendations

To note the update

Financial Impact

None

Risks

Have been mitigated by the management actions.

Equality implications

None
Safety at SOAS

Introduction

At its meeting in October 2015 the Audit Committee considered an update on progress against the recommendations from the internal audit of the School’s safety arrangements, which had taken place in 2014/15. The Board of Trustees had legal obligations in respect of health and safety and the report had raised a number of concerns.

The main recommendations had been around ensuring compliance with existing policies and procedures, in particular in respect of risk assessment and the need to audit activity. This was well managed in estates but less so in other areas and a particular concern for the Board of Trustees had been in respect of staff and students working overseas.

The Committee discussed in detail the issues associated with staff and students working overseas. The School had insurance in place for staff but this did not extend to students who had to arrange their own insurance. Further improvements were planned to the policies and guidance in this area but there also needed to be greater compliance. The Executive Board would review the position on insurance later in the term and the Committee agreed that the report and updated management actions would be considered by the Board of Trustees.

Update

Significant progress has been made in addressing all of the recommendations (see Annex for full report) since the appointment of an internal resource at the start of 2016. The previous arrangement had been to obtain advice from another institution.

A summary of the progress is below:

Risk assessments – A revised generic risk assessment process has been developed along with specific risk assessments for key areas of risk including working overseas. The draft versions are available for the School to use but will be approved formally at the Health, Safety & Security Committee later this term

Risk Registers – A central risk register for safety issues is maintained and reviewed by the Committee at each of its meetings and is included in the suite of risk registers reviewed by Executive Board

H&S Policy – A revised version was approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2015. Further revisions have been made and will come to the Board for approval in July 2016. This is part of a complete overhaul of all the related arrangements for specific areas of safety e.g. fire

Audits – The new Health and Safety Manager is now undertaking a monthly audit programme of key areas and has also initiated a more detailed building audit regime. Local safety representatives are being issued with a checklist to enable them to undertake local audits. Consideration will be given to a more detailed audit approach in 2016/17
**H&S Adviser** – The position has been revised to act as a Health and Safety Manager, rather than Adviser, and has been extremely successful to date. This is an interim appointment and a permanent arrangement will be made for 2016/17.

**Training** – The training programme has been revised for new staff and a more detailed induction process developed. Further thought will be given to specific training for key groups, including students.

**Students overseas** – Executive Board has agreed to extend the School's insurance arrangements to postgraduate students working overseas and to undergraduate students on a year abroad. This has been implemented.
Health and Safety
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Section one

Executive summary

Conclusion

From the work performed on the review of the School of Oriental and African Studies’ (the ‘School’) health and safety (H&S) arrangements, we have provided a rating of partial assurance with improvements required (Amber-Red). This is not in line with management’s forecast assurance rating which was significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities. The reason for the difference is our assessment that health and safety arrangements and policies requiring further enhancements beyond those already made.

Our review of the School’s H&S policy and strategy against the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, the HSE’s Successful Health and Safety Management and the BS OHSAS 18001:2007 identified a number of areas where the School needs to improve both its policy and practices in order to be compliant with each.

The provision of H&S training to staff is conducted as part of the induction process delivered by line managers to new members of staff. We noted areas for development regarding the training of staff. Managers delivering training should be offered more guidance on what H&S training should contain, a record of having completed H&S training should be maintained. Refresher training should be offered to those staff that require it and role specific training should be developed.

Reporting on H&S is currently undertaken on a School wide basis for Incidents. These are presented to the Health, Safety and Security Committee. Risk assessments are completed by Estates and Facilities for the areas they are responsible for. The high level results of these are presented to the Health, Safety and Security Committee. We identified areas where the reporting and monitoring of H&S at the school could be strengthened. This includes formalising the process by which risk assessment are completed and introducing an audit programme.

Background

Protecting the health and safety of employees, students and members of the public who may be affected by the activities of the School is an essential part of risk management.

The School is currently in the process of refreshing its Safety Policy and Manual, which was last refreshed in June 2012. The current policy was designed in accordance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 (the ‘Act’). Whilst overall responsibility for safety with the School rests with the Governing Body, day to day management of safety is delegated to the Director of SOAS. Responsibility for safety within faculties and directorates rests with the Deans of Faculties, Directors of Professional Services, Head of IFCELS and Heads of other units, who are required to carry out (at least) annual safety inspections.

A Health, Safety and Security Committee has been established, reporting to Governing Body; and working as a consultative committee between employer and employees and their representatives to ensure that the School carries out activities, wherever they are undertaken, safely and with regard to the health and safety of all its students, staff, visitors and those who may be affected by its activities.

As well as the Act, the School should also follow the ‘Plan, do, check, act’ approach set out in the Health and Safety Executive’s (HSE) Managing for Health and Safety guide, which emphasises the importance of treating health and safety management as an integral part of good management generally rather than as a stand alone system.

The School should also follow BS OHSAS 18001, which sets out the minimum requirements for occupational health and safety management best practice. BS OHSAS 18001 is a framework for an occupational health and safety management system, which supports organisations in putting in place the policies, procedures and controls to achieve the best possible working conditions, aligned to internationally recognised leading practice.
Objectives

The objectives of our work are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objective One: H&S Policy and Strategy | We reviewed the adequacy and effectiveness of the School’s Safety Policy and Manual by comparing its content with:  
  - Health and Safety at Work Act 1974  
  - HSE - HSG65 Successful Health and Safety Management  
  - OHSAS 18001 |
| Objective two: Training | We reviewed the current arrangements in place for the provision of health and safety training to new and existing staff and students. |
| Objective three: Reporting | We will review the way in which risks are identified and reported, including the way in which mitigations are designed and the way risks are continuously monitored. |

Areas of good practice

✓ The H&S policy includes an overview of roles and responsibilities of individuals within the organisation;  
✓ The School has a Health Safety and Security committee and discusses major H&S issues and monitors performance through reports from Facilities and Estates and the Health and Safety Advisor; and  
✓ The School has completed fire risk assessments for the Schools major buildings and the actions of these risk assessments are monitored by the Health, Safety and Security Committee.

Areas for development

- The School does not currently have a standard process by which directorates produce risk assessments for the areas they are responsible. In addition there are currently no audits carried out within the school in relation to health and safety (recommendation one and four);  
- We noted a number of areas where the Health and Safety policy is not in line with HSG65 and OHSAS 18001. To ensure that the school meets all legal requirements and is in line with best practice this guidance should be followed (recommendation three); and  
- The School does not currently have a centrally managed risk management process and process in place to ensure adequate risk assessments are undertaken across the school (recommendation one and two).

We have also identified two low priority recommendations relating to audits, the role of the H&S Advisor and training.

Recommendations raised

The overall number of recommendations raised is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation raised</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Section two
Recommendations**

This section summarises the recommendations that we have identified from our work. Each has a risk rating (as explained below) and it has been agreed with management what action will be taken.

### Priority rating for recommendations raised

- **High Priority (one):** Issues arising referring to important matters that are fundamental to the system of internal control. We believe that the matters observed might cause a business objective not to be met or leave a risk unmitigated and need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

- **Medium Priority (two):** Issues arising referring mainly to matters that have an important effect on controls but do not require immediate action. A business objective may still be met in full or in part or a risk partially mitigated but the weakness represents a significant deficiency in the system.

- **Low Priority (three):** Issues arising that would, if corrected, improve internal control in general but are not vital to the overall system of internal control.

### Examination Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Management response</th>
<th>Officer and due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(two)</td>
<td><strong>Risk Assessments</strong>&lt;br&gt;Directorates do not routinely undertake risk assessments for the areas of their responsibility. The ‘DO’ element of the HSEs effective health and safety management guidance and the ‘Planning’ element of BS OHSAS 18001 both require risk assessments to be included as part of health and safety management. Risk assessments are undertaken by Estates and Facilities as well as by contractors, however there is no central record kept of the risk assessments undertaken and no log of actions resulting from the risk assessments. In addition a comprehensive risk review has not been undertaken across the entire School.&lt;br&gt;Without undertaking risk assessments the school is missing a key component of effective risk management. Without reporting results of risk assessments the Health, Safety and Security Committee there is not adequate monitoring of the Schools compliance with Health and Safety.&lt;br&gt;Risk assessments should be undertaken by each directorate. These should be recorded in a central register, that includes a responsible officer and future review date. The frequency of risk assessments will be based upon the level of risk identified as part of the risk assessment process. Results of the risk assessments should be reported at a summary level to the Health, Safety and Security Committee.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong>&lt;br&gt;Although the School has a number of risk assessments recorded at the institutional level there is no record of any at a local level.&lt;br&gt;A suite of institutional risk assessments will be made available to directorates as part of the new H&amp;S Policy (work on these is already underway).&lt;br&gt;Any directorates with local risk assessments or with those that differ from the institutional version will be asked to log these centrally.&lt;br&gt;Work to be completed post new H&amp;S Policy and launch of MySOAS.</td>
<td>Owner: Secretary Deadline: 31 August 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section two
### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Management response</th>
<th>Officer and due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Two)</td>
<td><strong>Risk registers</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is not a robust process in place for centrally capturing SOAS-wide H&amp;S risks (i.e. strategic and divisional/departmental). Therefore, key H&amp;S risks and issues at Directorate level are not appropriately reported to the Health, Safety and Security Committee and mitigating actions are not put into place. We recommend that Directorates should be made responsible for escalating local risks where appropriate. The identification of risks through a formal risk assessment will aid this process. The level of risks should be kept under regular review by the Health, Safety and Security Committee. This will assist with ensuring faculty risks are being appropriately discussed and will improve the assurance over Health and Safety compliance.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong>&lt;br&gt;This will be linked to the introduction of an organisational based safety management system in the new H&amp;S Policy. A separate risk register of any safety risks will be maintained and reviewed as part of the regular risk management framework as well as a standing item on the HSSC agenda.</td>
<td>Owner: Secretary &lt;br&gt;Deadline 31 August 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3  | (Two) | **H&S policy**<br>We have reviewed the draft health and safety policy as presented to the Health, Safety and Fire Committee on 4th March 2015. Our review of the policy focused on compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, HSE - HSG65 and OHSAS 18001 as well as other areas of best practice. From this review we have noted a number of areas where the policy could be improved. In order to bring the policy in line with best practice the policy should document:  
  ▪ When and by who the policy will be updated;  
  ▪ How compliance will be monitored;  
  ▪ What training the FSRs will receive and how frequently this will be updated;  
  ▪ The legislation the school must comply with;  
  ▪ The process for completing risk assessments along with those who are responsible for completing the risk assessments;  
  ▪ How training will be delivered, the frequency of training and how different roles will receive different training based on need;  
  ▪ How the incidents will be reported investigated and the process for ensuring all RIDDOR incidents are reported; and  
  ▪ How the School ensures contractors and other personnel working at, but not employed by the School meet the requirements of the H&S policy. | **Accepted**<br>The Policy is being revised for the next meeting of the HSSC and then planned approval by Governing Body in July. These changes will be incorporated. | Owner: Secretary <br>Deadline 31 July 2015 |
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Management response</th>
<th>Officer and due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(One)</td>
<td>Audits</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Owner: Secretary&lt;br&gt;Deadline 31 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are currently no audits carried out within the school in relation to health and safety. This is due to staff not having relevant training or capacity to undertake audits. The ‘ACT’ element of the HSEs guidance on effective health and safety management and the ‘Planning’ and ‘Audit’ element of BS OHSAS 18001 both require that active measures to monitor health and safety are undertaken. Without undertaking audits the school is missing a key component of assurance over H&amp;S. Audits should be undertaken as part of a rolling programme. The frequency and areas of audits should be based upon the level of risk identified as part of the risk assessment process. Results of the audits should be reported at a summary level to the Health, Safety and Security Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Three)</td>
<td>Health and Safety Advisor</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Owner: Secretary&lt;br&gt;Deadline 31 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The role of the health and safety advisor is not clearly documented within the Health and Safety Policy. The role of the health and safety advisor should be agreed between the School and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. This should be done with reference to the current contract between the School and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. The role of the health and safety advisor should be documented in detail within the Health and Safety policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Three)</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Owner: Secretary&lt;br&gt;Deadline 31 October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and safety training is currently delivered by managers to new members of staff as part of their induction. There is however no record kept of the training having been delivered and there is no guidance on the contents of the training. In addition we note that there is no specific training given to Deans of Faculty, Registrar, Directors of Professional Services and Heads of Departments to enable them to fulfil their role as documented in the Health and Safety Policy. We recommend that the school implement a standardised template for H&amp;S training and this is recorded centrally. Specific training should also be offered to those with key roles in relating to Health and Safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix one

**Summary of work undertaken and risks reviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks reviewed</th>
<th>Controls and process tested</th>
<th>Findings / Issues / Exceptions</th>
<th>Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There is no clearly developed H&S Policy with strategy and objectives         | ▪ We reviewed the H&S Policy and associated relevant documentation and interviewed relevant stakeholders. | ✓ The school is currently developing a new Health and Safety Policy. This was presented to the Health, Safety and Security Committee on 4th March 2015.  
▪ The draft Health and Safety policy requires updating in a number of areas to be in line with legislation and best practice guidance, see appendix two for details. ([recommendation three](#)). | Partial assurance with improvements required.                                             |
| H&S governance and leadership not in place                                      | ▪ Review of committee minutes and relevant papers.                                          | ✓ The Health, Safety and Security committee meets once every term and has membership from across the School.  
✓ The Governing Body receives an annual report from the Health, Safety and Security Committee as well as each meetings minutes.  
✓ We reviewed the Health, Safety and Security minutes and papers for the October 2014 and March 2015 meetings and confirmed they had taken place and that relevant papers has been presented and discussed.  
✓ We reviewed the October 2014 Governing Body papers and confirmed Health and Safety reports and minutes had been presented. | Significant assurance.                                                                |
| Awareness of H&S roles, responsibilities and accountabilities is inadequate   | ▪ We reviewed the H&S Policy, organisation and arrangements for safety.                     | ✓ The H&S policy contains an overview of roles and responsibilities of those through out the School.  
▪ The role and reporting lines of the Safety Advisor is not adequately documented within the H&S policy ([recommendation five](#)).  
▪ There is no specific training given to Deans of Faculty, Registrar, Directors of Professional Services and Heads of Departments to enable them to fulfil their role as documented in the Health and Safety Policy ([recommendation six](#)). | Significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks reviewed</th>
<th>Controls and process tested</th>
<th>Findings / Issues / Exceptions</th>
<th>Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate competency and training mechanisms in place</td>
<td>▪ We reviewed the process by which H&amp;S training is given to staff. We also reviewed the process for monitoring health and safety training.</td>
<td>✓ H&amp;S training is given to new members of staff as part of the induction process. Initially a member of staff's line manager will deliver basic training on their first day. There is additional training conducted by the safety advisor at termly induction days. We have reviewed the training materials provided on the school wide induction days and confirmed that this contains sufficient detail.</td>
<td>Significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is little guidance provided to managers on what should be included within the initial induction for staff by line managers. (recommendation six).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ There is no training matrix detailing by role the different health and safety training required for different roles. We note that such a training matrix is being considered (recommendation six).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective mechanisms for risk identification, assessment and mitigation</td>
<td>▪ Risk assessments are completed and mitigating actions are put in place to address the risks identified.</td>
<td>✓ Risk assessments have been completed for fire, maternity, artificial optical radiation and dangerous substance and explosive atmospheres. ✓ Results of estates risk assessments are communicated to the Health, Safety and Security Committee in a report from the Director of Estates and Facilities. ▪ The H&amp;S policy does not include details of what risk assessments should be completed by those at department/directorate level (recommendation one).</td>
<td>Significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective mechanisms for risk identification, assessment and mitigation - fire</td>
<td>▪ Fire risk assessments are completed and kept up to date.</td>
<td>✓ The School has fire risk assessments in place for the main buildings maintained by the school. ✓ A comprehensive fire risk assessment was last completed in October 2013. Form reviewing the minutes of the Health, Safety and Security Committee we noted that the actions coming from this risk assessment are being monitored.</td>
<td>Significant assurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Summary of work undertaken and risks reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks reviewed</th>
<th>Controls and process tested</th>
<th>Findings / Issues / Exceptions</th>
<th>Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inadequate processes for communicating H&S information  | ▪ We reviewed the process for communicating health and safety information and performance data. | ✓ Staff are made aware of any changes to H&S information or procedures through the weekly e-bulletin.  
  ✓ The H&S policy and related procedures are freely available on the Schools website. | Significant Assurance                  |
| and performance data                                    |                                              |                                                                                                |                                      |
| An inconsistent process of reporting of accidents and   | ▪ Evidence of accident/incident reporting was reviewed.  
  Incidents                                              | ▪ From reviewing the Health, Safety and Security Committee minutes we noted that the incidents are reported to the committee. Incidents are also reported to the governing body in summary form as part of the annual Health and Safety Report.  
  ✓ Form our review of incidents we noted that no actions place had been completed. However given the that all incidents reported were minor in nature this appears appropriate. | Significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities |
| Inappropriate measurement of audit and inspection of   | ▪ We reviewed evidence of H&S monitoring and auditing at both the central and divisional level.  
  performance                                              | ▪ There is currently no School wide audit programme for H&S  
  (recommendation four).                                   | No Assurance                          |
|                                                        | ▪ These processes were discussed with interviewees.                                            |                                                                                                |                                      |
Overview

HSG65 offers guidance on how to develop and implement a framework for health and safety management that is suitable for meeting organisations legal requirements in relation to health and safety. The Plan, Do, Check, Act approach to health and safety aims to achieve a balance between the systems and behavioural aspects of health and safety management. It also aims to integrate health and safety within other management structures rather than having health and safety separate to other management systems. Below is an outline of the Plan, Do, Check, Act approach.

Compliance with HSG65

As part of our review we have reviewed the Schools compliance with HSG65. Below we have set out the key findings of the review for each stage of the Plan, Do, Check, Act approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Plan | ✓ The school has a statement of Intent included within the Health and Safety Policy. The policy sets out the overall aims of the policy and H&S aspirations of the School.  
✓ For the majority of individuals and groups the H&S policy clearly sets out what their role is in relation to H&S.  
   ▪ The policy does not state now compliance with the policy will be measured, how risk assessments will be carried out, how training will be delivered, how incidents will be investigated and the legal requirements which the School is required to fulfil (recommendation three). |
| Do   | ✓ The School has a disaster recovery pan and guidance for reacting to incidents.  
✓ The School engages a health and safety expert for specific health and safety advice.  
   ▪ The school has not completed an overall risk profile, there is no centrally monitored register of risk assessments and risk assessments are not routinely performed outside of Estates and Facilities (recommendation one). |
| Check| ✓ Incidents are routinely recorded, investigated and presented to the Health, Safety and Security Committee.  
   ▪ There are no active monitoring arrangements to monitor compliance with the H&S policy outside of Estates and Facilities. There is no audit plan presented to the Health, Safety and Fire Committee (recommendation four). |
| Act  | ✓ Performance against the H&S policy is monitored by the Health, Safety and Security Committee on a termly basis and on a yearly basis by the governing body. |
Appendix two
Compliance with health and safety requirements

Compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974

The Health and Safety at work act 1974 sets out the general minimum legal requirements that the School must adhere to. The HSE provide a summary of the key legal requirements that come out of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974. We have reviewed these against the procedures and mechanisms in place at the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A risk assessment for the organisation has been completed, major findings have been documented and measures have been implemented to address these risks | ✓ Estate and faculties undertake risk assessments of key areas for health and safety risk within their remit.  
- There has not been a comprehensive risk review undertaken for the entire school (recommendation one). |
| Competent persons are in place to implement health and safety arrangements | ✓ The School engages a health and safety advisor to give advice on specific health and safety topics.  
✓ The H&S policy clearly sets out the responsibilities of those with responsibility for implementing H&S arrangements. |
| Emergency procedures are in place | ✓ The school has emergency procedures in place for dealing with fire and emergency evacuations. |
| Clear information and training is provided to employees | ✓ Training on health and safety is included on the list of topics to be covered at new members of staff induction.  
- There is not sufficient guidance available to managers on delivering training to new joiners. The training also does not differentiate between job roles (recommendation six).  
- There is no record kept to evidence that all staff have received this H&S training (recommendation six). |
| Work together with other employers using the same premises | ✓ The School does not share building with other organisations who use the same premises but are not connected to the School. |

Compliance with OHSAS 18001:2007

BS OHSAS 18001, which sets out the minimum requirements for occupational health and safety management best practice. Below we have set out the key findings for each element of OHSAS 18001:2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Commitment and policy | ✓ The Health and Safety Policy sets out the overall aims of the policy and H&S aspirations of the School.  
✓ The policy places responsibility for H&S on those form senior management to line managers.  
- The policy does not adequately document the how the school commits to providing health and safety training to all members of staff (recommendation six). |
| Planning | - There is not a comprehensive risk assessment programme and control measures that cover all activities within the School (recommendation one) |
| Implementation and operation | ✓ There is clear responsibility, accountability and delegation within the H&S management structure.  
- There is no re-training programme in place for staff (recommendation six). |
| Checking | ✓ There are reactive measure in place for health and safety monitoring through the Health, Safety and Security Committee. |
| Audit | - There is no audit programme or regular audits (recommendation four). |
| Management review | ✓ The Governing Body receive an annual report on Health and Safety. |
Appendix three

Working overseas policy

Overview

A large number of the School’s employees undertake work on behalf and as part of their roles with the School. Whilst working abroad can pose no more risks than working in the UK, it is important for the School to have in place procedures to help insure the safety and wellbeing of their staff while working overseas. The School does not have a policy that covers international travel of staff, elements are covered in the insurance form and Ethical Research Policy. As part of the renewal of the School’s health and safety policy, a policy on international travel is to be introduced.

Benchmarking

Below we have set out the key elements that should be included within the overseas working health and safety policy. These areas have been identified through a benchmarking exercise of other Higher Education organisations working overseas health and safety policies. As well as detailing the key areas that should be covered we have also included the specific policies of other Higher Education organisations. Note that the items included within the table below are not exhaustive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Detail of areas covered</th>
<th>Specific policy decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>■ Training and education; ■ Vaccinations; ■ Dental health; ■ First aid provisions; ■ Incident reporting; ■ Injury and illness while abroad; and ■ Health clearance.</td>
<td>■ Vaccinations will be funded by the HE organisation. ■ Health clearance required for trips to tropical countries, in excess of 3 months, in remote areas (&gt;24 hours to medical assistance) and if undertaking high risk activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal security</td>
<td>■ Incident reporting; ■ Risk assessments (see below);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>■ Details of cover; ■ Policy details for taking holiday as part of the trip;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessments and planning</td>
<td>■ Guidance on risk assessments; ■ Responsibility for undertaking risks assessments; ■ How risks assessments will be documented; ■ Who keeps track of staffs travel abroad; ■ Contingency planning</td>
<td>■ Risk assessments should be completed for all overseas travel, this does not have to be formal or written down if low risk e.g. traveling to Europe for a conference. ■ Where FCO advise states travel is not recommended a risk assessment must be documented stating why FCO advice is being ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>■ Supervisions; ■ Use of transport; ■ Leisure time; ■ Catering and sanitation; and ■ Training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix four
Staff involvement and documents reviewed

We undertook interviews in March and April 2015 with key stakeholders to inform this work, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ince</td>
<td>School Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Haddon</td>
<td>Head of Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Alderton</td>
<td>Heath and Safety Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During our testing, we reviewed the following documents:
- Health and Safety Policy;
- Health, Safety and Security Committee terms of reference;
- Health, Safety and Security Committee minutes and papers;
- School risk register;
- Risk assessments;
- Risk Management Policy;
- Slide of staff Health and safety Induction; and
- List of incidents.
Academic Development Committee is asked to note the contents of this report which will also be submitted to Academic Board.

1. Introduction

1.1 This report gives an overview of complaints and academic appeals made by students to SOAS in 2014-15 and disciplinary action taken against students in the same period. It also summarises other issues related to the School's student complaints and disciplinary procedures, including the outcomes of complaints and appeals made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA).

1.2 Students may appeal an academic decision of the School. Undergraduate and Taught Masters students may appeal an academic decision to Registry under the Procedure for Considering Representations in respect of Examination and Assessment Results. Research Students may appeal academic decisions under the procedures set out in the Code of Practice for Research Degrees (to appeal decisions during the course of their degree) or the Procedure for Consideration of Appeals by Candidates for Research Degrees (to appeal a final result).

1.3 Any student may complain about the quality of their experience at the School using the Student Complaints Procedure. This procedure covers such issues as supervision, teaching and facilities and is managed by the Information Compliance Manager.

1.4 The School's Dignity at SOAS procedure, managed by the Diversity and Inclusion Manager, provides a mechanism for informal resolution of issues such as prejudice and harassment. Where it is not possible to reach a resolution under this procedure, complaints may be referred to the Student Complaints Procedure or the appropriate disciplinary procedure.

1.5 The Students' Union has its own complaint procedures covering complaints about its facilities and services.

1.6 Where an allegation of misconduct is made against a student, this is dealt with under the Student Disciplinary Procedure, managed by the Information Compliance Manager. Allegations of assessment and examination offences (eg plagiarism) are dealt with by Registry under the Regulations for proceedings in respect of assessment and examination offences.

1.7 When students have exhausted the School's complaints or appeals procedures, they are issued with a Completion of Procedures letter. If they remain dissatisfied, they may make an appeal to the OIA.
2. **Student Complaints Procedure**

2.1 The formal Student Complaints Procedure consists of two stages: Stage 1, an investigation by a nominated investigator; and Stage 2, an appeal panel chaired by a senior member of staff accompanied by a member of the Academic Board or a Professional Services Director, and a Student Union representative.

2.2 Five complaints were considered under the formal Student Complaints Procedure in 2014-15 (compared to three in 2013-14). The chart below shows the number of formal complaints dealt with under the Student Complaints Procedure in the last five academic sessions.

![Formal complaints under the Student Complaints Procedure chart]

2.3 All but one of the complaints was resolved at Stage 1. The complaints fell under the following categories:

- Insufficient payment from SOAS for work provided by the student
- Poor administration/delivery of a course (2)
- Discrimination and bullying
- Late withdrawal of degree programme

2.4 One complaint was upheld, three were partially upheld and one was not upheld. The complaint that went to an appeal panel under Stage 2 of the procedure was partially upheld. In total, the School issued payments of over £12,000 (£10,500 of which was for one case) as part of the proposed resolutions to the upheld and partially upheld complaints. One complaint was reported to the Learning and Teaching Quality Committee in order to highlight lessons to be learnt.

2.5 Six new volunteers from across the faculties signed up to be student complaint investigators and received training in May 2015. In total, there is now a pool of 15 trained investigators for student complaints.
2.6 An updated Student Complaints Procedure for 2015-16 was approved by Academic Board and Governing Body over the summer. The updated procedure is consistent with the OIA’s *Good practice framework for handling complaints and academic appeals*, which will be applied by the OIA to student complaints it receives from 2015-16 academic year onwards. The main changes are to the timescales (the two formal stages should be completed within 90 calendar days) and the addition of a section on vexatious complaints.

3. **Dignity at SOAS procedure**

3.1 The Dignity at SOAS procedure is an informal approach that aims to resolve issues before considering recourse to the appropriate formal complaints procedure. The Diversity Office and SOAS Anti-Harassment Advisers record each time they are approached for guidance on the Dignity Policy.

3.2 During the 2014-15 academic year there were nine student complaints (seven female, two male). These nine cases included complaints regarding harassment, discrimination, abusive behaviour and the conduct of the Students' Union.

3.3 Records for 2013-14 remain incomplete due to the sudden death of the Diversity Adviser in the Summer Term 2014. However, there were 10 reported student cases during 2012-13 (eight female, two male) and five in the academic year 2011-12 (Four female, one male). It is, therefore, evident that the number of Dignity cases remains broadly in line with previous years.

3.4 However, the disproportionate percentage of cases from female students is consistent. One of the aims of the new SOAS guidance on preventing and responding to gender based violence (due for launch on 25 November 2015) is to address this anomaly. The impact of this guidance will be monitored by student surveys and continuing to analyse trends in Dignity cases and complaints.

3.5 The Dignity at SOAS policy is currently under review to ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities. The revised policy will be circulated for consultation before the end of the calendar year.

3.6 Training was provided for the Anti-Harassment Contacts in April 2015 and a renewed appeal for volunteers will be made at the same time as the re-launch of the Dignity at SOAS policy.

4. **Appeals from undergraduate students**

4.1 The following table provides details of appeals received from undergraduate students under the *Procedure for Considering Representations in respect of Examination and Assessment Results* in 2014-15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for appeal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Upheld</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New mitigating circumstances</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative error/irregularity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The chart below provides a comparison of the total figures for each of the last five academic sessions, based on the status of the appeals at the time of data collection.

5. **Appeals from postgraduate taught students**

5.1 The table below provides details of appeals received from taught masters students under the *Procedure for Considering Representations in respect of Examination and Assessment Results* in 2014-15. *Please note that the deadline for appeals relating to dissertation results or overall classifications is early January 2016 and therefore these figures are incomplete.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for appeal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Upheld</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New mitigating circumstances</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative error/irregularity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 The chart below provides a comparison of the total figures for each of the last three academic sessions, based on the status of the appeals at the time of data collection.
6. Appeals from research students

6.1 Five students appealed the outcome of their examination and one student appealed against a decision to terminate their research degree in 2014-15. The table below provides further details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal against</th>
<th>Appeal grounds</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Outcome of examination</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Appeal not allowed</td>
<td>No grounds for consideration and no supporting evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outcome of examination</td>
<td>Procedural irregularity</td>
<td>Appeal not upheld</td>
<td>Insufficient evidence and outside remit of procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcome of examination</td>
<td>Procedural irregularity</td>
<td>Appeal upheld</td>
<td>New exam to be established with new examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outcome of examination</td>
<td>Procedural irregularity</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Awaiting panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Outcome of examination</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Awaiting panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Termination of degree</td>
<td>Procedural irregularity</td>
<td>Appeal upheld</td>
<td>Permitted to re-enrol in 2015-16. Fees and stipend covered by SOAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Student Disciplinary Procedure

7.1 Complaints about two students were considered under the Student Disciplinary Procedure (the same number as in the previous two academic sessions) both of which were resolved at Stage 1 (informal investigation by Head of Department). One
complaint related to discrimination and harassment of another student via email and the other complaint concerned harassment of another student. In both cases, the students were asked to sign undertakings regarding their future conduct and given warnings.

7.2 Three further complaints about student behaviour were resolved informally, avoiding the need to take formal disciplinary action.

8. **Office of the Independent Adjudicator**

8.1 SOAS was notified of three complaints made to the OIA in 2014-15: two from research students complaining about poor supervision and termination of PhD registration respectively, and one from a postgraduate taught student complaining about their mark for a particular course module.

8.2 One of the complaints from the research students remains open but the other was deemed not eligible for consideration under the OIA’s rules as the student had not engaged fully with the School’s internal complaints procedures. The postgraduate taught student’s complaint was found to be not justified as there was no evidence of any bias or error in the marking of the course module in question and the OIA cannot review decisions made by academic judgment.

8.3 The OIA issued decisions in respect of four complaints made in 2013-14. One decision has been referred to in 8.2. Of the other three decisions, one found that an appeal relating to mitigating circumstances for coursework was not justified; one found a complaint about PhD termination to be partially justified and asked SOAS to reconvene an academic appeal panel to reconsider the case; and another complaint about PhD termination was settled between the School and the complainant, who agreed to try to resolve the matter through mediation.
The Board of Trustees is asked to note the heatmap of the risk register that was considered at the last meeting of the Audit Committee.

**Executive Summary**

The heat map is provided as part of the termly formal update on the School’s risk management framework to the Audit Committee.

**Recommendations**

Board of Trustees to note the paper.

**Financial Impact**

Many of the risks listed 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
Note - Arrows represent management’s assessment of the adequacy and effectiveness of controls currently in place.

Gross risk (assessed before ‘Existing Controls’)

Current risk (assessed after ‘Existing Controls’)

Risk severity:
- Low
- Moderate
- High

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.
The Board is asked to note the dates of meetings for 2016/17

Executive Summary

The dates of meetings for the Board of Trustees in 2016/17 are as follows:

- Tuesday 11 October 2016 – 15.30-18.00
- Thursday 3 November 2016 – 16.00-18.00 (Informal meeting with Academic Board)
- Tuesday 29 November 2016 - 09.30-12.30
- Thursday 2 February 2017 - 09.30 – 16.00 (Informal away day, preceded by dinner on 1 February)
- Tuesday 4 April 2017 - 09.30-12.00
- Thursday 18 May 2017 – 16.00-20.00 (Informal meeting)
- Monday 10 July 2017 – 15.30-18.00 (Followed by annual dinner)

Dates of meetings for the Board’s sub-committees will be confirmed in due course.

Recommendations

To note the dates of the Board meetings for 2016/17

Financial Impact

None

Risks

None

Equality implications

None
**LETTER FROM JOHN MCDONNELL**

The Board is asked to **note** the attached letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chair of the Board received the attached letter on 3 March 2016 and agreed it should be included on the agenda for the Board to note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To <strong>note</strong> the letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Trustees,

Over the past decade, I have witnessed the struggle of the cleaners at SOAS for improved pay and condition and against their outsourcing to private firms, and, alongside Jeremy Corbyn, have lent my support and solidarity to their campaign. At this key moment in deciding the future of these workers, I thought I would take the opportunity to write to you and urge you, as Trustees of the School, to intervene and ensure the correct decision is made.

I have met with a number of cleaners at SOAS, joined them on picket lines and spoken at their meetings. They are a truly inspirational group of people; as I’m sure you witnessed yourself when Consuelo Moreno addressed your last meeting. The demand being put forward by the cleaners, and their supporters, is clear and simple: to bring the cleaners in-house.

This demand has the clear support of the School’s vibrant, academic community; with over 200 academic staff supporting the call to be brought in-house and the backing of the student body. It is clear that these voices - which make SOAS such an exciting and unique institution - should not, and cannot be ignored in taking this decision. SOAS is an institution which prides itself on its commitment to advancing equality, justice and human rights, and maintaining an outsourced two-tier workforce is not compatible with these strongly held values.

Not only this, but the reason often used to justify outsourcing - as a way to save money - simply does not apply in this case. As a recent Association of Public Service Excellence Report found, bringing the cleaners in-house would be "cost neutral". In fact, I believe there would in fact be a number of benefits for the School in taking a stand against the failed and unethical practice of outsourcing.

Outsourcing companies have a track record of pushing up profits by driving down wages and terms and conditions, and by using excessive and harsh management practices. These firms are also involved in deeply questionable industries. I have repeatedly expressed my concerns about immigration detention centres; two of which - run by Mitie, with whom SOAS currently has a maintenance contract - are within my constituency of Hayes and Harlington. I believe it would be in keeping with SOAS' values and ethics to avoid undertaking any dealings with such companies.

Given these facts, I hope you will take the time to consider the arguments being put forward by the Justice for Cleaners campaign at your next meeting and, upon considering the evidence, agree that the cleaners must be brought in-house.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
STUDENTS’ UNION ACCOUNTS

The Board is asked to **note** the Students’ Union’s draft accounts for 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board of Trustees is required to receive the Students’ Union’s annual accounts under the Education Act. The Students’ Union is a separate legal entity from the School and registered independently with the Charity Commissioners. The accounts are marked as draft as still require signature by the Students’ Union’s auditors due to discussions over the note included on pensions. However, the numbers within the accounts are confirmed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To <strong>note</strong> the accounts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Report of the Trustees
for the Year Ended 31 July 2015

The trustees present their report with the financial statements of the charity for the year ended 31 July 2015. The trustees have adopted the provisions of the Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) 'Accounting and Reporting by Charities' issued in March 2005.
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STRUCTURE, GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT
Governing document
The charity is controlled by its governing document, a deed of trust, and constitutes an unincorporated charity.

Structure, governance, and management
SOAS Students’ Union (SU) is a Registered Charity, Charity Number 1150717, and was registered on the 06/02/2013. SOAS SU is constituted under the Education Act 1994 as a charity with internal regulations and a Constitution approved by the Governing Body of the SOAS (the University) and the Charities Commission. SOAS SU’s aims and objectives, as laid out in its constitution, are to provide representation and support for the students’ of the University, and are further supplemented by the objective of helping members to develop their own charitable activities with active participation in civil society.

SOAS SU is administered by its Executive Committee of students, elected annually by cross-campus secret ballot of the SOAS SU membership. The three Co-President posts are full-time, or ‘sabbatical’, posts remunerated as authorised by the Education Acts and cannot exceed two years’ duration for each holder. The three full-time and fourteen part-time Executive Officers’ posts are regarded as the charity trustees of SOAS SU for the purposes of the Charities Act. (For voting purposes Officers doing a job share are counted as half a vote if they are both present).

SOAS SU operates on democratic principles, with supervisory power vested in the democratically elected Trustees. The Trustees meet at least four times a year to oversee the Union finances, strategic plan, operating plan and risk register. The Trustees report to the membership via the SOAS Union General Meeting, which can question decisions made by the Trustees and holds ultimate democratic veto of no confidence over them. The Union General Meeting membership comprises all of the ordinary members of SOAS Students’ Union as defined by the SOAS SU Constitution. The SOAS UGM meets monthly during term time and an Emergency Meeting can be called at three days notice by ordinary members as laid out in the constitution.

The Trustees (Executive Committee), assisted by sub-committees where appropriate, have delegated the day-to-day running of SOAS SU to a General Manager. As the charity trustees, all Executive Officers receive an induction into their legal and administrative responsibilities, with an ongoing training programme as and when needed during their term of office. In addition to this they meet as an Executive Committee weekly during term time to receive reports from individual Officers, sub-committees and the General Manager, to review the Union’s performance and administration and to decide policy issues. SOAS SU also employs three additional non-student members of staff for the sake of continuity in the management of its many activities. Those staff are accountable to the Trustees for the performance of their duties.

Relationship with SOAS
The relationship between the University and SOAS SU is established in the Standing Orders of the University and detailed in the SOAS SU constitution approved by both organisations. SOAS SU receives a Block Grant from the University, agreed annually and part-occupies both the SOAS buildings. This non-monetary support is intrinsic to the relationship between the University and SOAS SU. In addition to the grant provided to SOAS SU of £270k, the School also provides the SOAS Students’ Union with utilities, office space, IT and administrative support and certain staff free of charge. The fair value of this donation was approximately £550k in 2014-2015. Although SOAS SU continues to generate supplementary funding from various mutual trading activities, it will always be dependent on the University’s support.

There is no reason to believe that this or equivalent support from the University will not continue for the foreseeable future, as the Education Act 1994 imposes a duty on the University to ensure the financial viability of its student representative body.
STRUCTURE, GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Risk management

The responsibility for Risk Management sits with the Trustees who have tasked the General Manager to prepare and update a risk register for them. Scrutiny of the risk register is a standing item on the Trustee meeting agenda, and through it the Trustees consider the major business, strategic, reputational and operational risks faced by SOAS SU. Where appropriate, systems or procedures have been established to mitigate the risks the Union faces.

Budgetary and internal control risks were minimised by the implementation of procedures for authorisation of all transactions and projects. Procedures are in place to ensure compliance with health and safety of staff, volunteers and participants on all activities organised by the Union. These procedures are periodically reviewed to ensure that they continue to meet the needs of the Union.

Reportable Issues 2014-15

The Union received a letter from the Charities Commission regarding an e-mail sent to all students' by one of the Co-Presidents just after the 2015 General Election. There had been a complaint sent to the Commission that the letter broke the rule about the Union being neutral regarding party politics (it specifically identified a protest against the Conservative party), and was therefore against charity rules. The Trustees met over this issue and an apology was sent to all students, and a letter explaining the error was sent to the Charities Commission, who were satisfied that this issue had been dealt with properly and the Union had appropriate procedures in place to deal with issues such as this.
OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES
Aims, Objectives and Activities
The SOAS SU had revised its constitution in October 2010 and has identified the aims and objectives of the SU as follows:

1. The Union's objects are the advancement of education of Students at The School Of Oriental and African Studies for the public benefit by:
   1.1 promoting the interests and welfare of Students at The School Of Oriental and African Studies during their course of study and representing, supporting and advising Students;
   1.2 being the recognised representative channel between Students and The School Of Oriental and African Studies and any other external bodies; and
   1.3 providing social, cultural, sporting and recreational activities and forums for discussions and debate for the personal development of its Students.

In pursuit of these aims for the public benefit, SOAS SU will ensure the diversity of its membership is recognised, valued and supported and has established services for use by its members to support its work within the University. These include the SOAS Shop, Vernon Square Shop, SOAS Bar, the SOAS Class Rep System and over 200 sports and societies. SOAS SU representatives sit on all the relevant committees of the University including the SOAS Board of Trustees.

SOAS SU continues to represent the students of the University on relevant local, national and international issues by maintaining a high proportion of student representatives. SOAS SU gets the highest proportional turnout for a Students' Union in the UK in its sabbatical elections. Student representatives attend all School academic departmental meetings which allow the Union to cater effectively to the needs of the students. Student representatives are present on all relevant policy and strategy making bodies.

To further enhance the student experience the Union works closely with the School in a number of partnership initiatives. The Union fully supports the School's Welfare and Wellbeing Unit and works closely with the Careers Service, in particular with the Student Volunteering Unit, supporting SOAS Students volunteering in the community. It also works closely with the School's Enterprise Unit, supporting Student Enterprise. It partners with the Academic Development Directorate to promote the National Student Survey, and uses the results to inform its charitable aim of improving the education at SOAS. The Union is fully represented on working groups for the expansion of the School's Estate in 2016 into the North Block of Russell Square.

When reviewing our objectives and planning our activities, we give due consideration to the Charity Commission's general and relevant supplementary guidance on public benefit.
ACHIEVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

2014-15 was notable for no extended staff or student disruption at SOAS, and a lot of forward planning within the School for the move into the Senate House North Block. It also marked the premature retirement of the SOAS Director Professor Paul Webley CBE, with whom the Students’ Union had built a strong and open relationship, benefiting the operation of the Union. The Union was fully involved in the appointment process of his successor Baroness Valerie Amos, who we also hope to have a constructive ongoing link. SOAS Union maintained its NSS satisfaction remaining in the top quartile of UK Students’ Unions for Satisfaction, and the highest rated Union in a University Of London institution. Other Unions have however made significant strides in improving their election turnout so we can no long claim to be the Union with the highest election turnout.

The new staff team settled in 2014-15 and we obtained part-funding for a new post, Sports, Activities and Events Co-Ordinator to support the Co-President Activities and Events. There was also a request for a fourth sabbatical officer to cover Equality and Liberation - which has been held back until 2016-17 to further get research on similar roles in the sector. The Union re-achieved Gold Standard in the NUS Green Impact (after a year off for a Green Excellence Project). With the new Sport, Societies and Activities Co-Ordinator we were able to start three new competitive sports team (additional Football and Basketball teams and a Lacrosse Team), and ran increased intra-mural sports events to increase non-competitive sports. The Union continues to fundraise and support two Scholarships, and also paid £90,000 - the full cost of the project - to reclaim the outside area of the bar and therefore increase student space. We also planned a significant improvement for our AV equipment for the bar and JCR to be installed summer 2015.

Please find below specific movement on our operating plan for the year.

OBJECTIVE

EDUCATION

i) The Union will develop a new Education Priority Paper for the first SOAS Academic Board meeting, this paper will go to the first UGM of the year. We will be looking for a significant move on four of the points in the paper.

ii) Running the trial of Unitu (student representative development system) with three pilot departments with the aim to roll out to all of the School by the end of the year if successful.

SPORT DEVELOPMENT

i) Develop the use of the new membership database to accurately measure and survey the sporting activity of students, and identify hard to reach groups.

ii) Recruit, train and embed the new Sports, Activities and Events Co-Ordinator in the Union, to create with the Co-President Activities and Events a three year Sports Development Strategy by year end

INTERNATIONALISATION

i) Run at least 9 high profile speaker events on major international topics to give new perspectives and further engagement with the world for SOAS Students

ACHIEVEMENT

EDUCATION

i) The school implemented the new Mitigating Circumstances policy, agreed to run a pilot on exam feedback, agreed to look into contact time for PGT students during dissertations and had a review of academic governance leading to greater transparency.

ii) The first phase of the Unitu trial was run with mixed success, it was agreed to run a second year trial for full faculty to see if it was worth the investment and if it really gave us any measurable improvement in our discussions with reps.

SPORT DEVELOPMENT

i) Despite issues in getting regular data updates from the School, we were able to accurately map students into their sports teams, getting an engaged sporting number of 696 students - and notable drop outs from certain groups of first year undergraduates which will be followed up.

ii) Sebastian Cirillo was recruited in September and was able to assist start three new sports teams, and book pitches in advance for 15/16, with projected savings of £6,000 due to early block booking. Sports and activities strategy moved to 2015/16.

INTERNATIONALISATION

i) Ran the successful "100 Years Of Knowledge Production Talks" across three departments, and four high profile Decolonising SOAS talks with over 700 attendees.
ACHIEVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

ii) Improve School support for PhD International Students with Visa issues around writing up and corrections.

iii) To work with the School to create alternative options for a UK Guarantor scheme to help ameliorate accommodation issues that international students face.

ENVIRONMENT AND ETHICS

i) Embedding Equality & Diversity training in Society & Sports Training and developing a Safe Space policy to enshrine Equality & Diversity monitoring in all that we do.

ii) Continue the campaign to improve the access to drinking water on campus and get water fountains installed.

ENTERPRISE AND EMPLOYABILITY

i) Continue working to persuade the School to allow free access to Gradclub for SOAS graduates and working with the Careers service to publicise this opportunity.

ii) To set up a committee and plan for an external SOAS Festival for the year end, under good business practice rules and with the long term aim of making such an event annual and sustainable

WELFARE

i) Develop the peer support network beyond the pilot with Student Advice and Wellbeing.

ii) To promote a review of the Students Advice & Wellbeing to identify strengths and weaknesses and areas which require additional support in preparation for the move to the Student Hub and North Block.

ii) We worked with the Doctoral School to look at the position of international students with writing up issues and identify plans for those who may have difficulty.

iii) Agreed a School Guarantor Pilot for 15/16 and worked with the School's new Housing Officer to look at implementation.

ENVIRONMENT AND ETHICS

i) Ran a pilot of Equality & Diversity Training for all sports and societies. There were issues with the number who turned up and we will work with the School to deliver these sessions in greater depth in future.

ii) Water Fountains have been put in place now across the whole main building on each floor and within the library.

ENTERPRISE AND EMPLOYABILITY

i) The Careers service removed the fee for Gradclub in summer of 2015, meaning all graduates now had free access to careers advice and support.

ii) Significant work was put into researching and planning a summer festival, but the business plan did not warrant continuing with the organisation.

WELFARE

i) Peer support network was extended in 14/15 and we worked closely with the School to make sure it was now embedded into Welcome Week.

ii) This was delayed by the vacancy in Director of Student and Registry Services post, we were unable to get the School to review the provision until this position is filled.

FINANCIAL REVIEW

SOAS SU's gross income from all sources this year totalled £1,331,131. Total expenditure was £1,312,095 which left a small profit at year end of £19,036(of which surplus of £6,448 related to unrestricted purposes). The Union held £513,511 in reserves at the end of the year (of which £34,417 are restricted funds of its constituent societies). The Union has committed however to a capital spend of approximately £120,000 for refurbishing the outside area of the bar and improving its sound equipment.

SOAS SU has continued to benefit from the recognition and support of the University, who are their principal funders, and this year the Block Grant was £250,031. This money primarily supports the day-to-day charitable activities, funding for sports teams, societies, the student representation systems and other membership services,This figure also includes £82,768 in salaries of the full time sabbatical officers. The grant was increased in 2014-15 to increase support for sports, with additional ring fenced money for pitch hire, and subsidy for an additional post in the Union to run sports, activities and events.

Other income is generated by commercial services within the Union, a student bar and social space, a stationary and coffee shop on each campus and some money raised from contracting out the SU Radio Studio. Most of these student facing commercial services are run with a low margin as a service to students, which also provides safe social space within the University, however the Union has a reserves policy for any profits made.
FINANCIAL REVIEW
The Union maintains three months running costs plus stock costs as reserves, (which have been valued at £90,000). The Union aims to make a small profit on a year on year basis, and feeds 60% of this operating profit into the societies fund, accruing the rest for capital projects.
FUTURE PLANS AND FUNDING
In 2010-2011 SOAS Students' Union undertook a Strategic Referendum to identify the areas of concern students most wanted the Union to concentrate on. This has subsequently been turned into a Strategic Plan for the School's centenary, covering 2011-16. The six areas of priority indicated by the referendum were:

- Education
- Sport Development
- Internationalisation
- Environment and Ethics
- Employability and Enterprise
- Welfare

In 2015-16 the Students' Union will undergo it five year governance review to see if its constitution and processes are fit for purpose. It will also be running a strategic referendum to identify new strategic priorities for 2016-2019 - it has been identified that a three year cycle for strategy is more suitable for Students' Unions. As such the new strategy will be drawn out of this process and be developed via our democratic structures during the year.

As 2015-16 will be spent doing this work, it was agreed to just have one operational goal for each of the strategic headings and also so a final review of our Centenary Strategic Plan.

EDUCATION
- The Union will develop a new Education Priority Paper for the first SOAS Academic Board meeting, this paper will go to the first UGM of the year. We will be looking for a significant move on four of the points in the paper.

SPORT DEVELOPMENT
- The Union will develop individual budget setting for the sports teams, putting proper financial autonomy into sport teams hands hopefully reducing wasted money from unused pitches and fines.

INTERNATIONALISATION
- The Union will develop its strategy for Decolonising the Curriculum, running a number of events and feeding into the School's curriculum review with this as a priority (mirroring a similar successful UCLU project).

ENVIRONMENT AND ETHICS
- Run the Solar SOAS project (a student led community run solar panel scheme) as a Green Impact Excellence Project and gain Gold in excellence.

ENTERPRISE AND EMPLOYABILITY
- Work with Student Enterprise to expand and embed the SOAS Bazaar as a regular part of the Union Calendar, and to work with Student Hubs on expanding their consulting pilot.

WELFARE
- The Union will pilot a number of sexual violence and consent classes for students and societies, with the aim of getting the School to run consent classes for all new students in 2016-17.

To support these goals the Students' Union has developed a Non-Academic Priorities paper for Finance & Planning Committee., The Union will continue working with the School to identify more space on campus for student activities and will be involved in national issues via its membership of the National Union Of Students.

Commercially the Union has set a target of 1% (inflationary) growth in the Snack Bar, 8% in the Bar (due to additional space) and 1% (inflationary) increase in Vernon Square. The Union has set SOAS Radio a target of £35,000 income for the year, in line with this year - to break even.
STATEMENT OF TRUSTEES RESPONSIBILITIES
The trustees are responsible for preparing the Report of the Trustees and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

The law applicable to charities in England and Wales, the Charities Act 2011, Charity (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 and the provisions of the trust deed requires the trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the charity and of the incoming resources and application of resources, including the income and expenditure, of the charity for that period. In preparing those financial statements, the trustees are required to

- select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- observe the methods and principles in the Charity SORP;
- make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in business.

The trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and to enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011, the Charity (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 and the provisions of the trust deed. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

The Trustees confirm that SOAS SU has sufficient funds to meet all of its obligations. The Block Grant for 2015/16 has been confirmed at £291,035 and the commercial activities are expected to generate an operational profit of £35,000 for the year to be ploughed back into student facing services.

Approved by order of the board of trustees on ............................................. and signed on its behalf by:

.............................................
Trustee
We have audited the financial statements of School of Oriental and African Studies Students' Union for the year ended 31 July 2015 on pages thirteen to twenty two. The financial reporting framework that has been applied in their preparation is applicable law and the Financial Reporting Standard for Smaller Entities (effective April 2008) (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice applicable to Smaller Entities).

This report is made solely to the charity's trustees, as a body, in accordance with Section 144 of the Charities Act 2011 and regulations made under Section 154 of that Act. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to the charity's trustees those matters we are required to state to them in an auditors’ report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the charity and the charity's trustees as a body, for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of trustees and auditors
As explained more fully in the Statement of Trustees Responsibilities set out on page ten, the trustees are responsible for the preparation of the financial statements which give a true and fair view.

We have been appointed as auditors under Section 144 of the Charities Act 2011 and report in accordance with regulations made under Section 154 of that Act.

Our responsibility is to audit and express an opinion on the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland). Those standards require us to comply with the Auditing Practices Board's Ethical Standards for Auditors.

Scope of the audit of the financial statements
An audit involves obtaining evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements sufficient to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. This includes an assessment of: whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the charity's circumstances and have been consistently applied and adequately disclosed; the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by the trustees; and the overall presentation of the financial statements. In addition, we read all the financial and non-financial information in the Report of the Trustees to identify material inconsistencies with the audited financial statements and to identify any information that is apparently materially incorrect based on, or materially inconsistent with, the knowledge acquired by us in the course of performing the audit. If we become aware of any apparent material misstatements or inconsistencies we consider the implications for our report.

Opinion on financial statements
In our opinion the financial statements:
- give a true and fair view of the state of the charity's affairs as at 31 July 2015 and of its incoming resources and application of resources for the year then ended;
- have been properly prepared in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice applicable to Smaller Entities; and
- have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011.
Matters on which we are required to report by exception

We have nothing to report in respect of the following matters where the Charities Act 2011 requires us to report to you if, in our opinion:

- the information given in the Report of the Trustees is inconsistent in any material respect with the financial statements; or
- sufficient accounting records have not been kept; or
- the financial statements are not in agreement with the accounting records and returns; or
- we have not received all the information and explanations we require for our audit.

Knox Cropper
Chartered Accountants and Statutory Auditors
Eligible to act as an auditor in terms of Section 1212 of the Companies Act 2006
153-155 London Road
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire
HP3 9SQ

Date: .............................................
INCOMING RESOURCES

Incoming resources from generated funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted fund</td>
<td>Restricted funds</td>
<td>Total funds</td>
<td>Total funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for generating funds</td>
<td>£234,145</td>
<td>£46,193</td>
<td>£280,338</td>
<td>£225,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>£409</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£409</td>
<td>£379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incoming resources from charitable activities

| Union bar | £248,445 | - | £248,445 | 257,052 |
| Union shop | £570,605 | - | £570,605 | 561,152 |
| Vernon Square Cafe | £95,080 | - | £95,080 | 87,363 |
| Clubs and societies | - | £73,894 | - | £73,894 | 75,316 |
| Union entertainment | £10,870 | - | £10,870 | 3,815 |
| SOAS Radio | £36,800 | - | £36,800 | 43,775 |
| Events | £7,300 | - | £7,300 | 6,322 |
| Other incoming resources | £7,390 | - | £7,390 | 3,088 |

Total incoming resources

| £1,211,044 | £120,087 | £1,331,131 | £1,264,083 |

RESOURCES EXPENDED

Charitable activities

| Welfare and campaigns | £33,726 | - | £33,726 | 32,767 |
| Union bar | £220,539 | - | £220,539 | 208,278 |
| Union shop | £492,181 | - | £492,181 | 519,816 |
| Vernon Square Cafe | £102,825 | - | £102,825 | 82,819 |
| Subscriptions and affiliation fees | £38,101 | - | £38,101 | 34,615 |
| Clubs and societies | £158,886 | £107,499 | £266,385 | 264,350 |
| Union entertainment | £62,143 | - | £62,143 | 55,035 |
| SOAS Radio | £61,588 | - | £61,588 | 66,310 |
| Events | £7,844 | - | £7,844 | 12,380 |
| Scholarship | £18,000 | - | £18,000 | - |
| Governance costs | £8,763 | - | £8,763 | 4,246 |

Total resources expended

| £1,204,596 | £107,499 | £1,312,095 | £1,280,616 |

NET INCOMING/(OUTGOING) RESOURCES

| £6,448 | £12,588 | £19,036 | (16,533) |

RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS

Total funds brought forward

| £460,058 | £34,417 | £494,475 | £511,008 |

TOTAL FUNDS CARRIED FORWARD

| £466,506 | £47,005 | £513,511 | £494,475 |

The notes form part of these financial statements
Balance Sheet  
At 31 July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fund</td>
<td>funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIXED ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>302,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank and in hand</td>
<td></td>
<td>199,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>518,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDITORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts falling due within one year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(122,202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>396,006</td>
<td>47,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSETS LESS CURRENT LIABILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>466,506</td>
<td>47,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>466,506</td>
<td>47,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>466,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The financial statements were approved by the Board of Trustees on ........................................... and were signed on its behalf by:

.............................................
Trustee

The notes form part of these financial statements
1. ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Accounting convention
The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention, with the exception of investments which are included at market value, and in accordance with the Financial Reporting Standard for Smaller Entities (effective April 2008), the Charities Act 2011 and the requirements of the Statement of Recommended Practice, Accounting and Reporting by Charities.

Incoming resources
The school grant is included on the Statement of Financial Activities when the charity is legally entitled to the income and the amount can be quantified with reasonable accuracy. Income in respect of trading activities is accounted for when received and is stated net of VAT.

Resources expended
Expenditure is accounted for on an accruals basis and has been classified under headings that aggregate all cost related to the category. Where costs cannot be directly attributed to particular headings they have been allocated to activities on a basis consistent with the use of resources.

Tangible fixed assets
Are recorded at cost. Items with a value below £1,000 are not capitalised. Depreciation is provided for at the following rates in order to write off each asset over its estimated useful life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Depreciation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to property</td>
<td>- 10% on cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures &amp; fittings</td>
<td>- 20% on cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stocks
Stocks are valued at the lower of cost and net realisable value, after making due allowance for obsolete and slow moving items.

Taxation
The charity is exempt from tax on its charitable activities.

Fund accounting
Unrestricted funds can be used in accordance with the charitable objectives at the discretion of the trustees.

Restricted funds can only be used for particular restricted purposes. Restrictions arise when specified by the donor or when funds are raised for particular restricted purposes.

Restricted funds comprise of the sports and societies fund, which represents funds raised by the individual clubs and societies for their own use.

2. ACTIVITIES FOR GENERATING FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School grant</td>
<td>276,479</td>
<td>222,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission income</td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>3,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. INVESTMENT INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit account interest</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. INCOMING RESOURCES FROM CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bar</td>
<td>223,801</td>
<td>229,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier target discount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bar</td>
<td>24,644</td>
<td>27,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack shop sales</td>
<td>570,605</td>
<td>561,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Square Café Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Square Cafe</td>
<td>95,080</td>
<td>87,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and Societies income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and societies</td>
<td>73,894</td>
<td>75,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union entertainment</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>3,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS Radio</td>
<td>36,800</td>
<td>43,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshers Fayre</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>6,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total incoming resources from charitable activities: 1,042,994 | 1,034,795

5. CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Direct costs</th>
<th>Support costs (See note 6)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare and campaigns</td>
<td>33,726</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bar</td>
<td>189,967</td>
<td>30,572</td>
<td>220,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union shop</td>
<td>425,054</td>
<td>67,127</td>
<td>492,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Square Cafe</td>
<td>87,793</td>
<td>15,032</td>
<td>102,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and societies</td>
<td>228,284</td>
<td>38,101</td>
<td>266,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union entertainment</td>
<td>24,042</td>
<td>38,101</td>
<td>62,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS Radio</td>
<td>60,019</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>61,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>7,844</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions and affiliation fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,101</td>
<td>38,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total charitable activities costs: 1,074,729 | 228,603 | 1,303,332
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6. **SUPPORT COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Basis of allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance costs</td>
<td>Student Social Enterprise - 49.5% (split as a % of turnover Student representation and activities - 49.5% Governance costs - 1% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bar</td>
<td>Student Social Enterprise - 49.5% (split as a % of turnover Student representation and activities - 49.5% Governance costs - 1% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union shop</td>
<td>Student Social Enterprise - 49.5% (split as a % of turnover Student representation and activities - 49.5% Governance costs - 1% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Square Cafe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions and affiliation fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Basis of allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Student Social Enterprise - 49.5% (split as a % of turnover Student representation and activities - 49.5% Governance costs - 1% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Student Social Enterprise - 49.5% (split as a % of turnover Student representation and activities - 49.5% Governance costs - 1% )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support costs, included in the above, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance costs costs</th>
<th>Union bar</th>
<th>Union shop</th>
<th>Vernon Square Cafe</th>
<th>SOAS Radio</th>
<th>Subscriptions and affiliation fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>23,646</td>
<td>51,917</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>29,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT equipment and Event Manager</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation - tangible assets</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>7,525</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>4,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,572</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,127</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,032</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clubs and societies</th>
<th>Union entertainment</th>
<th>SOAS Radio</th>
<th>Subscriptions and affiliation fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>29,468</td>
<td>29,468</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT equipment and Event Manager</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried forward</td>
<td>33,303</td>
<td>61,567</td>
<td>68,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 2014
6. SUPPORT COSTS - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clubs and societies</th>
<th>Union entertainment</th>
<th>SOAS Radio</th>
<th>Total activities</th>
<th>Total activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought forward</td>
<td>33,303</td>
<td>61,567</td>
<td>68,404</td>
<td>202,881</td>
<td>203,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14,952</td>
<td>15,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation - tangible assets</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>4,272</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>25,886</td>
<td>27,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>2,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,101</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,101</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>230,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>209,781</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. GOVERNANCE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors' remuneration</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,763</td>
<td>4,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. TRUSTEES' REMUNERATION AND BENEFITS

None of the trustees were remunerated or paid expenses in respect of the performance of their duties as trustees. Trustees were remunerated in respect of their roles as sabbatical officers. See note 15

Trustees' expenses

No trustees were paid expenses in respect of the performance of their duties as trustees.

9. STAFF COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages and salaries</td>
<td>427,383</td>
<td>388,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average monthly number of employees during the year was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time management staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time retail staff</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No employees received emoluments in excess of £60,000.
10. PENSION SCHEMES

a) Universities Superannuation Scheme (USS)
The company participates in the Universities Superannuation Scheme, a defined benefit scheme which is externally funded and contracted out of the State Second Pension (S2P). The assets of the scheme are held in a separate trustee-administrated fund.

The latest triennial actuarial valuation of the scheme was at 31 March 2014. This was the third valuation for USS under then new scheme-specific funding regime introduced by the Pensions Act 2004, which requires schemes to adopt a statutory funding objective, which is to have sufficient and appropriate assets to cover their technical provisions.

At the valuation date, the value of the assets of the scheme was £41.6 billion and the value of the scheme's technical provisions was £46.9 billion indicating a shortfall of £5.3 billion. The assets therefore were sufficient to cover 89% of the benefits, which had accrued to members after allowing for expected future increases in earnings.

Following UK government legislation, from 2011 statutory pensions increases or revaluations are based on the Consumer Prices Index measure of price inflation. Historically these increases had been based on the Retail Prices Index measure of price inflation.

The company participates in the salary sacrifice pension scheme. The staff costs (note 9) shows the pensionable salary which includes the company contribution rate payable, which was 16% of pensionable salaries.

As at 31 July 2015 the institution had 2 active members participating in the scheme.

The total pension cost (excluding the salary sacrifice pension element) for the company was £XXXX (2014: £XXXX).

b) Superannuation Arrangements of the University of London (SAUL)
The company participates in a centralised defined benefit scheme for all qualified employees with the assets held in separate Trustee-administered funds.

The scheme is subject to triennial valuation by professionally qualified and independent actuaries. The last available valuation was carried out as at 31st March 2011. The market value of the scheme's assets was £1,506 million representing 95% of the liability for benefits after allowing for expected future increases in salaries.

Based on the strength of the Employer covenant and Trustee's long-term investment strategy, the Trustee and Employers agreed to maintain Employer and Member contributions at 13% of salaries and 6% of salaries respectively following the valuation. The above rates will be reviewed when the results of the next formal valuation (as at 31 March 2014) are known.

A comparison of SAUL's assets and liabilities calculated using assumptions consistent with FRS17 revealed SAUL to be in deficit at the last formal valuation date (31st March 2011).

The more material changes (the introduction of a Career Average Revalued Earnings, or "CARE", benefit structure) to SAUL's benefit structure applied from 1 July 2012. As a consequence, the cost of benefit accrual is expected to fall as existing final salary members are replaced by new members joining the CARE structure. This will allow an increasing proportion of the expected asset return to be used to eliminate the funding shortfall. Based on conditions as at 31 March 2011, the shortfall is expected to be eliminated by 31 March 2021, which is 10 years from the valuation date.

The company participates in the salary sacrifice pension scheme. The staff costs (note 9) shows the pensionable salary which includes the which includes the company contribution rate payable, which was 13% of pensionable salaries.
10. **PENSION SCHEMES**
The total pension cost for the company (excluding the salary sacrifice pension element) was £XXXX (2014: £XXXX).

11. **TANGIBLE FIXED ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improvements to property</th>
<th>Fixtures and fittings</th>
<th>Totals £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 1 August 2014</td>
<td>128,396</td>
<td>75,330</td>
<td>203,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At 31 July 2015</strong></td>
<td>128,396</td>
<td>76,604</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPRECIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 1 August 2014</td>
<td>56,844</td>
<td>51,770</td>
<td>108,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge for year</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>13,046</td>
<td>25,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At 31 July 2015</strong></td>
<td>69,684</td>
<td>64,816</td>
<td>134,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BOOK VALUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 31 July 2015</td>
<td>58,712</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>70,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 31 July 2014</td>
<td>71,552</td>
<td>23,560</td>
<td>95,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **STOCKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,365</td>
<td>18,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **DEBTORS: AMOUNTS FALLING DUE WITHIN ONE YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade debtors</td>
<td>50,701</td>
<td>55,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other debtors</td>
<td>251,454</td>
<td>160,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302,155</td>
<td>216,679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other debtors relates entirely to the grant received from SOAS
14. **CREDITORS: AMOUNTS FALLING DUE WITHIN ONE YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank loans and overdrafts</td>
<td>£ 0</td>
<td>11,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade creditors</td>
<td>96,440</td>
<td>27,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation and social security</td>
<td>6,749</td>
<td>18,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other creditors</td>
<td>19,013</td>
<td>32,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>122,202</td>
<td>90,143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **MOVEMENT IN FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At 1.8.14</th>
<th>Net movement in funds</th>
<th>At 31.7.15</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General fund</td>
<td>460,058</td>
<td>6,448</td>
<td>466,506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restricted funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and Societies</td>
<td>34,417</td>
<td>12,588</td>
<td>47,005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>494,475</td>
<td>19,036</td>
<td>513,511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net movement in funds, included in the above are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incoming resources</th>
<th>Resources expended</th>
<th>Movement in funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General fund</td>
<td>1,211,044</td>
<td>(1,204,596)</td>
<td>6,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restricted funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports ground fund</td>
<td>41,832</td>
<td>(41,832)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport fund</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>(4,361)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and Societies</td>
<td>73,894</td>
<td>(61,306)</td>
<td>12,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>1,331,131</td>
<td>(1,312,095)</td>
<td>19,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. RELATED PARTY DISCLOSURES

The Union transacts with the University of Oriental & African Studies (SOAS) their relationship is defined in the Report of the Trustees. A grant was received by the Union from SOAS as detailed in the notes to the accounts, Note 2.

The following transactions took place with sabbatical officers in the year ended the 31st July, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sabbatical Post</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co President Democracy &amp; Education</td>
<td>£23,260</td>
<td>£ 966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co President Sports &amp; Societies</td>
<td>£23,260</td>
<td>£1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co President Welfare &amp; Campaigns</td>
<td>£23,260</td>
<td>£1,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Statement of Financial Activities
for the Year Ended 31 July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities for generating funds</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School grant</td>
<td>276,479</td>
<td>222,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission income</td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>3,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incoming resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>280,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>225,821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment income**

| Deposit account interest       | 409       | 379       |

**Incoming resources from charitable activities**

| Bar sales                      | 223,801   | 229,115   |
| Snack shop sales               | 570,605   | 561,152   |
| Union entertainment            | 10,870    | 3,815     |
| Vernon Square Café Sales       | 95,080    | 87,363    |
| Supplier target discount       | 24,644    | 27,937    |
| SOAS Radio                     | 36,800    | 43,775    |
| Clubs and Societies income     | 73,894    | 75,316    |
| Freshers Fayre                 | 7,300     | 6,322     |
| **Total incoming resources**   | **1,042,994** | **1,034,795** |

**Other incoming resources**

| Other Income                   | 7,390     | 3,088     |

**Total incoming resources**

| **Total incoming resources**   | **1,331,131** | **1,264,083** |

**RESOURCES EXPENDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charitable activities</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and wages</td>
<td>248,789</td>
<td>226,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union bar purchases</td>
<td>113,863</td>
<td>101,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack shop purchases</td>
<td>342,154</td>
<td>372,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union affiliations</td>
<td>14,552</td>
<td>14,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainments</td>
<td>24,042</td>
<td>20,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns</td>
<td>33,726</td>
<td>32,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licences</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Square Café purchases</td>
<td>49,334</td>
<td>46,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS Radio</td>
<td>7,486</td>
<td>24,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport clubs expenditure</td>
<td>24,156</td>
<td>23,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and Societies</td>
<td>114,780</td>
<td>120,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports travel</td>
<td>5,904</td>
<td>3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>8,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch hire</td>
<td>65,956</td>
<td>59,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried forward</td>
<td>1,048,885</td>
<td>1,056,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This page does not form part of the statutory financial statements
## Detailed Statement of Financial Activities

for the Year Ended 31 July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought forward</td>
<td>1,048,885</td>
<td>1,056,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshers events</td>
<td>7,844</td>
<td>12,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,074,729</td>
<td>1,068,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditors' remuneration</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>178,594</td>
<td>161,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT equipment and Event Manager</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training &amp; other expense</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>9,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and renewals</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>3,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to property - Depreciation</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>12,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures and fittings - Depreciation</td>
<td>13,046</td>
<td>14,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>228,687</td>
<td>207,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>2,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resources expended</td>
<td>1,312,095</td>
<td>1,280,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income/(expenditure)</td>
<td>19,036</td>
<td>(16,533)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This page does not form part of the statutory financial statements
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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ACADEMIC BOARD

MINUTES
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Baroness V Amos (Chair) Dr E Onyema
Professor C Bramall Professor C Oughton
Professor A Contadini

Professor R Fardon Professor S Reid
Professor A George Mr J Robinson
Ms L Gibbs Professor G Singh
Dr L Hammond Ms H Slydel
Dr R Harris * Mr M Vlatkovic*
Professor S Hopgood
Dr D Johnston
Dr G Kirsch*
Mr P Kohler
Dr M Laffey
Professor L Marten
Professor D Mosse
Dr B Murtagh*
Professor I Nikolaeva

* - denotes apologies

In attendance:
Mr P Baran
Ms S Blohm
Ms V Burnett

Mr G Davies
Dr C Ince
Dr Ian Pickup

26. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 11th November 2015 and 21st January 2016 were approved as a true record.

27. Action Taken

Academic Board noted the action points from the last meeting.
28. Matters Arising/For Report
There were no matters arising.

29. Director’s Report

Academic Board noted the most recent written report from the Director. An oral report was presented of the Resource and Planning Committee (RPC) meeting on Tuesday 8th March 2016.

Discussions at RPC took place around how academic strategy linked to the financial issues under discussion as part of the sustainability work. There were a range of issues discussed in relation to the financial sustainability document, which went to all staff members in February. RPC members noted what had been proposed in the document and discussed the proposals. Academic Board noted the view from the members who attended RPC that the sharing of information and discussions at RPC was very interesting and useful.

30. SOAS Strategy

The Director reported that this was the first draft of the Strategy for discussion at Academic Board before wider consultation with the School. The strategy piece of work was a key part of the overall sustainability work and would be formally approved later in the year by the Board of Trustees. The aim of the discussion at Academic Board was to receive initial feedback and views from members on what their thoughts were. Further work would take place to develop objectives and performance indicators. The strategy would also assist in the development for the case for support to be used during the centenary fundraising campaign.

Members of the group felt SOAS should pride itself on world class research and this should be recognised as the first strategic aim in the document. The document needed to emphasise the importance of languages and doctoral students within the narrative. Academic Board members were encouraged to look through the document and discuss together and email comments any further comments.

Academic Board noted that the Strategy would be discussed at the next Head’s Forum as part of the wider consultation process.

31. Learning, teaching and student experience strategy

Academic Board considered the paper from the Pro-Director, Learning & Teaching, which set out the new learning and teaching strategy for the school but now incorporated the student experience. The Learning and Teaching goals linked to the overarching SOAS strategy and reflected the external issues such as the Teaching Excellence Framework. Due to the changing external environment the strategy was over a three-year period to 2019.

It was crucial that members were happy with the goals for SOAS and further comments could be sent in from staff and students. The final version would be agreed by the end of the academic session.

32. Curriculum Review

The paper set out a key part of the implementation of the draft Learning & Teaching Strategy and the curriculum review work stream under the current work of the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board. The key elements of the process for curriculum review were to enhance healthy recruitment in line with our
financial sustainability plans, provide support around improvement and improve the on-going curriculum reform process. A curriculum review needed to be informed by the School strategy and with broad clarity and agreement about the reviews goals. Decisions regarding the process at SOAS had to be led by departments with staff engagement and involvement at all levels. However, there would need to be input from School level structures, such as Academic Development Committee, to facilitate discussions across the school and learn from departments on what they have achieved. This would also look at overlap between departments.

The timeline and priority was to agree Terms of Reference for the Curriculum Review group, including membership, scope and plan before the end of the month. This Group would then undertake the curriculum review to deliver a new and revised curriculum by 2018. The Pro-Director welcomed any further views and comments from members of the Academic Board and hoped to reflect those comments in the final document.

33. Research Excellence

The Pro-Director, Research & Enterprise reported that the paper set out a new strategy and provided a report on the work initiated by Academic Board in the previous academic year. The five strategic objectives are recognition of excellence, regional engagement, disciplinary approaches, impact on scholarship and benefits for society. Some of the activities on the report will require a budgetary allocation for regional institutes. This needed to be agreed, together with targets for external income to be raised. Some of the issues to clarify were the Institutes’ role in providing leadership within the research strategy, a clearer strategy on languages and improving data. It was suggested to organise a day long workshop with 4-sessions with different people from faculties to analyse these questions. In addition, to take on conversations on what is strategically good for the school.

Academic Board put forward their comments and approved the report and its recommendations.

34. Regional Institutes & Centres

Academic Board approved the paper.

35. Review of Languages

The Dean of the Faculty of Languages & Cultures reported that the aim was to have a clear plan that provided input to the development of an institutional strategy for languages. This would maintain a broad range of languages to support the strengths of disciplines and language-based area studies. It was essential to develop a sustainable financial basis for language learning and teaching, placing a particular emphasis on the maintenance of small student numbers. Members provided feedback on the paper. It was suggested to receive further thoughts from members outlining what the objectives would be around strategic priorities and, the general importance around SOAS languages going forward.

36. Academic Governance

The Secretary introduced the paper which asked Academic Board to consider and approve the proposals for recommendations to the Board of Trustees on changes to the School’s academic governance structures.

The Board of Trustees initiated a 2015/16 Effectiveness Review to address issues on institutional governance raised by the 2013/14 Governing Body Effectiveness Review, the 2014/15 Academic Board Working Group and the Democratise SOAS campaign. The Board of Trustees also received an internal audit report covering a number of recommendations at its meeting in July 2015.

Academic Board discussed in detail the proposals to create an Academic Senate. It was noted that this would be a large group that might not work due to its size. Academic Board debated if the membership
of the Group should comprise permanent academic staff or also include professional services staff at Grade 8 and above as members or to be in attendance. There was no consensus on the issue so a vote was held and by 13 to 7 votes Academic Board agreed to recommend that this group of professional services staff would be full members.

Academic Board noted that the first meeting of the Senate was provisionally scheduled for 11 May. A key task for this term was to elect the academic staff members from the Senate to the Academic Board.

Academic Board approved proposals to increase its membership. These would be revised to retain representation from the Associate Deans.

Academic Board approved the recommendations in the paper subject to the above changes. The Secretary would prepare a revised paper for submission to the Board of Trustees meeting on 22 April.

37. Academic Promotions Criteria
Academic Board was asked to agree and approve revised criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor as part of the Academic Performance Framework.

Questions were considered of whether the recently agreed criteria for promotion to Reader and Professor should prioritise the position of research in promotion as these had previously concluded that this should be a requirement. However, since then, the Government has published its Green Paper on Higher Education which made clear that under rules from the Teaching Excellence Framework, universities would be expected to recognise and reward excellent teaching through parity of status between teaching and research. Therefore the School had to agree a mechanism to address.

It was agreed that the criteria would be revised to reflect the necessary change. The Pro-Director, Research & Enterprise would convene a small working group to consider the key issues and then report back to Academic Board at its next meeting. This would include criteria for measuring teaching performance, a review of the earlier decisions and detailed working for the final document.

38. Centralised Timetabling
Academic Board was asked to note and approve the recommendations to move to the collection of staff availability in late March/April 2016. Heads of Department would sign-off and approve the responses.

The central timetabling Office would collect data throughout the school and provide departments with a viable timetable. This process had already been successfully implemented elsewhere.

Members expressed concerns that the current system was not sustainable and approved the principle to move to the new process. The current system was not satisfactory and students were unhappy about their timetables.

39. Senior Fellows

The paper proposed the creation of a new category of Senior Fellow that would be available to individuals outside the Higher Education sector with whom we are partnering on a specific activity. The award was for those who have achieved distinction in a practice or profession of relevance to the SOAS mission, and is actively working with the School in pursuit of a common goal. The appointment would carry no salary. The status would normally be fixed term for 3-years, and approved by the Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise).
The proposal for criteria for the award of the position of Senior Fellow was approved with immediate effect.

40. Department name – DeFims
The recommendation is to change the name of the Department of Financial and Management Studies to the School of Finance and Management with effect from 31st Jul 2016.

Academic Board approved the recommendation in the report and agreed to remove the acronym.

41. Constitution for the Centre for English Studies, SOAS
Constitution for the Centre for English Studies was approved by members of the group.

42. Stern Review
The Stern Review paper from the Pro-Director, Research & Enterprise was noted by Academic Board.

43. Student Complaints, Appeals and Disciplinary Cases
Action: Academic Board agreed this item would be discussed at the next meeting.

44. *Sub-Committees
The following termly reports were received Academic Board members:

(a) Academic Development
(b) Research & Enterprise Committee
(c) Equality & Diversity Committee

45. *Board of Trustees Minutes
Board of Trustees open minutes of 27th November 2015 was noted.

46. * Professional Title
Board members congratulated Mike Charney on his title of “Professor of Asian and Military History”.

47. Date of next meeting
The Academic Board noted the date of the next meeting, on:

- Wednesday 8th June 2016 at 2pm-4pm (Room 116).
## 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>39 (13/14)</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Monitor effect of changes re PGT deadlines</td>
<td>2015/16 session</td>
<td>Director AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Research Excellence</td>
<td>Organise workshops to discuss approach and key questions</td>
<td>8/6/16</td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Promotions criteria</td>
<td>Convene working group and report back with final recommendations</td>
<td>8/6/16</td>
<td>RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Student Complaints</td>
<td>Carry over paper to next meeting</td>
<td>8/6/16</td>
<td>CI</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 4th February 2016

MINUTES

Members: Steve Tinton (Chair)
Andrew Popham

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

Apologies: Rosna Mortuza
James Aston (BDO – External Auditors)
Neil Thomas (KPMG – Internal Auditors)

22. Minutes
The minutes of the meeting on 5th November 2015 were approved. The Committee noted that under Minute 16, the Audit Committee was monitoring the risk register on behalf of the Board of Trustees.

23. Action Points
(i) MIN 5 - Key Performance Indicators
The Committee noted that this action would be delayed until the first meeting of 2016/17 as much of the work would have to take place once the development of the new Strategy and outcome of sustainability work was complete.

(ii) MIN 8 - Internal Audit Plan
The Secretary reported that the internal audit plan had been publicised to staff through the weekly e-newsletter and on the staff intranet, MySOAS. Further consideration would be given to other methods of communicating this to staff, such as departmental visits, when the next year’s plan was prepared in the autumn.

(iii) MIN 10 – Safety audit
The Secretary reported on the progress that was being made to address the recommendation in the internal audit safety report. The Board of Trustees would be updated at its next meeting and a full report would be made to the next Audit Committee meeting.

(iv) MIN 17 – Staff overseas
The Director of Finance & Planning reported that work on policies relating to staff working overseas and necessary NI contributions is under development. It was noted that when overseas people are employed by SOAS, the contract is with SOAS, which means the
payroll is outsourced to the local country. This is a work in progress and is a sector-wide issue, but a low risk. It was also noted that there are issues surrounding work visas for staff and students working overseas.

It was **agreed** that the Bribery Act policy must be reviewed.

(v) MIN 17 – Credit card information
The Director of Finance & Planning noted that IFCELS does not retain any data, this is all held with the Finance directorate. The Language Centre does retain this documentation, but a spot check is carried out on a regular basis. It was **agreed** that this data would be held centrally in the Finance directorate going forward. There was also a suggestion that this information could be moved online in the future.

**24. Matters arising/matters for report**
There were no matters arising.

**25. Risk Register Update** (Appendix A)
The Risk Register update was **noted**. There followed a discussion about the ease of use of the Risk Register and how it should be more focussed. For example, the Risk Register should show KPIs, drivers, actions and how these actions are being monitored. This would help to identify the drivers of the risks and what actions can tackle them. An example Risk Register could be drawn up for the risk around Sustainability. It was **agreed** that this would be discussed further at Academic Board and Executive Board.

**26. HESES Report** (Appendix B)
The Audit Committee **received** the HESES Report for 2015/16. The Director of Finance and Planning **noted** that there are no issues with the quality of the return, but there was a need to further improve the process as there was a problem with the quality of input data for student returns. Therefore, considerable time was taken to check the data quality at the end of the process which would be better resolved at the start. This will be reviewed as part of the internal audit of data quality arrangements.

**27. KPMG Progress Report and recommendation tracker** (Appendix C)
The Internal Auditors **noted** that work on the library, core financials, data quality and Tier 4 would be carried out over the next few weeks and reported to the next meeting of the Committee. These elements were all part of the internal audit plan.

It was **noted** that seven recommendations had gone beyond the agreed deadline. The management updates had been received for these, along with reasons for the delays and revised deadlines had been **agreed**. The Government records may depend on the effectiveness review.

**28. IT Infrastructure Review** (Appendix D)
It was **noted** that there had been improvements since the last report. A draft IS strategy had been drawn up, but was yet to be widely discussed. The Committee **noted** that there had been some examples of poor governance around change management in IT systems. This work has now been incorporated into the Portfolio Board and operational issues were being dealt with. However, there was a need for strategic development. It was **agreed** that an update would be brought to the next Audit Committee.
29. Prevent (Appendix E)
The Registrar noted the difference between the legislation and the guidance that had followed. The Act dealt with issues of radicalisation and the freedom of speech, but the implementation of the guidance risked moving away from the wording of the Act. It was noted that the Act is not about monitoring, but supporting staff and students. HEFCE had visited twice about the articles published in the national media about radical speakers on university campuses, including at SOAS. The Director noted that the approach must be balanced and deal with wider or existing policies and our duty of care to students, staff and visitors.

To date, Prevent had been approached lightly by the School. The first stage of the monitoring has been completed, and the second stage was to supply our documentation to support and explain our approach. The deadline for this was 1st April 2016. The Director noted there was an informal sounding board of academics involved in the work in this area. These academics are content with the ‘A’ rating we awarded in relation to student engagement.

A training plan had been agreed for all staff, and will be approached via the student support handbook. Certain identified staff would be sent on more formal training.

It was agreed that the School’s whistleblowing policy and points of contact would be checked.

30. Date of next meeting:
The Committee noted the next meeting would take place on 26th May 2016
# 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>1 October 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Deep Dive – KPIs</td>
<td>Discussion at BoT with a view to a revised set of KPIs post sustainability work</td>
<td>6/10/16</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safety Audit</td>
<td>Report and management actions to be considered by Board of Trustees</td>
<td>22/4/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 November 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Risk Register Update</td>
<td>A new Risk Register format to be prepared, showing clearly the linkages between identified risks, the drivers of those risks, the actions being taken and the associated measurement/monitoring via KPIs. A traffic light system should be explored for risks and their drivers.</td>
<td>26/5/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td>Formerly Minute 17 – Staff Overseas Review the Bribery Act policy</td>
<td>26/5/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Risk Register Update</td>
<td>Discuss the formatting of the Risk Register at Academic Board and Executive Board</td>
<td>26/5/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>IT Infrastructure Review</td>
<td>Update on the strategic development of the governance of the IT change management</td>
<td>26/5/16</td>
<td>LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Prevent</td>
<td>Check the School’s whistleblowing policy and points of contact</td>
<td>26/5/16</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOAS UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

2\textsuperscript{nd} March 2016 at 10.00am

Room 116

Members
Matthew Craven**
Regina Everitt (Library representative)
Dr Colette Harris
Elizabeth Hull (UCU representative)**
Russell Hunter (Interim Safety Manager)
Chris Ince (Chair)
Jahan Latif (UNISON representative)
Zain Mohamed Dada (Student representative)**
Debbie Nelson
Richard Poulson (Director of Estates and Facilities)
Tim Surch (Human Resources Manager)**
Jonathan Tanner

In attendance
Mike Haddon (Minutes Secretary)

** Member unable to attend.

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 7\textsuperscript{th} October 2015 were confirmed.

2. MATTERS ARISING

The issue of e learning was raised and discussed. This matter will be closed at the next meeting.

3. REPORT FROM THE SAFETY OFFICER

The Committee noted a report from the Safety Officer. Our previous service was largely reactive. This will now change and the new Safety Manager has made immediate progress by working to produce new drafts of the Health and Safety policy and the Overseas Travel policy, for feedback. A review has been undertaken which will lead to recommendations for changes in numerous procedures. Formal approval for these will be sought at the next meeting. Overseas insurance arrangements are being evaluated to ensure adequate cover is in place for staff and students.
Equipment is not currently covered due to high excesses. A form is available on our website for those travelling abroad.

The Health and safety audit completed by KPMG is to be reviewed and a draft risk assessment created. Timescales for implementation will be agreed at the next meeting. A monthly walk around is proposed to detect issues and rectify them. DSE training may be linked to general induction and training.

4. REPORT FROM THE HEAD OF FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

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

Work had continued on the final low risk recommendations from the last fire risk assessment and all agreed actions have now been completed.

A security report detailing incidents for the previous quarter was noted by the Committee.

The Secretary explained some of the measures and policies introduced to tackle gender based violence.

5. OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Committee noted an update and further statistics on the new occupational health contract provided by the HR Manager.

7. SAFETY RISK REGISTER

The Committee noted an updated Safety Risk Register which will be checked at the next meeting in May 2016.

8. REPORTS FROM STAFF AND STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

The Committee noted the following:

**Library:**
No issues were reported.

**Student Representative:**
No representative present

**UCU Representative:**
No representative present

**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>07-10-15</td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Audit recommendations</td>
<td>Training to be promoted via faculty meetings and possibility of training for reps</td>
<td>Chris Ince</td>
<td>25-5-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-10-15</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Recommend FMG’s &amp; DOPS to have standing item on agenda</td>
<td>Chris Ince</td>
<td>25-5-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03-16</td>
<td>HOFM Report</td>
<td>Ensure latest asbestos report is available</td>
<td>Mike Haddon</td>
<td>25-5-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03-16</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Invite Peter Baran to attend future meetings</td>
<td>Mike Haddon</td>
<td>25-05-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015/16 Meetings:

Wednesday 25th May 2016 at 10.00 in Room 116
14. Minutes
The minutes of Resources & Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 10 November 2015 were approved.

15. Action Taken
It was noted that minuted item 42 (2014/15) would be addressed at this meeting of the RPC.

Minuted item 7 was addressed by the Director of Marketing, Student Recruitment and Communications at Board of Trustees February meeting, and an analysis of undergraduate recruitment for 2015/16 academic cycle would be addressed at this meeting of the RPC.

16. Matters arising/for report
The chair welcomed Dr Johnston to the Committee in her role as interim Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching), along with other recent new members, Mr John Feeney and Mr Steve Tinton (Acting Vice-Chair, Board of Trustees). The Committee expressed its thanks to Dr Tim Miller for his service to the Resources and Planning Committee in his former role as Chair of the Board of Trustees, and previously Governing Body.

It was also with great sadness that the members of the Committee acknowledged the passing of former Director, Professor Paul Webley. Members were advised that details of a memorial service for him at SOAS would be available shortly.
17. Director’s Report

A report was received from the Director at Appendix A.

The Committee noted the recent inaccurate press coverage which implied that the School was failing to meet its duties under the Prevent legislation. The Director outlined the collaborative approach that was being taken by many of the universities, but that there was not a sector-wide consensus. This continued to be further hindered by the assessors’ limited understanding of the complexity of the issues. The Committee acknowledged the School’s advantage in having in-house expertise in this matter to advise the Director and Registrar.

18. Finance

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

The Committee noted that the 2015-16 forecast out-turn showed an improvement of £0.9m over the budgeted financial performance. While this improvement is welcomed the revised projected deficit of £0.4m falls someway below the target surplus of 5% of income (£4.1m) the School is seeking to achieve by 2017-18.

The improvement in the projected financial position for 2015-16 is largely attributable to lower than anticipated non-pay expenditure, largely as a result of budget holders not utilising their allocated budgets, and higher expected staff cost savings as a consequence of delays in appointing to (largely) academic positions. A proportion of the general contingency budget has also been released, as deemed appropriate for this stage of the academic cycle. These positive variances are partially offset by lower income projections within IFCELs and CeFIMS distance learning, as well as a decrease in projected other operating income as a result of the occupation of the Brunei Gallery at the start of the year.

The impact of the student occupation of the Brunei Gallery was further considered, in particular the total cost to SOAS. The Director of Finance and Planning reported that while costs of £170k can be directly attributable to the action, future conference earnings are likely to be adversely effected by these actions. The Committee noted that catering income has been in decline and that steps have been taken to better manage the relationship and improve financial performance.

The Committee noted that salary savings had arisen as a result of resignations of academic staff over the summer and part way though the academic year which have not yet been replaced on a like-for-like basis.

It was further noted that this is the second year that non-salary savings have occurred. This under-spend has resulted from an aggregated amount across Departments, particularly in the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences. Consequently as part of the sustainability review, this behaviour is being more closely analysed by Finance directorate with the Faculties.

The Committee also noted that the budget includes an exceptional item of £1.45m for Voluntary Severance scheme costs, based on the assumption that twenty-five staff severances are accepted and agreed under the soon to be launched scheme, all with five or more years of service.

A power-point presentation on Financial Sustainability was delivered by the Director of Finance and Planning, the Deans, and the Registrar, a copy of which was Tabled and is attached as Appendix B(ii).
The key factors contributing to the current financial position were presented, in particular the under-recruitment of PGT students compared to targets, changes to the fee mix, the constraint of not being able to raise regulated income to match inflation, reduced government funding, and the increased costs associated with salaries and investment in our Estate. There were some new additional government charges, such as the apprenticeship levy from April 2017. The Committee noted that the School was required to pay the levy and would consider its options in using apprentices if suitable areas could be found.

The Committee considered the projected shortfall for the School, noting the greatest level of shortfall was within the Faculty of Languages & Cultures.

The Deans each provided a summary of their Faculty's plans towards financial sustainability.

The Faculty of Arts & Humanities is seeking to strategically grow its suite of new programmes leveraging off its relationships with key partners (for example the new MA in Museums Heritage & Material Cultural Studies). While it is also interested in growing markets such as Media Studies and English, it acknowledged that delivering economies of scale through larger recruitment programmes, such as in History and Anthropology, could better help to address shortfalls. The Faculty would also focus on growing enterprise income with the support of alumni and marketing areas of the School. However, it was not considered possible to grow income enough to address the total deficit, and that current staff cost savings via attrition/non-replacement (4.4 FTE) would need to be supplemented with an additional 12.5 FTE reduction in staff should no further growth opportunities be identified.

The Faculty of Languages and Cultures faces particularly difficult decisions given its large deficit and the core role that area studies represent for SOAS. The Committee noted that the Faculty is not well set up structurally with Departments of uneven sizes and teaching programmes occurring in centres sitting outside the department structure. The Faculty is seeking to make savings in salary costs through attrition (7 FTE) and streamlining of teaching. The Committee considered the issue of the range of languages offered, particularly the large number of small enrolments in areas that have traditionally defined SOAS, versus the “big four” where language enrolments are more robust (Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Arabic). An additional summary explaining the languages offered has been attached as tabled item Appendix B(iii). It was suggested that other opportunities such as Executive Training and translation be explored, along with the importance of continuing to compete in the market for the “big four” languages against new competitors entering this space. Without growth, the Faculty is looking at staff reductions of between 8-18 FTE.

The Faculty of Law and Social Sciences is seeking to grow existing successful programmes, such as in Law and Development Studies, by offering extensions or variations of these offerings. It is also proposing new MSc programmes to be delivered via distance learning. The Faculty anticipates a minimal loss of staff, mostly from attrition or Voluntary Severance.

The Registrar outlined the Professional Services strategic direction which would focus on increased investment in Student Recruitment, Student Experience, and Academic Support in the next three years. To achieve this without added expense, current resources (primarily from Estates and LIS) would be re-purposed. The Committee noted that while academic costs for the School were the third highest out of 160 HEIs, professional costs sat mid-way (84th out of 160), and that competitors had been investing heavily in specific areas, such as Marketing. Professional Services are seeking to save £0.3m via staff and non-staff costs.
In summary, while Faculty and Professional Services plans will save in the range of £3.5m to £4.3m, the total shortfall remaining for the School is between £2.2m to £3m. The Committee noted the School’s plan to address this through a Voluntary Severance Scheme which will run via formal recommendations from a Voluntary Severance Panel (meeting on five occasions between mid-March and mid-December) to the Director, whose decision is final.

19. 2016-17 UG Admissions Progress
A report was received from the Head of Planning at Appendix C.

It was noted that, as of the previous Friday (4 March 2016), undergraduate applications were up 13% compared to the same time last year, and offers made by the School were up 93% (3,889 offers compared to 2,012 at the same time last year). The number of firm acceptances was also up 58% although these numbers were low (285) given the early stage of the admissions cycle.

An analysis of possible enrolments for this year based on applications to date suggested that if past enrolment patterns continued then SOAS would likely need to go into clearing to meet targets. However, the School has made more offers earlier this year and plans to increase its conversion activities, which could change conversion patterns and thus improve forecasts. The Committee noted that further updates would be provided as the cycle neared the more critical stages.

20. HEFCE
The Committee considered the test for reasonableness applied in the preparation for the School’s TRAC return for 2015 at Appendix D.

The Committee agreed with the analysis presented.

21. Accelerated Investment Fund
A report was received from the Secretary of SOAS on the current portfolio of programmes in the Accelerated Investment Fund at Appendix E. The paper summarised projects within each programme area of Student, Staff, and IT and included a summary of approved funding and expenditure as at December 2015.

The Committee noted that there are fewer open projects remaining as many are now transitioning to business as usual.

22. Students’ Union Sabbatical Officer
The Committee received a report from the student representative at Appendix F expanding on an earlier paper from the Students’ Union on funding a fourth Sabbatical Officer.

The Committee noted that the benchmarking of student numbers and sabbatical officers against other HEIs was complicated by a variety of methods (some use campuses, others faculties) but that the current ratio with three officers for SOAS appeared favourable against other universities. The ability to support volunteer staff and to widen participation were considered worthwhile benefits, and the Committee acknowledged that the Students’ Union received favourable feedback in the National Student Survey (NSS).

The Committee considered that in the current financial climate the position could not be supported until SOAS had returned to a sustainable state, and that it would consider the matter again at a future date.
23. Investment Advisory Panel
The Committee noted the minutes of the meeting of the Investment Advisory Panel held on 10 November 2015 at Appendix H.

The Chair provided a brief update on the School's current position, noting that, given the volatility in the market, SOAS had managed not to be any worse off, which could be considered a good result.

The Committee was asked to recommend for IAP the following signatories with Newton's:

- Director (Baroness Valerie Amos)
- Pro-Director, Research & Enterprise (Professor Richard Black)
- Registrar (Ms Laura Gibbs)
- Director, Finance & Planning (Mr Graeme Appleby)

The Committee approved the signatories.

24. Cash Position
The Committee noted the reports on Capital, Debt, and Cash Flow at Appendices I and J.

It was noted that the cash position in July 2017 is estimated to fall to around £1m. Given the capital investments planned for the future, further scrutiny of investments and further development of endowments will be important strategic sources to safely enable these future plans.

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

Tuesday 7 June 2016

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

RESERVED ITEMS
There was no reserved business conducted at this meeting.
There were no action points raised in this meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Sustainability
Financial Sustainability
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Introduction

- Target surplus of 5% of income to be achieved by 2017-18
- Current financial projections suggest we will fall short of this target by £6.2m in 2017-18 & £6.5m by 2018-19
- Plans have been developed in each faculty and professional services to address this shortfall
- Plans have been presented to the School for formal consultation
- Consultation responses are currently being collated for consideration by the Sustainable SOAS Programme Board
There are a number of factors impacting on our ability to improve our financial performance and achieve the target surplus set.

On the income side these include:

- Setting PGT income projections based on more realistic student number projections (-£4.1m per annum by 2017/18)
- The ongoing financial impact of the imbalance between home and overseas students in the September 2015 UG cohort (-£0.2m p.a.)
- The ending of specialist institutional funding in support of minority language provision (-£0.7m p.a.)
- The ongoing reduction in quality related grant funding following the last REF (-£0.5m p.a.)
- The current inability to inflate regulated Home/EU undergraduate fees in line with costs (-£0.5m each year so £-1.5m p.a. in 3 years).
Financial Context

On the cost side these include:

- Rising staff costs as a consequence of increased employer contributions to national insurance (+£0.8m p.a.) and both Saul and USS pension schemes from April 2016 (+£0.9m p.a.)

- Rising staff costs as London weighting allowance is increased to £3,500 by August 2018, (+£1.2m p.a. by 2018/19)

- Contributing 0.5% of our pay bill in accordance with the government’s apprenticeship levy to be introduced from April 2017 (+£0.25m p.a.)

- Rising depreciation charge (+£3.3m p.a. by 2018/19) as we continue to invest in our estate and new technology

- Rising space costs (+£0.6m) as we expand our estate
# Financial Shortfall

Projected shortfall by area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Languages &amp; Cultures</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Law &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Context – Planning Considerations

• In light of historical underperformance against targets, any PGT growth plans proposed must be robust

• Current projections already include some growth in UG numbers

• SOAS currently expends a high proportion of its income on staff costs -academic staff costs proportionally high (3rd /160), support staff costs is mid-range (84th)

• Historical underspends against non-pay budgets (2014-15 £1m) opportunities exist for cost reductions

• The increasing competition we face in attracting, recruiting and retaining new students suggests that savings should not be sought from key areas such as marketing, student recruitment and learning support.
The Faculty of Arts and Humanities is projected to fall short of its financial target by £1.8m in years 2017/18 and 2018/19.

The Faculty proposes to address part of the shortfall by a combination of income generation and modest reductions in costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of financial proposals</strong></td>
<td>£’000</td>
<td>£’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Religions UG numbers (existing BA)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MA Museums Heritage &amp; Material Cultural Studies (Anthropology)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MA Muslim Minorities (Distance Learning)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cost saving achieved via attrition and non-replacement (4.4fte)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(790)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The Faculty will need to make a net saving of £1.0 million in 2017/18 to address the overall shortfall of £1.8 million.

• In order to meet this target a further reduction of staff in the region of 12.5 FTEs is required, should no further growth opportunities or non-staff cost savings be identified.
The Faculty of Languages and Cultures is projected to fall short of its financial target by £3m in years 2017/18 and 2018/19.

The Faculty proposes to address part of the shortfall by cost savings, as summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Languages &amp; Cultures</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of financial proposals</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cost saving achieved via attrition and non-replacement (7 fte)</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through streamlining and increasing the efficiency of module delivery, leading to reductions in teaching hours</td>
<td>245 to 886</td>
<td>245 to 886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff savings through merging of modules, leading to reductions in teaching hours</td>
<td>49 to 193</td>
<td>49 to 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total impact</td>
<td>787 to 1,572</td>
<td>787 to 1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>1,413 to 628</td>
<td>1,413 to 628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• There is still a significant shortfall against financial targets

• The Faculty will need to make a net saving of £0.6 million to £1.4 million (depending on the type of posts impacted by the savings) to address the overall shortfall of £2.2 million in 2017/18

• In order to meet this target a further reduction of staff in the region of 8-18 FTEs is required, should no further growth opportunities or non-staff cost savings be identified
The Faculty of Law and Social Sciences is projected to fall short of its financial target by £1.1m in year 2017/18 and by £1.4m in 2018/19.

The Faculty proposes to address part of the shortfall by a combination of income generation and modest reductions in costs.

### Faculty of Law & Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of financial proposals</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Law PGT numbers - overseas partner institutions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Development Studies UG numbers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New MSc in Finance (DeFIMS)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CISD based MSc Distance learning programmes</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Law LLB - 4 year extension</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pay Faculty budgets</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance learning cost base</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cost savings via VS and attrition</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total impact</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Services

• To support the faculty plans and strategic aims of the School, Professional Services need to support a range of academic activities including marketing and student recruitment, student experience and increasing research income.

• The priorities for Professional Services over the next three years are:
  • Student recruitment
  • Student experience
  • Academic support

• To achieve this we plan to transfer resources of approximately £0.7m across Professional Services (primarily from Estates and LIS) to allow us to invest in the priority areas

• Professional services are seeking to make a further £0.3m savings by 2017/18 via a combination of staff and non-staff costs (primarily from Estates and LIS)
Revised financial position

• The proposals developed in each of the Faculties and Professional Services have identified a financial improvement in the range of £3.5m to £4.3m by 2018/19

• This leaves a shortfall of between £2.2m to £3m still to address

• We are looking to address this shortfall through a Voluntary Severance (VS) Scheme

• The salient details are:
  • Financial package for those employee who apply for VS and are accepted:
    Those with continuous service over 5 years: 12 months’ salary.
    Those with 2-5 years’ continuous service: 6 months’ salary
  • The VS Scheme will run from 18 March to 2 December 2016
  • Applications will be reviewed by a Voluntary Severance Panel consisting of the two Pro- Directors, the Registrar, Director of Finance & Planning and the Director of HR
  • Formal recommendations from the Voluntary Severance Panel will be made following each Panel meeting to the Director, whose decision is final.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 March</td>
<td>Formal consultation period on Financial Sustainability closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 March</td>
<td>VS Scheme approved by Sustainable SOAS Programme Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March</td>
<td>VS Scheme opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td><strong>Closing date for applications to be considered by first VS Panel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/c 16 May</td>
<td>First VS Panel to meet to consider all applications and make recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May</td>
<td>EB/SOAS Director sign off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 3 June</td>
<td>Applicants/Deans/Directors/Line managers advised of outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By w/c 11 July</td>
<td>Second VS Panel to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By w/c 5 Sept</td>
<td>Third VS Panel to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By w/c 31 Oct</td>
<td>Fourth VS Panel to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dec</td>
<td><strong>Final closing date for all Applications in this VS round</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By w/c 12 Dec</td>
<td>Fifth VS Panel to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dec</td>
<td><strong>Final decisions on VS applications to be taken</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Languages at SOAS

SOAS currently teaches 26 modern languages, nine ancient languages, and six classical language forms from across Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Amharic, Hausa, Somali, Swahili, Yoruba, Zulu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near and Middle East</td>
<td>Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Bengali, Hindi, Nepali, Punjabi, Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia</td>
<td>Burmese, Indonesian, Khmer, Thai, Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>Chinese (Mandarin), Cantonese, Hokkien,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese, Korean, Tibetan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient and classical</td>
<td>Akkadian, Hittite, Sumerian, Avetsan, Pahlavi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages</td>
<td>Pali, Syriac, Prakrit, Sanskrit, plus classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Persian, Tibetan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These languages are taught at different levels of depth, ranging from major to basic provision. Major provision is provided in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

Comprehensive provision is provided in Persian, Swahili, and Turkish.

Intermediate provision is offered in Bengali, Burmese, Hebrew, Hindi, Indonesian, Nepali, Punjabi, Thai, Tibetan, Urdu, and Vietnamese.

Basic provision is provided in Amharic, Cantonese, Hausa, Hokkien, Khmer, Punjabi, Somali, Yoruba, and Zulu.

Provision in ancient languages focuses on written texts, and ranges from introductory level (for most ancient languages) to advanced-level competency (e.g. in the reading of cuneiform texts in Akkadian).