

**ACADEMIC BOARD**

**OPEN AGENDA**

**Wednesday 31<sup>st</sup> January 2018 at 2.00pm  
(Conference Suite, Paul Webley Wing)**

**Apologies:** Sian Hawthorne, Sarah Pett, Michael Jennings, Richard Alexander and Lutz Marten

<b>AB 2017/18 3 A</b>	<b>Minutes</b> To approve: minutes of the meeting held on 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2017	[attached]
<b>AB 2017/18 3 B</b>	<b>Action Points</b>	[attached]
<b>AB 2017/18 3 C</b>	<b><u>Matters Arising/Matters for Report</u></b>	
<b>AB 2017/18 3 D</b>	<b>Research and Enterprise</b>  <b>Research Impact – Significance, Progress and Outstanding Issues</b> To approve	[attached]
<b>AB 2017/18 3 E</b>	<b>Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators:</b>  <b>Sub-Committees</b> To receive: termly reports from (i) Academic Development Committee (10 <sup>th</sup> January)  <b>Teaching Excellence Plan</b> To discuss  <b>Teaching Innovation Fund</b> To discuss  <b>Teaching Away Days</b> To approve  <b>Attainment gaps</b> To approve  <b>Fundraising for strategically important and vulnerable language</b> To discuss	[attached]  [verbal update]  [verbal update]  [attached]  [attached]  [attached]
<b>AB 2017/18 3 F</b>	<b>People and Change</b>  <b>Constitution for: SOAS Centre for Asian Legal Studies</b> To approve	[attached]

	<b>Student and Academic Engagement Consultation Outcome</b> To note	[to be circulated]
<b>AB 2017/18 3 G</b>	<b>Culture and Values</b>  <b>Decolonisation project plan</b> To discuss	[verbal update]

ACADEMIC BOARD

OPEN MINUTES

Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2017 at 2.00pm  
(Conference Suite, Paul Webley Wing)

Baroness Valerie Amos (Chair)  
Dr R Alexander  
Dr B Bhandar  
Professor M W Charney  
Professor S Hopgood  
Ms N Farzad  
Dr H Bo  
Professor C Tan  
Professor D Johnston  
Ms Waite  
Professor K Latham  
Dr M Nelson  
Professor A Saad Filho  
Ms N Phillips  
Dr M Sabaratnum

Professor N Al-Ali  
Professor R Bachmann  
Professor R Black  
Dr J Caron  
Ms R Everitt  
Dr S Hawthorne  
Ms H-Y Tam  
Dr U Volz  
Dr M Jennings  
Dr M Laffey  
Dr A Lockyer  
Dr B Murtagh  
Dr A Newsham  
Dr S Pett  
Mr H Anderson

**Apologies**

Professor C Bramall\*  
Dr N Hill\*  
Professor L Marten\*  
Professor R Reid\*

Professor A Contadini\*  
Dr T Kaiser\*  
Ms P Sanderson\*

**In attendance:**

Mr G Davies  
Dr C Ince

Ms S Harris (For Item I)  
Miss S Priddle (Minutes)

### **AB 2017/18 2 A Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 1 November 2017 were approved, subject to the following amendments:

- Minute AB 2017/18 1F should read: 'Academic Board approved the recommendations in the Report but agreed that an Area Studies Academy would not be created.'
- Minute AB 2017/18 1L additional point: 'It was agreed that the detail of the student evaluations of modules would be returned to LTQC for further review and action.'

### **AB 2017/18 2 B Action Points**

Academic Board **noted** that four action points due to be presented at the meeting were not on the agenda but would be presented at the next meeting 31 January 2018.

### **AB 2017/18 2 C Matters Arising/Matters for Report**

A second request was made for committee vacancies on other committees. Any members interested in serving on one of the committees should contact the Secretary this week.

Academic Board structure beneath academic board proposal would be tabled at January meeting following feedback from the Quality Assurance team.

An initial breakdown of the Decolonisation Working Party budget was tabled during the meeting. A detail report on analysis of spend and project plan would be tabled at January meeting. The Committee **noted** the budget update.

### **AB 2017/18 2 D Directors Report**

Academic Board **noted** the Directors Report.

### **AB 2017/18 2 E Sub-Committees**

#### **Academic Development Committee (18th October)**

The Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) highlighted three points to the Board:

- i. The progress with teaching excellence plan. Further detail would be presented to the Board at the next meeting.
- ii. The work undertaken on auditing assessment. The Board was encouraged to engage with the audit as it would enable the School to rethink the forms of assessment utilised.
- iii. The work undertaken by Academic Development Panel on language qualifications. The panel are reviewing the language degrees to support the School in providing the highest standard language qualifications.

The **Board** received the report.

#### **(ii) Equality & Diversity (20th October)**

The **Board** received the report.

### **AB 2017/18 2 F Teaching Qualifications at SOAS: Amendments suggested for**

### Academic Board Discussion

The Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching) **reported** on current teaching qualification requirements for academic staff and the current disparity between requirements for Teaching Fellows, Senior Teaching Fellows and Lectors and other teaching staff. It was recommended that the requirements for these staff would be aligned with other permanent teaching staff.

The Board **considered** how the changes would be integrated into the probation route and promotion programme.

The Board **considered** the development of a specific language teaching pathway for Lectors.

**Action:** Academic development panel to develop a draft proposal for a language teaching pathway.

It was **agreed** that all teaching staff would be included under the recommended procedure until a separate procedure was developed for Lectors.

*Item AB 2017/18 2 H was considered prior to AB 2017/18 2 G.*

### AB 2017/18 2 H Online Learning Strategy

The Pro-Director (International) **reported** that the proposal had been considered at a number of meetings and asked the Board to feedback outside of the meeting. The proposal outlined the School's ambitious digital future and aimed to improve the alignment between the SOAS provision online and on campus.

The Board **considered** how distance learning students had input into this proposal and more widely how their perceptions were captured by the School and the Students' Union. A Students' Union Undergraduate representative reported that the Students' Union had developed an alternative online learning proposal. The Pro-Director (International) said it would be helpful to see a copy of the proposal.

The Board **considered** how changes to online learning would impact on the workload model and noted the need to have positive staff incentives to engage with online learning.

**Action:** Include online learning in workload model discussions.

**Action:** Professor Simon Rofe to confirm how student views had been fed into the proposal.

**Action:** Establish clarity on relationship between Students' Union and distance learning students and report on current provision and sector best practice.

The Academic Board **approved** the recommendations and the implementation of this strategy.

### AB 2017/18 2 G Changes to Economic Degree classifications

Head of Economics Department **reported** that the School's Economic diploma programme was currently assessed by averaging module results across the programme; therefore

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 A**

students could achieve the higher awards despite achieving weakest in core modules. The proposal recommended that students would no longer be able to achieve a distinction or merit if they did not secure, at least, a merit in the core modules. These changes would support students' transition to Master degrees which require the skills and knowledge from core modules.

The proposal also outlined the change of the course weighting to 80% exams and 20% coursework.

It was **reported** that changing the degree classifications would not impact on the number of students who complete the programme.

The Board **considered** whether changing the criteria for classifications for Economics would impact on other degrees and subjects. It was **agreed** that the most important point was to establish how classifications are agreed and communicating this clearly to everyone.

The Board also **considered** whether the changes would equally impact all groups of students. The Board **considered** the analysis of how these changes would impact on student outcomes.

The Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching) **reported** that this proposal had been scrutinised and approved at Academic Development Committee and LTQC.

The Board **considered** what constituted secure performance and whether this should be a department agreed issue and whether a Grade Point Average system would support departments in establishing a consistent assessment system.

**Action:** Investigate the possibility of implementing a Grade Point Average system.

**Action:** Return paper to LTQC and ADC for consideration of Academic Board's points.

## **AB 2017/18 2 | Academic reward at SOAS**

Pro-Director (Research and Enterprise) outlined that the proposal was a product of the academic restructuring and aligned the processes for rewarding academic and professional staff.

The proposal outlined a revised process for awarding one-off rewards and the process would sit outside of the process for reviewing promotions and awarding increments.

The Board **considered** the implications of the proposed change and the implications of academic staff rewards being assessed by professional staff. It was confirmed that all application forms for rewards would include a section for heads of department to outline their support and justifications.

It was confirmed that the proposal aimed to establish equity and align SOAS practice with sector best practice.

Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) outlined that ICFELs staff's rewards were overseen by professional services staff.

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 A**

The Board **considered** how the make-up of the panel could be amended to ensure an equal number of professional staff and academic staff. It was **agreed** that an additional member of academic staff would sit on the panel to ensure balance.

The Board **approved** the recommendations on the basis of the agreed amendments.

**AB 2017/18 2 J Research Fellow**

The Board **noted** the appointment of Marc Dubois as Research Fellow.

**AB 2017/18 2 K Senior Fellow**

The Board **noted** the appointment of Baiju S Vasani as Senior Fellow.

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018  
2017/18 AB 3 B**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action Detail</b>	<b>When?</b>	<b>By ?</b>	<b>Any comments</b>
<b>AB 2016/17</b> <b>Two subject degrees</b>	Academic Development Committee was asked to do further work on the home location of the two-subject degrees and to produce financial models of impact including in relation to registration fees.	31/1/18 moved to 14/3/18	DJ	Item postponed and to be included on next agenda. ADC have requested additional work to be undertaken prior to tabling a paper at AB. No concerns raised about postponing this item.
<b>AB 2016/17 7 G</b> <b>Attainment Gap</b>	AB agreed that Attainment Gap would be a regular item on the AB agenda.	31/1/18	CB	Item included on agenda AB 2017/18 3 E Appendix 3
<b>AB 2016/17 7 L</b> <b>SOAS Languages Strategy</b>	The SOAS Languages Strategy is to be brought back to AB for further consideration.	31/1/18	LM	Item postponed and to be included on next agenda. No concerns raised about postponing this item.
<b>AB 2016/17 7 M</b> <b>Fundraising for Strategic and Vulnerable Languages</b>	The paper on Fundraising for Strategic and Vulnerable Languages is to be brought back to AB for further consideration together with the SOAS Languages Strategy.	31/1/18	LM	Item included on agenda AB 2017/18 3 E Appendix 4
<b>AB 17/18 1 F – Area Studies Review</b>	Proposals for Area Studies PhD and any specific entry requirements	31/1/18 moved to 14/3/18	SH	Item postponed and to be included on next agenda. No concerns raised about postponing this item.
<b>AB 17/18 1</b>	Report on teaching matrix	31/1/18 moved to 14/3/18	DJ	Item postponed and to be included on next agenda. LTQC have requested additional information and modelling prior to tabling a paper at AB. No concerns raised about postponing this item.
<b>AB 17/18 1 G - Student Safeguarding Policy</b>	Report on implementation of Policy	14/3/18	IP	



# Research Strategy

**Research Impact – Significance, Progress and Outstanding Issues**

Academic Board is asked to **note** the following Report and **consider and approve** the recommendations in the report.

**Executive Summary**

This report provides information on the increased significance of impact in REF 2021 (compared to REF 2014), progress made to date, and outstanding issues. A number of recommendations which aim to address the issues are included for consideration.

**Recommendations & Next Steps**

- Mobilise collective School resources around impact, including Senior Team, Board of Trustees, School events programme, international strategy.
- Ensure those achieving impact are recognised in reward and promotion procedures.
- Include a provision within the new workload allocation model for those working on potential 4\* case studies to be given time to achieve impact and write impact case studies.
- Appoint a REF 'Critical Friend' for impact.
- Recruit, train and pay a small team of motivated PhD Students (with pay), to support academic leads with the development of impact case studies.
- Where appropriate and feasible, encourage the formation of 'impact teams' around each impact case study, so that the burden does not fall on an individual.
- (Possibly) formalise a position of Associate Director (Impact).
- (Possibly) appoint academic champions for impact in each Unit of Assessment, with recognition for this role within the new workload allocation model.

**Financial Impact**

With the exception of the appointment of an Associate Director (Impact), the recommendations can be supported by the School's REF budget.

**Risks**

The most significant risk to the School is the possibility of failure to achieve success in REF 2021. This risk can be mitigated by adoption of the recommendations.

**Equality implications**

None.

**Consultations**

Professor Richard Black, Silke Blohm, Professor Matthew Craven, and Professor Paul Basu have all been consulted about the issues faced by the Research Information and Strategy Unit in promoting excellence in research impact.

## Research Impact: Significance, Progress and Issues

### 1. REF 2021 – progress with impact case studies

For REF 2021, the increase in the weighting for impact from 20% to 25%, and the moving of the Impact Statement into the Environment statement, means that each individual Impact Case Study carries significantly more weighting than in 2014. As James Wilsdon, Director of Impact and Engagement at the University of Sheffield, has said: *“the significance of the impact case studies will in effect rise by more than half, from 16% to 25% of the exercise.”*<sup>1</sup>

One way of understanding the importance of impact is to compare the contribution of each output and each Impact Case Study to the final score. In Annex A, each case study is expressed as a number of outputs; this shows that one impact case study corresponds to 3.65 outputs for our smallest UoA, Music, but up to 10 outputs for our largest UoA, Development Studies.

This analysis demonstrates that achieving a high score in REF 2021 will be largely determined by our performance in the impact element, yet in REF 2014 eight out of the School’s 11 UoAs did worse than average with regard to impact (in terms of % 4\*):

#### SOAS rank position by performance measure and unit of assessment in REF 2014

4*	Outputs rank	Environment rank	Impact rank	Overall
Management studies	65/101	75/101	37/101	55/101
Law	5/67	18/67	49/67	20/67
Politics	20/56	28/56	13/56	18/56
Anthropology	5/17	14/17	12/17	8/17
Development studies	6/8	7/8	6/8	7/8
Area studies	14/22	11/22	16/22	16/22
Linguistics	7/22	7/22	16/22	13/22
History	44/83	53/83	75/83	52/83
Religions	10/33	9/33	20/33	14/33
History of Art	7/25	9/25	18/25	7/25
Music	1/44	22/44	35/44	7/44

*\*Note: ranking is based on ‘similar’ departments, so for example Development studies is only compared to other universities including Development studies staff in the combined Anthropology & Development UOA.*

It is therefore imperative that the School submits strong impact case studies to each UoA, and that we have a pool from which to make a selection. Based on current FTE, we estimate that we will need 38 impact case studies. In 2018, we aim at shortlisting a total of no more than 51 case studies (38 + one extra for each Unit of Assessment).

### 2. Progress to date

A considerable amount of effort has gone into developing an impact strategy and case studies over the period since 2014. We currently have a list of 80 potential impact case studies overall, with a sufficient number for each UoA. They include work that is influencing

<sup>1</sup> <http://wonkhe.com/blogs/ref-just-got-real-ref2021>

approaches to combatting corruption, to EU programming in the Horn of Africa in relation to conflict and displacement, and to educational curriculum development in Myanmar.

However, unsurprisingly, some are significantly stronger than others. In some cases, the impact(s) may not happen within the necessary time scale for submission to REF 2021; in others impact activities have yet to take place, and/or it may be difficult to gather evidence.

### **3. Ongoing issues**

A number of areas of concern around impact have been identified at this stage in our REF planning.

First, whilst REF Coordinators have generally made good progress in moving forward the outputs and environment elements of their submissions, many have expressed concern about the impact case study potential in their UoAs, and/or have a lack of knowledge or capacity to work in this area. This was a problem commonly reported by other institutions in REF 2014, and the appointment of academic impact 'champions' or similar has become wide-spread practice. Additional academic support for impact within SOAS would be beneficial, not only to the REF submission, but also in promoting SOAS' wider mission to have a positive impact on the world. This would also assist with the development of School and UoA impact strategies – we must not forget that impact statements are still required as part of the Environment Statement.

Second, there remain some complaints that impact and public engagement are insufficiently recognised in the current [promotion criteria](#), although these were revised by Academic Board in the Autumn and do now specifically acknowledge impact work.

Third, there are increasing demands from staff, including those most engaged in impact work, for more support and resources. Some say they feel unfairly burdened with responsibility for producing and writing an impact case study, even if they appreciate it is critical to the School's success in REF 2021. They need time for planning and carrying out impact activities, gathering and storing evidence, and writing the study.

Fourth, the School currently uses Sharepoint (MySOAS) for storing evidence of impact, but this is not popular with academic staff, and is not widely used. A more robust and 'user friendly' system is needed.

Fifth, analysis of successful impact case studies from REF 2014 and the UK Research Councils suggests that impact is often a collaborative effort, including with external organisations. However, our potential Impact Case studies are often based on the work of one individual. Where appropriate and feasible, the formation of 'impact teams' around impact case studies would ease the burden on individuals.

Finally, further consideration needs to be given to the School's overall strategic approach to impact; for example, there is strong evidence that impact is best designed into research from the beginning of a project, but we are still finding that plans are too vague, or not carried out. Work is progressing on a School wide impact strategy and delivery plan to address our long term aim of making impact an integral part of academic work. Further recommendations will be brought to Academic Board.

#### **4. Recommendations**

The following has been agreed and is in progress:

- Appointment of an additional Research Communication and Impact Officer in REO (recruitment under way).
- Establishment of an Impact Case Study Enhancement Fund (strategic investments).
- Establishment of an Impact Acceleration Fund (annual competition).
- Appointment of an external editor to 'polish' impact case studies and impact statements.
- Review of Vertigo Ventures 'Impact Tracker Tool' by a small panel, with agreement that a trial should be conducted this year.

The views of Academic Board are sought on the following recommendations:

- Mobilise collective School resources around impact, including Senior Team, Board of Trustees, School events programme, international strategy.
- Appoint a REF 'Critical Friend' for impact.
- Recruit, train and pay a small team of motivated PhD Students to support the development of impact case studies.
- Ensure those achieving impact are recognised in reward and promotion procedures.
- Include a provision within the new workload allocation model for those working on shortlisted 4\* case studies to be given time to achieve impact.
- (Possibly) formalise a position of Associate Director (Impact).
- (Possibly) appoint academic champions for impact in each Unit of Assessment, with recognition for this role within the new workload allocation model.

Elizabeth Nolan, Research Excellence Manager, January 2018.

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 D**

**Annex A**

REF 2021: Research Outputs vs. Impact Case Studies

Staff FTE	Outputs	Contribution of each output to final score	Case studies	Contribution of each ICS to final score (25/no of ICS)	Each case study expressed as number of outputs	UoAs (current FTE)
7	17.5	3.4%	2	12.5%	3.65	Music
8	20	3.0%	2	12.5%	4.17	
9	22.5	2.7%	2	12.5%	4.69	Media
10	25	2.4%	2	12.5%	5.21	
11	27.5	2.2%	2	12.5%	5.73	
12	30	2.0%	2	12.5%	6.25	
13	32.5	1.8%	2	12.5%	6.77	
14	35	1.7%	2	12.5%	7.29	Area Studies, Art and Design
15	37.5	1.6%	3	8.3%	5.21	
16	40	1.5%	3	8.3%	5.56	
17	42.5	1.4%	3	8.3%	5.90	Literature
18	45	1.3%	3	8.3%	6.25	
19	47.5	1.3%	3	8.3%	6.60	Anthropology, Religions
20	50	1.2%	3	8.3%	6.94	
21	52.5	1.1%	3	8.3%	7.29	Linguistics
22	55	1.1%	3	8.3%	7.64	
23	57.5	1.0%	3	8.3%	7.99	
24	60	1.0%	3	8.3%	8.33	
25	62.5	1.0%	3	8.3%	8.68	
26	65	0.9%	3	8.3%	9.03	
27	67.5	0.9%	3	8.3%	9.38	Management Studies, History
28	70	0.9%	3	8.3%	9.72	
29	72.5	0.8%	3	8.3%	10.07	Law
30	75	0.8%	4	6.3%	7.81	
31	77.5	0.8%	4	6.3%	8.07	
32	80	0.8%	4	6.3%	8.33	
33	82.5	0.7%	4	6.3%	8.59	
34	85	0.7%	4	6.3%	8.85	
35	87.5	0.7%	4	6.3%	9.11	
36	90	0.7%	4	6.3%	9.38	
37	92.5	0.6%	4	6.3%	9.64	
38	95	0.6%	4	6.3%	9.90	
39	97.5	0.6%	4	6.3%	10.16	
40	100	0.6%	4	6.3%	10.42	
41	102.5	0.6%	4	6.3%	10.68	Languages and Linguistics
42	105	0.6%	4	6.3%	10.94	Politics
43	107.5	0.6%	4	6.3%	11.20	
44	110	0.5%	4	6.3%	11.46	
45	112.5	0.5%	5	5.0%	9.38	
46	115	0.5%	5	5.0%	9.58	
47	117.5	0.5%	5	5.0%	9.79	
48	120	0.5%	5	5.0%	10.00	Development Studies

Academic  
Strategy and  
Key  
Performance  
Indicators

SOAS UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 10.00am  
in Room SG36

MINUTES

**Members:**

Mr Hamish Anderson	Dr Jaeho Kang
Professor Richard Black	Dr Zoë Marriage
Professor Chris Bramall	Professor Lutz Marten
Ms Susan Clucas	Dr Satoshi Miyamura
Dr Catherine Dolan*	Ms Nisha Phillipps
Dr Chege Githiora	Dr Ian Pickup
Professor Stephen Hopgood*	Dr Marie Rodet
Dr Deborah Johnston (Chair)	Dr J Simon Rofe
	Ms Robyn Waite*

**In attendance:**

Professor Nadje Al-Ali (Head of Doctoral School)*	Ms Philippa Hewett (Head of Careers)
Dr Richard Alexander (Senior Tutor)	Dr Angus Lockyer (ADLT AHU)*
Dr Hong Bo (ADLT LSS)	Ms Sally Priddle (Governance & Risk Officer)
Graham Davies (Head of IFCELS)	Ms Jenni Rhodes (Secretary)
Ms Regina Everitt (Director of Library & Learning Resources)	Dr Julia Sallabank (ADLT PGT LCU)
	Dr Mustafa Shah (ADLT UG LCU)*
	Dr Ulrich Volz (Head of Economics: for item 33.1)

Those marked with a \* were not present.

**28 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting on 15 November 2017 were **approved**.

**29 Action Points**

The Committee **received** an update on action taken. Several would need to be carried over to the next meeting. Other action points were complete and/or covered by agenda items.

**30 Matters Arising**

There were no matters arising.

**31 Chair's Report**

**31.1** The Chair reported that Academic Board had not approved ADC's recommendation of the revised classification scheme for the Graduate Diploma in Economics. ADC asked the department to revisit the proposal and work with QA to adapt it such that AB could approve.



**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 1**

**31.2** ADC heard that Executive Board had approved the recommendation from the TEF Strategy Group that SOAS should enter TEF3 in 2018 as well as the subject-level pilots in which it was participating. Submission was due on 19<sup>th</sup> January. It was confirmed that this decision appropriately sat with EB because of the serious financial implications. It was noted that it was widely anticipated that future rounds of TEF would be effectively mandatory, with participation a requirement of OfS registration.

**31.3** Departments had received relevant TEF metrics and were developing action plans which came under the overarching Teaching Excellence and Student Experience Plan. ADC would be updated on these plans in February.

**32 Committee Structure 2018/19 onwards (Appendix A, tabled)**

ADC received a diagram setting out a proposal for the structure of learning and teaching committees in the coming year. It was noted that issues such as inclusion and the student experience should be a shared responsibility across all committees, and similarly that all reference to students or to programmes should include all those at SOAS (for instance, including online and on-campus; credit-bearing and non-credit-bearing; taught and research).

There was discussion of committee membership, with several ADC members feeling that they would also need to be members of the proposed Teaching, Learning & Student Outcomes Committee [TeLSOC]. The principle that professional services colleagues should not constitute more than half the membership of any committee was felt to be unhelpful as these members shared the School's objectives and brought relevant expertise to discussions. There was however concern over the large size of some committees.

ADC agreed to recommend that Library, Careers and Learning & Teaching Development should all be represented at TeLSOC; the Language Centre at Curriculum Quality Assurance Panel; and Student Advice & Wellbeing at Student Experience & Engagement Committee. ADC asked to see full terms of reference for the learning and teaching committees before they were considered by Academic Board.

**33 Curriculum Review update**

**33.1 Department of Economics (Appendix C)**

ADC received an update from the Head of Economics on actions taken following curriculum review in 2017. The report and its contents were commended, with the following elements of good practice particularly highlighted:

- Teaching awayday, including student feedback from an earlier Staff: Student forum, and a presentation from a student on their experience of learning and teaching in Economics
- Successful events including alumni, such as the institution of an annual Alumni Lecture and reception; especially the recognition that these events need not be motivated solely by fundraising but could also benefit current students by focussing on networking and employability.
- The department's willingness to use learning technology in new ways.

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 1**

The Head of Department agreed to meet with the Academic Head of Online Learning to discuss the potential for blended and other online learning in Economics.

- 33.2** ADC agreed to postpone discussion of the update from the Department of History to its next meeting.

**34 Student Prizes (Appendix B)**

ADC considered a paper on student prizes, which included recommendations approved by EB. It was noted that a review of prizes across the School was needed, both to transition away from Faculties, and to ensure that prizes were awarded strategically in line with agreed objectives: for instance to recognise the diversity of student success. It was agreed that ADC in Term 3 would receive detailed recommendations for implementation from a working group composed of:

Richard Alexander

Ian Pickup

Philippa Hewitt

Chege Githiora

Nisha Phillipps, who would also invite another officer of the SU to ensure representation from the liberation campaigns.

The remit of the working group would be to undertake recommendations 1(a)-(c) and 4(a) and (c) of the paper.

**35 Careers**

ADC received a Student Enterprise Strategy and operating plan. The plan was **approved**, conditional on two amendments:

- the section on existing financial arrangements, which should be removed before publication
- under key internal stakeholders, it would be clarified that the SU was already a key partner in this work.

**36 Two subject degrees**

The committee was reminded of its previous recommendations to AB (minute 39.1, 23 May 2017). These had been approved except for recommendations relating to the allocation of home departments and resource for these. AB had felt that students of two-subject degrees needed support from both departments, and both the nominated home and the recipient of the departmental portion of fees needed to include both departments. ADC agreed that further work on the responsibilities of programme convenors would help with the support aspect of these programmes. The decision on joint home departments and allocation of resource would be passed to the Restructuring Working Group (workload allocation) and those responsible for amending systems following restructuring.

The second aspect of the recommendations from this work was the development of criteria against which two subject (and other) programmes could be considered for support/hibernation/withdrawal. This related to the agreement that Comprehensive Review from 2018/19 would include the revalidation of programmes. The Chair and ADLTs agreed to bring a first draft of criteria to the next meeting.

**37 Language learning (Appendix F)**

ADC received a report from the working group on language learning which made a number of recommendations. The committee agreed that further work was needed in the development of a Languages Strategy, with specific objectives and action points, and that the same working group should expand its membership to facilitate the undertaking of this work. In addition, the committee asked the Academic Teaching Development Panel to look specifically at language pedagogy and determine what measures might be needed to support excellence in language teaching.

**38 Inclusion**

The committee agreed that updates on Decolonisation, Attainment Gaps, Retention and Inclusive Assessment would be considered at its next meeting.

**39 Academic Partnerships**

**39.1 Shangdong University, China (Appendix G)**

The Committee received a proposal for an academic partnership with the above institution to facilitate the recruitment of students to the MA Translation Studies. Concern was expressed that it was not clear that Student Recruitment supported this partnership and had considered its benefits to outweigh any risks. Members queried why the partnership was with a department rather than the parent institution, and whether this would be a beneficial partner for SOAS. The partnership was **not approved**. Chair's action could be taken if additional information was received.

**39.2 Hebei University of Technology, China (Appendix H)**

The Committee received a proposal for an academic partnership with the above institution to facilitate the recruitment of students to the MA Translation Studies. Concern was expressed that it was not clear that Student Recruitment supported this partnership and had considered its benefits to outweigh any risks. Members did not believe that this institution had a sufficiently prestigious reputation to make it a beneficial partner for SOAS. The partnership was **not approved**. Chair's action could be taken if additional information was received.

**39.3 Rothberg International School, Israel (Appendix I)**

The committee noted that the proposal to extend the one year partnership previously agreed with the above institution, to host students on their language year abroad, did not address the concerns expressed at that time. ADC **declined to consider** the proposal and asked the department to reconsider.

**40 Dates of next meetings**

The committee noted the following dates for future meetings of ADC:

21 February 2018  
14 May 2018 (n.b. Monday)

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 1**

13 June 2018

Meetings may start at 9.30a.m. if volume of business demands.

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 1**

**SOAS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON**

**ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 10 January 2018**  
**Action Points**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>By When</b>	
<b>2016/17</b>				
36.4	Peer Assisted Study Support	Develop a strategic approach to further implementation and report to next meeting	Retention Action Group (RA)	Feb
39.1	Two subject degrees	(b) Propose criteria for the rationalisation of programmes and report to next meeting	Chair & ADLTs	Feb
<b>2017/18</b>				
6.1	TESEP	(a) Bring update to ADC January	Secretary	Feb
		(b) Return to ADC with proposals for SOAS Pedagogy	IP	Feb
7.1	Student outcomes	(a) Review 2016/17 NSS/TEF action plans and report to ADC	Planning	Feb
7.2	Attainment gaps	(a) Working group to identify KPIs to be reported to ADC regularly	CB	Feb
		(b) Working group to group and prioritise recommendations, report to LTQC, and disseminate those which did not require further policy or procedural change	CB	Jan
		(c) ADC to receive updates as a standing item at least once per term	Secretary	Feb
		(d) Discuss implementation of recommendation on anonymous marking.	Chair, ADLTs	asap
9	Language learning	(a) Refer programme-level recommendations to departments	Secretary	asap
25	SOAS Pedagogy	Refer to LTQC	Secretary	Jan

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 1**

31.1	Graduate Diploma in Economics	Revise proposals to address AB concerns and return to LTQC	Dept of Economics	Jan
32	Committee Structure 2018/19	Report ADC comments to Working Group, and bring Terms of Reference to next meeting	Secretary	Feb
33.1	Economics Curriculum Review	Meet with Academic Head of Online Learning	Head of Economics	End Term 2
		Consider how to disseminate good practice identified by ADC	Chair & ADLTs	End Term 2
33.2	History Curriculum Review	Schedule discussion of History review at next meeting	Secretary	Feb
34	Student Prizes	Bring recommendations to ADC in Term 3	Working Group	Feb
35	Student Enterprise Plan	Make amendments and publish	Head of Careers	Jan
36	Two subject degrees	Ensure relevant working groups on restructuring are aware of decision on home departments	Secretary	asap
37	Language Learning	Invite additional members and bring draft Language Strategy to ADC in Term 3	Working Group	May
		Academic Teaching Development Panel to make recommendations to working group on language pedagogy	ATDP	End Term 2
38	Inclusion	Schedule updates for next meeting	Secretary	Feb
39	Academic Partnerships	Report outcomes to departments	Secretary	asap

**TEACHING AWAYDAY**

*Academic Board is asked to **approve** the recommendations in the report*

**Executive Summary**

Only some departments currently hold a teaching awayday (or half-day). Academic Board is asked to consider if this should be an essential component of the academic year.

DEBORAH JOHNSTON

**Recommendations & Next Step**

1. That all depts. have a teaching away day (either on its own or connected to their research awayday).
2. That this is used to look at both qualitative and quantitative information on student outcomes and experience.
3. That this considers what is happening elsewhere in the sector on issues of pedagogy and student outcomes.

Next step is to produce fuller indicative outlines for what a teaching awayday might achieve.

**Financial Impact**

*An extra awayday is costly in terms of both the actual cost of holding an event (room hire or refreshments) but also in terms of colleagues' time. However, without an awayday, the space for reflection on teaching (as the majority source of SOAS income) is limited.*

**Risks**

*Colleagues might feel overloaded and either do not attend, or attend but not contribute. Data may not be available to inform discussions.*

**Equality implications**

*Academic staff with caring responsibilities may find it difficult to managed additional scheduled events, especially if in the summer.  
Students from non-traditional backgrounds and from ethnic minority groups are most likely to benefit from any improvement in teaching and learning practice.*

**Consultations**

LTQC and ADC have both discussed this issue and recommended that all depts. have awaydays for teaching.



**TEACHING AWAYDAY**

Overtime, additional quantitative and qualitative data about student recruitment, experience and outcomes are being made available at the department, subject and programme level.

However, it is not clear how much space there is to discuss the issues raised in department meetings and how well-known the evidence is around teaching and learning.

For example, LTQC are asked to propose new thresholds at which Student Evaluation of Module data is used for the evaluation of staff performance.

However, it is clear that general guidance is needed on how to use existing SEM data. LTQC suggest that

- 1) Where SEM data meets the thresholds, the Head of Department should discuss issues raised with individual staff members where necessary and reflect this in SDR discussions where appropriate.
- 2) For all SEM data, the L&T Coordinator should report patterns in SEM and trends over time at the first Department meeting of the year. This should be complemented by a discussion of other kinds of feedback: issues raised in the past year's Student-Staff forum; NSS/PTES quantitative and qualitative findings; and other kinds of formal and informal feedback. The L&T coordinator should reflect on lessons learned or action taken.
- 3) Programme convenors should see the SEM for the core and compulsory modules that form part of their programmes and be required to reflect on this data for the Annual Programme Review. The programme convenor should reflect on lessons learned or actions taken.

However, it is unclear if there is space in a department meeting agenda for the kind of in-depth discussion envisaged in item 2 above. Few departments have a teaching awayday, although it is thought that almost all have research awaydays.

As a result, both LTQC and Academic Development Committee (ADC) suggest that Academic Board consider whether or not to make a teaching awayday standard practice.

Example schedule for a teaching away day (or half-day) might be:

- 1) Recruitment data is discussed.
- 2) SEM data and other data from the dept data packs (NSS, PTES, Continuation, League table) that relates to learning and teaching should be presented.
- 3) Issues raised in the staff-student forum are discussed.
- 4) Issues related to inclusion (which may be hidden by numeric averages) are discussed, especially differences in racialised attainment gaps and drop-out rates.
- 5) The department reflects on and revises its TEF action plan.

To maximise the impact of the day, it should happen at the start of the new academic year. The full set of data are available at that stage and there is the opportunity to reflect on the upcoming session. There are costs to a teaching awayday, and these will reflect both the financial costs of the exercise as well as the opportunity cost of engaging. Both academic

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 2**

and professional service colleagues might feel overloaded and either do not attend, or attend but not contribute. If held early in the year, student reps will not have been selected, and a disadvantage is that student engagement may be low.

DEBORAH JOHNSTON

**Attainment Gap Action Plan**

Academic Board is asked to **approve** the Attainment Gap Action Plan

**Executive Summary**

The Attainment Gap Working Group was established by ADC in autumn 2016 with members drawn from across SOAS (academic and professional services) and jointly-chaired by the SU sabbaticals. Its establishment owed much to the SU-commissioned report *Degrees of Racism*, which provided qualitative data on the student experience for ethnic minorities at SOAS. The remit of the Group was to look at attainment gaps at SOAS, in particular the poor experience and attainment of BME students, and to make recommendations as to how the gap might be closed. The Group reported more than 30 recommendations to Academic Board in the autumn of 2017. An action plan has been developed based on those recommendations and is now brought to Academic Board for approval.

CHRIS BRAMALL

**Recommendations & Next Step**

Academic Board is asked to **approve** the Action Plan.

**Financial Impact**

The Action Plan will involve some costs but these are modest and should be more than offset by the positive impact on retention and recruitment of reducing the attainment gap.

**Risks**

Failure to act will continue to generate adverse reputational effects; SOAS was the fourth worst UK university in terms of the attainment gap between black and white students for first class degrees (Wonkhe Aug 11 2017).

**Equality implications**

Positive effect on the experience of BME students at SOAS. The Action Plan focuses on the attainment gap for black students (the most disadvantaged racial group at SOAS) but it is expected that closing this gap will help close the attainment gap for all BME students.

**Consultations**

The Action Plan is based on the work of the Attainment Gap Working Group chaired jointly by Chris Bramall and Halimo Hussain (one of the SU sabbatical officers). Academic Board should note that this plan has not yet been approved by the Working Group, which has not properly met because of scheduling problems. It does, however, accurately reflect the Group's recommendations developed over the last 18 months and I would not wish to delay moving forward on the issue of racial attainment gaps.

**Attainment Gap Action Plan**  
 January 2018

	Recommendation	Actions	Responsibility	Status/Priority
1.	Adopt KPIs which focus on BME students	Agree and monitor the following KPIs:  a) Percentage difference between the proportion of undergraduate black and white students achieving a first class degree  (b) Percentage difference between the proportion of postgraduate black and white students achieving a distinction  (c) Percentage difference in non-continuation rates between black and white students	Equality & Diversity Committee/Board of Trustees/ADC	High
2	Public commitment acknowledging the racial attainment gap at SOAS and committing to reduce it to no higher than the London <sup>1</sup> median within three years	Chairs of attainment gap working group to draft	Director	High

<sup>1</sup> 'London' is defined here as LSE, UCL, KCL, Imperial, Queen Mary, Royal Holloway, Kingston, Goldsmiths, Westminster, City and Greenwich. The median black-white gap for first class degrees was 17 percentage points in 2016, compared with a SOAS gap of 30 percentage points (Wonkhe).

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 3**

3	Improved training for staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Mandatory unconscious bias training as a requirement for successful completion of probation;</li> <li>b) Mandatory refresher course in unconscious bias for all staff every three years</li> </ul>	Staff development	High. We have made this a requirement for appointment committees as part of our Athena SWAN plan but we also need to make sure that training and refresher courses covers appropriate classroom practices.
4	Provide information to departments on the size of the gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) departments expected to discuss the issue at a departmental meeting (a representative of the working group will be happy to speak to the issues)</li> <li>(b) circulate information on the gap to HoDs on an annual basis</li> <li>(c) collect data on postgraduate attainment gap</li> <li>(d) include as part of the the APR and as part of Comprehensive Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) HoDs</li> <li>(b) Head of Equality and Diversity/Planning</li> <li>(c) Planning</li> <li>(d) Academic Development Committee</li> </ul>	<p>Extensive data has already been circulated to HoDs, Academic Board and Executive Board on the undergraduate attainment gap. The main gap here relates to PGT attainment</p> <p>The Comprehensive Curriculum Review intends to include data on inclusion. The process has started in 2017/18 and will be implemented in full during 2018/19.</p>

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 3**

				The APR response needs to be updated to include these data and a response to them from the programme convenor.
5	Ensure greater awareness of differences in marks by race at module level	Provide module marks by race to module convenors	Academic Development Committee	Discussions already underway with Associate Deans and at FLTCs
6	Produce research/archive on SOAS's colonial legacy	(a) commission research (b) create film archive	Decolonization working group	Medium
7	Monitor student perceptions of teaching	Introduce additional questions on to the SOAS module evaluation form as follows:  (a) The curriculum appropriately reflected the views of non-white male writers;  (b) The teachers on my course were sensitive to the needs and backgrounds of BME students when leading classroom discussion	Academic Development Committee	High
8	Promote inclusive assessment of modules	(a) Blind marking of all assignments (School Learning	Prodirector for Learning and Teaching; Academic Development Committee	High

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 3**

		and Teaching Committees to investigate feasibility)  (b) Implement the recommendations of the Inclusive Assessment Working Group		
9	Improve study skills	(a) Introduction of study skills component into all first year degree programmes Departmental learning and teaching committee to consider how to make this operational  (b) All module outlines to include information on (i) the module's aims and objectives and (ii) the requirements for obtaining a II.1 or First <b>on that module</b>  (c) Better publicize academic support available for mature students	Departmental Learning and Teaching coordinators  Learning and Teaching Quality Committee	High
10	Review the SOAS complaints procedure	(a) Undertake an audit and make an annual report to be made to Academic Board  (b) Consider introducing a specific appeals process for decisions in respect of mitigating circumstances	Head of Governance and Compliance	Medium

**ACADEMIC BOARD 31 January 2018**  
**2017/18 AB 3 E**  
**Appendix 3**

11	Improve non-academic support for BME students	Tailored support for BME students	Head of Student Advice and Well-Being	High
11	Improve student academic support	<p>(a) BME mentoring</p> <p>(b) All departments to have a designated BME tutor</p> <p>(c) Ensure office hours are adhered to</p> <p>(d) Produce comprehensive guide to academic, welfare and administrative support for students</p>	<p>(a) Director of Academic Services/Students' Union</p> <p>(b) HoDs</p> <p>(c) HoDs</p> <p>(d) Director of Academic Services/Head of Student Advice and Well-Being</p> <p>Oversight for all these to lie with Academic Development Committee</p>	<p>(a) already underway. Consider extending beyond first year students)</p> <p>(b) High</p> <p>(c) High</p> <p>(d) Medium<sup>2</sup></p>

<sup>2</sup> Only listed as medium priority because it is probably not feasible to put together a guide until Professional Service Restructuring is agreed ie we will probably not be able to have a guide in place for the start of the 2018/19 academic year



**Fundraising for strategically important and vulnerable languages**

Academic Board is asked to **discuss** the following report on the HEFCE Catalyst funding for strategically important and vulnerable languages and related fundraising activities

**Executive Summary**

SOAS has been awarded £5m funding for supporting strategically important and vulnerable languages (SIL) of Africa, Asia and the Middle East, focussing on 22 languages currently taught at SOAS. The funding is contingent on SOAS's raising £5m of philanthropic funding for SIL by 2021, as well as other success criteria. Fundraising efforts have begun, and members of the SOAS community are asked to help reaching the target.

Lutz Marten, Ben Murtagh and Ruth O'Hanlon

**Recommendations**

Members of AB are asked to support the project, and to encourage colleagues to contribute to reaching our fundraising goal through ideas, activities or contacts.

**Financial Impact**

A ring-fenced investment of £10m would make a steady contribution to our SIL scholarship. Failure to reach the fundraising target could result in the loss of (some of) the HEFCE funding.

**Risks**

Failure to raise the target amount would result in increased pressure on SIL scholarship and could also lead to reputational damage.

Constraints on capacity in DEAA may restrict the SIL fundraising activities we can undertake.

**Equality implications**

There are no direct equality implications.

**Consultation**

*Earlier versions of this paper were discussed with Estates, Finance, and DEAA, who supported the paper.*

**Fundraising for strategically important and vulnerable languages**

Lutz Marten, Interim Dean FAH&LC and Chair of the Project Strategy Board

31 Jan 2018

On 19 July 2017, SOAS was awarded £5m funding from HEFCE's Catalyst fund for a project to safeguard UK provision in strategically important and vulnerable languages (SIL) of Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

The funding is contingent on SOAS's raising £5m of philanthropic funding by 2021, as well as other success criteria related to the refurbishment of part of the SOAS estate, numbers of students graduating with a knowledge of a SIL language, and outreach activities. The objectives of the project from the bid document are provided in Appendix 1.

The project runs to 2020/21, with several milestones and success measures throughout this period. The building aspects will have to be completed by March 2019. A Project Strategy Board oversees progress of the project.

The portfolio of 22 SIL language supported by the project consists of:

Amharic, Hausa, Somali, Swahili, Yoruba, Zulu (Africa); Hebrew, Persian, Turkish (Near and Middle East); Bengali, Hindi, Nepali, Punjabi, Urdu (South Asia); Burmese, Indonesian, Khmer, Thai, Vietnamese (South East Asia); and Cantonese, Hokkien, Tibetan (East Asia).

These 22 languages are spoken as a first language by 1.1 billion people across the world. Within the UK, 13 of these languages are taught only at SOAS at university level.

The refurbishment aspect of the project focuses on the Brunei Gallery and includes the development of a central Language Space in the Brunei Suite which visually and physically demonstrates the embedding of languages in the wider life of the School. Other aspects are the refurbishment and upgrade of the BGLT and to install cinema quality AV facilities, and the refurbishment and sound protection of the teaching space on the first floor, and refurbishment and upgrade of teaching space on the second floor.

The fundraising aspect of the project aims to establish a ring-fenced investment of £10m to support up to seven SIL academic and/or lector position in perpetuity. Half of this amount will come from philanthropic donations. The aim of the project is to support existing activities, so fundraising focusses on the 22 SIL of the project.

The Directorate of Development, Alumni and External Engagement has developed a fundraising strategy for SIL as part of our 'Questions Worth Asking' campaign. For some languages specific gift ideas or potential donors have been identified and more specific fundraising plans are being drafted, including Burmese, Hausa, Yoruba.

The Strategy Board is keen to hear from colleagues about fundraising ideas for any of the 22 languages, or for groups of languages – for example for making the case for academic importance, for suggestions about events or strategy, or in terms of contacts with communities or potential donors.

## Appendix 1

The aim of the HEFCE-funded Catalyst project is to make a strong contribution to language scholarship, training, and expertise of strategic and vulnerable languages of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East in the UK. Specific outputs and outputs are provided below (from the original bid document, amended January 2018)

### 1. Outcomes

- 1) To safeguard and strengthen the provision of a **broad portfolio of about 20 highly specialised SIL** in the UK
- 2) To ensure maintenance of a **pool of skilled graduates** with advanced knowledge of the languages and cultures of the key geographic regions Africa, South Asia, South East Asia, and the Middle East
- 3) To **raise the profile of a wide range of languages spoken in the UK** by communities with recent or historic origins in Asia, Africa or the Middle East

### 2. Outputs

We highlight six outputs against which progress in the project can be measured:

- 1) The creation of a **new School of Languages** as the intellectual and physical home of teaching and research in SIL
- 2) **Refurbishment of part of the SOAS Estate** to support the new School of Languages
- 3) Up to seven **academic posts and/or teaching lectorships** in highly specialised languages secured in perpetuity, based on £5m philanthropic funding matched by £5m from internal funding
- 4) A steady number of **trained graduates and postgraduates with high competence** in specialised SIL of Africa, Asia and the Middle East (annually 20 students to higher intermediate and 20 to advanced level)
- 5) A steady number of 125 undergraduate and postgraduate students per year with up to intermediate **degree-level learning experience** of an African, Asian, or Middle Eastern SIL
- 6) **Widening participation and recruitment activities** including ambassador and internship schemes for strategic languages, and school and wider public outreach events aimed at enhancing interest and confidence in language learning, and uptake of African, Asian, or Middle Eastern SIL, including pupils at primary and secondary level

# People and change

**Constitution of Centre of East Asian Law**

*Report by Chair of Centre of East Asian Law on modification of centre name, expansion of centre's remit, and CEAL membership approval of new centre constitution.*

*AB is asked to **approve** the recommendations in the report*

**Executive Summary**

After consultation with members of Centre of East Asian Law (CEAL), as well as the head of the law school, it was decided that both the existing title and remit of the CEAL do not adequately reflect the research and teaching interests of the law school, and leave several potential members of the law school (SoL) without an adequate regional centre to associate. After consultation with several members of the law school, it was decided that a broader *regional* centre is required. As such, the members of CEAL have decided to alter the name of the Centre to—Centre for Asian Legal Studies—and to produce a new constitution for the centre that better reflects the research interests of the SoL staff as well as our intended goals for developing SOAS as a hub for the study of Asian law.

**Recommendations**

- *The Chair in consultation with membership of CEAL nominated a new title for the centre: Centre for Asian Legal Studies.*
  - Members voted in favour of name change.
- *The Chair in consultation with membership of CEAL produced a new constitution for the centre.*
  - Members voted in favour of the new constitution.
- *The Chair and membership of CEAL recommend that AB approve:*
  - *New title of: SOAS Centre for Asian Legal Studies*
  - *New Constitution of Centre for Asian Legal Studies (Appendix A)*

**Risks**

*No risks related to this proposal.*

**Equality implications**

*No equality implications.*

**Consultations**

*Consultation with membership of Centre of East Asian Law*

**Supplementary Report**

Introduction—

After consultation with members of Centre of East Asian Law (CEAL), as well as the head of the law school, it was decided that both the existing title and remit of the CEAL do not adequately reflect the research and teaching interests of the law school, and leave several potential members of the law school (SoL) without an adequate regional centre to associate. After consultation with several members of the law school, it was decided that a broader *regional* centre is required. As such, the members of CEAL have decided to alter the name of the Centre to—Centre for Asian Legal Studies—and to produce a new constitution for the centre that better reflects the research interests of the SoL staff as well as our intended goals for developing SOAS as a hub for the study of Asian law.

Rationale—

- East Asia, typically encompasses China, Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan, Japan, and North and South Korea. However, the SoL currently has three members of staff explicitly researching China or Taiwan, but none researching other areas of East Asia.
- The SoL currently has several members of staff researching South Asia, Central Asia, and Southeast Asia, but these members lack a regional law centre with which to associate.
- The Centre of East Asian Law currently hosts the externally funded Thai Rule of Law Project. This project considers public law issues related Thailand, a Southeast Asian country. The project has raised external funding and is a successful component of the SoL, but having it housed in an East Asian focused centre is awkward. By altering the title and remit, the Centre could potentially serve as a host for projects ranging from India to Japan, and North Korea to Indonesia. It would provide a Centre-host for multiple funding applications which tend to fall outside the scope of “East Asia”.
- Renaming the Centre would provide SOAS and the SoL with a truly regional law centre that can support the research of more than ten current members of staff and numerous PGR students.

Conclusion—

For the reasons listed above, the members of CEAL currently request that AB approve the alterations to the title of the Centre and to its constitution.