

ACADEMIC BOARD
OPEN AGENDA

12th December 2018
(Conference Suite, Paul Webley Wing)

AB 2018/19 2 A	Minutes	
AB 2018/19 2 B	Action Points	
AB 2018/19 2 C	Matters Arising/Matters for Report	
AB 2018/19 2 D	Updates on School Strategic Plans and Committee priorities Research Strategy Risk Register To consider Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Risk Register To consider Equality and Diversity report To consider Reports from new Academic Committee Structure To consider	 [Attached] [Attached] [Attached] [Attached]
AB 2018/19 2 E	Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators Scholarships To approve Professors of Practice To approve Student Development Fund To approve Education focused career route To approve Review of Finance and Management To approve	 [To follow] [Attached] [Attached] [Attached] [Attached]

	Review of SIS To note	[Oral update]
	Workload Model To note	[Oral update]
AB 2018/19 2 F	People and Change Emeritus Professors To note Professor Laurence Smith - Emeritus Professor* Professor Nigel Poole - Emeritus Professor* Dr Colin Poulton - Emeritus Reader* Professor Ben Fine- Emeritus Professor*	

ACADEMIC BOARD

OPEN AGENDA

Wednesday 31st October (Conference Suite, Paul Webley Wing)

Attendees: Valerie Amos (Chair) Hugh Bendor- Samuel, Hau-Yu Tam, Peter Baran, Kira Brenner, Alfredo Saad-Filho, Angus Lockyer, Meera Sabaratnam, Brenna Bhandar, Graham Davies, Awino Okech, Kevin Latham, Michael Charney, Narguess Farzad, Ulrich Pagel, Uli Volz, Carol Tan, Mike Jennings, Alison Kennell, Christine Wise, Paula Sanderson, Ian Pickup, Deborah Johnston, Steve Hopgood, Shane McCausland, Andrea Cornwall, James Caron and Sally Priddle.

Apologies: Richard Alexander, Sarah Pett, Silke Blohm, Andrew Newsham, Hong Bo, Tania Fraizer

AB 2017/18 1 A Minutes

Minutes were **approved** as an accurate record of the meeting held on 6th June 2018.

AB 2017/18 1 B Action Points

All action points were completed or included on the agenda.

AB 2017/18 1 C Matters Arising/Matters for Report

No matters were raised.

AB 2017/18 1 D Terms of Reference and the Procedures for the Conduct of Meetings

AB **noted** the Terms of Reference and the Procedures for the Conduct of Meetings. AB noted that revised terms of reference

AB 2017/18 1 E Main item for discussion

SOAS Sustainability: Current financial position, the next steps and Academic Board's role

A presentation was provided to AB on the current financial position, next steps and Academic Board's role. The presentation was displayed on the screens.

The School's total income was £92.2 million, tuition fees were the largest source of this income. The rest of the income comes from council grants, endowment and other income. The School had seen a significant decrease in student figures and this had had a significant impact on the School's income. There had been a drop of 40% in UG students since 2016-17.

The School had poor NSS results and were in the bottom quartile in the majority of the areas. The league table position had also decreased and there was a direct correlation between entry tariff, overall ranking and the number of students recruited.

Non- continuation was also a problem and the School's non-continuation is significantly higher than the sector as a whole.

The School's business model was currently unsustainable and the expenditure was great than the income. The majority of expenditure went on staff costs and the percentage was higher than the sector average. The size of the School meant that economies of scale were not possible.

The School's finances had gone from a surplus of 3million in 2011/12 to deficit of 7.1 million in 2017/18.

The School did receive investments and endowments however this generated cash for specific academic activity. These funds were within the reserves however were restricted and was not able to be spent on other activities.

AB **noted** the actions that were proposed to address the current position and build a sustainable SOAS. The cash position needed to be improved in the longer term and therefore the footprint of the SOAS estate needed to be considered. The School had identified areas for growth to improve recruitment in these areas. The School would focus on providing a consistently excellent experience. The School would also grow TNE, Foundation and Online provision.

The languages provision would be reviewed because the current portfolio was not sustainable. AB noted that the School intended to retain what was special and the priority specialisms. How the School teach languages would be reviewed. Languages were important to vision of SOAS but cannot continue to be taught in the way that they have been.

The School were reviewing all cost base and centres.

The presentation would be delivered at department level, trade unions, students union, Senate and a whole School meeting.

AB **noted** the timelines for completing reviews. The Languages review, School of Finance and Management review, interdisciplinary review and institutes review would all be concluded by the end of November and presented to the December Academic Board.

The School were evaluating the offer provided to students and staff included how staff took leave and sabbaticals.

AB **discussed** why the School did not sell assets to address the deficit. It was reported that the assets enabled the School to increase borrowing. Without assets there would be nothing to borrow against.

AB **discussed** how growth departments would be supported and how priorities were agreed.

AB **discussed** whether the measures are sufficient. AB agreed the School's business model needed to change, it was not sustainable to have most of income coming from fees and the greatest expenditure being staffing.

The long-term vision for SOAS was to be elite institution that attracted the best staff and best students.

AB **discussed** what timelines EB were setting themselves to secure savings and address problems.

AB 2017/18 1 F Research and Enterprise

Research Strategy Risk Register

AB **noted** that as agreed at the last meeting the risk registers would be reported termly and have been considered and approved by the research committees below AB.

AB discussed the financial incentive action and it was reported it would be reviewed.

Action: Revised Research Strategy Risk Register to be reported to next AB.

AB 2017/18 1 G Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators

Annual Complaints Report

The annual complaints report forms part of the School's quality assurance return to the regulator and notes the School's actions to address trends or issues identified.

AB **noted** that there had been an increase in the number of complaints which could in part, be linked to the institutional action.

AB **noted** that an external complaints review had been commissioned and the outcome report would be brought to AB for consideration.

AB **approved** the report.

Safeguarding Policy and annexes

AB **noted** that the main body of Safeguarding Policy had been approved in July 2017. AB had requested that annexes were added to provide additional guidance and clarity to staff and students. The annexes had been approved by TLSOC. Once approved the Policy would be submitted to OfS.

AB **approved** the annexes of the Safeguarding Policy.

Attainment gap action plan recommendations

AB **noted** that the attainment gap action plan had been updated and had a new project owner Angus Lockyer Associate Director (Learning Environment and Student Outcomes). AB were asked to note the updates and approve the recommendations.

The revised action plan intended to streamline actions and highlight priorities. Reports would be regularly provided to AB. The working group would collate departmental, programme and module level data.

AB **agreed that** academic buy in was essential. Provisionally agreed KPIs for the attainment gap would be built into the review process. Unconscious bias training would be built into promotions process, including increments and staff advancement.

AB **noted** the impact of anonymous marking and the importance to implement the process. It was reported that there were practical issues about implementing the processes in the languages departments but alternative arrangements would be identified.

AB **agreed** that presentations would be held in all departmental meetings and key messages would be circulated to all staff.

Action: Attend all departmental meetings and present on the importance of the attainment gap work and actions that needed to be implemented at all levels.

Action: Circulate key messages and expectations to all staff.

Education focus career route

AB were asked to approve the proposed education focus career route for consultation. The proposal recommended that the route would simplify job titles and enable the progression of talented staff. The route would value and promote excellence within teaching. The role would include development and administration time.

AB **agreed** that it was crucial that there was an ability to switch into and out of the role. A business case would be required for any staff member wishing to switch onto the career route. The candidate would have to meet all the criteria.

The proposal would be discussed in focus groups and at Senate. AB discussed how the route would work for staff working in Singapore.

AB **agreed** that there needed to be a similar research model.

AB **agreed** that there needed to be clarity on how staff would transfer out of the route.

Action: Develop research career route.

Action: Provide a Singapore School presentation for AB.

Change to Teaching, Learning and Student Outcome Committee Membership

TLSOC voted to ask Academic Board to approve additional members to their committee to enable effective discussion and decision making.

AB **approved** the request to add members to TLSOC.

Quality Assurance Report

AB **noted** that the annual return was required to provide assurance to the Board of Trustee about the School's ongoing academic quality and how the School utilised data and trends to improve provision.

The report showed the state of play with the review process within the Academic year, the annual programme reviews, the periodic programmes reviews, the external examiners, new programmes and changes that had been made.

AB **agreed** that the action plan needed to reflect actions approved through other academic committees.

AB **approved** the report.

Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Risk Register

AB **discussed** the actions required to improve marking turnaround. There was also a review of the peer observation project.

AB **noted** that the Multi faith advisor that the School had recruited was no longer going to take up post. An alternative provision would be identified.

Reports from new Academic Committee Structure

Each committee had summarised its objectives for the year and any key things they wanted to raise with AB. The reports intended to provide AB with assurance that the new committee structure was being implemented effectively and the committees were focusing on the right priorities.

AB noted the reports from new Academic Committees.

Student Protection Plan

Academic Board **noted** that the student protection plan had now been approved by OfS. The School had to comply with it. Academic Board needed to be clear that if they make decisions that impact students' ability to continue studying in the way they originally intended then the plan will have to be followed. It is also Academic Board's responsibility to ensure that all departments are consistently using it in departments and all staff are aware of it.

AB 2017/18 1 H People and Change

Decolonising SOAS

An update was provided on the Decolonisation Working Group's work and Academic Board was asked to approve the action plan and recommend ongoing provision of support to the Working Group by EB.

Academic Board **noted** that this year's action plan focused on embedding the toolkit launched last academic session. The Working Group was working with the library to see how they would be integrated into the plan. There was a library representative on the Working Group. The Working Group would also work on public engagement and outreach. There were a number of exciting events and activities planned and they would utilise the pot of funding strategically.

Academic Board **approved** the action plan and recommended the support.

Academic Promotions

AB was asked to approve 3 additional members to the Academic Promotions Panel for 3 years and approve the changes to individual circumstances panel.

Academic Board **approved** the proposal.

Emeritus Professors and Readers*

Academic Board noted the Emeritus Professors and Readers*

DRAFT

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2B

Agenda item	Action	Timeframe	Owner	Update
6th June 2018				
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Objectives AB 2017/18 5 E	Director of HR to attend a future Academic Board and report on the progress against particular objectives	31/10/18	SP	Included on the agenda
Academic links with Hebrew University AB 2017/18 5 E	Complete review of options and provide further information on potential options to Academic Development Committee in December.	12/12/18	BM	Oral update
Safeguarding Policy Implementation AB 2017/18 5 E	Provide further guidance for staff working with under 18s.	12/12/18	IP	An under 18s working group has been established, the policy will be revised and returned to Academic Board in the Spring term 2019.
31st October 2018				
Research and Enterprise AB 2017/18 1 F	Revised Research Strategy Risk Register to be reported to next AB.	12/12/18	AC	Included on the agenda
Attainment gap action plan recommendations AB 2017/18 1 G	Attend all departmental meetings and present on the importance of the attainment gap work and actions that needed to be implemented at all levels.	12/12/18	DJ	Oral update
Attainment gap action plan recommendations AB 2017/18 1 G	Circulate key messages and expectations to all staff.	12/12/18	DJ	Oral update
Education focus career route AB 2017/18 1 G	Develop research career route.	July 2019	DJ/AC	Ongoing
Education focus career route AB 2017/18 1 G	Provide a Singapore School presentation for AB.	30/01/19	PS	

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 1

Research Risk Register				
Objectives	Milestones	Narrative Any internal or external factors result in any amber or red progress ratings?	Mitigating actions What additional or different actions will be undertaken to address any amber or red progress ratings?	Timeframe
Transforming the way we do research by transitioning from individual to more collaborative and cross-disciplinary research projects building on our unique regional and global research portfolio and strengths	All relevant policies relating to research grant applications and authorship adjusted to place significant emphasis on need for international collaboration	Amber Paper considered at REC Feb 18; Publications Fund launched March 18 which emphasises importance of internationally co-authored outputs	. Action agreed for PDRE to write a report for EB recommending financial incentives for academics who publish internationally co-authored papers. . It is anticipated that the Publications Fund will run again in 2018/19 (subject to budget approval) - the Terms of Reference have been amended to put greater emphasis on internally co-authored outputs. .Publications Fund for 2018/19 (with amended Terms of Reference) to be launched first week of December with total budget of £20,000.	. November 18 EB. . Pubs Fund 18/19 to be re-launched December 2018
	Sound post award processes established; improved initiation, management and	Amber . External research finance review completed . Implementation schedule to be developed	. Writing up of processes and procedures for post-award currently being	End of March 2019

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 1

	close-down of collaborative grants		undertaken. Collaborative approach with pre-award being currently designed . Implementation process to start with several working groups	
	Contracts appropriately negotiated and put in place in a timely fashion with risks fully considered and managed	Amber Significant progress has been made: external contracts benchmarking exercise completed, School wide contract internal review completed, paper went to EB 14/5/18 and was approved in principle but no additional resource offered to make it a reality.	Continue to process REO contracts as a priority and manage other agreements when possible. Head of Legal services in place and expected to take the lead on development of approval processes and library of preferred School T&Cs	February 2019
Establishing innovative structures, systems and processes that increase efficiency of research support and administration to maximise research outcomes	Process / system in place to review and report on research outputs, collaborations, co-authored outputs, publication routes used (eg which journals) to inform strategies	RED Good manual processes in place (e-Prints) but with high transaction costs	Request sent to IT 19/08/18 for support to improve the e-Prints reports. Positive response to this specific request received 19/09/18 but this and other improvements will now have to await appointment of Research Support Librarian with imminent departure of Digital Services Support Officer. Research Support Librarian due to start at SOAS on 14/12/18 but has	July 2019

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 1

			leave during January 2019, so it is unlikely this can be looked at before March 2019.	
	Ability to report on current, past and forecasted research & enterprise income and other performance indicators (applications and awards), both at School and Departmental level, with appropriate benchmarks in place	<p>Red</p> <p>Work on-going with IT and Finance to establish WT/Agresso interface. It is now possible to set up projects in Agresso test with the budget amounts against the right account codes, and if desired against certain workspells. The intention is that this will allow for forecasting in the future of live research grants.</p> <p>. We are able to report on numbers of applications and awards going back to 2013 and the value of the applications and awards. However 2013-2017 data is based on historic Excel spreadsheets whereas moving forward reporting is from Worktribe data and there are ongoing discussions with IT about IT providing automated reports from Worktribe for REO/HoDs/Senior Managers. Work is very labour intensive and ad hoc.</p> <p>. In terms of Post Award, research income report to be done periodically. Meetings with HODs to be held to go through their reporting needs as well as Senior Management - Planned to be completed by December 2019</p>	Work with new CIO to prioritise this work	July 2019
	Intranet (MySOAS) and internet content revised/improved to meet information/training needs of SOAS researchers	<p>Amber</p> <p>. Pre-award, scholarly communications and REF information currently available.</p> <p>. Enterprise work affected by vacancies. Content to be signed off by end of Oct. 2018.</p> <p>. Post- Award processes and procedures clarifying responsibilities of PIs and HoDs are under development</p>	EN led project over summer to update the information on the external website. Work in progress on some pages, including Enterprise, but agreed that post award pages would be slightly delayed due to	December 2019 Deadline extended to May 2019

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 1

			<p>staffing constraints. Successful Bid library has been launched. Research Professional has been updated with new academic structure and new specific searches for each department.</p> <p>Pages being gradually updated by various teams in REO.</p>	
	All staff granted research leave to have clear objectives, outputs and outcomes set which are monitored on return by Departments	<p>Amber Information currently held by faculty administrators; outputs of research leave not consistently captured</p>	<p>Work needs to be done at academic department level. Discussion with MN have started.</p>	March 2019
	Worktribe embedded across institution, options for purchase of other systems reviewed (Outputs/REF, SciVal, impact repository, automated production of reports on research and enterprise activity)	<p>Amber Worktribe Pre-Award module embedded. Trial of VV Impact Tracker Tool scheduled summer 2018.</p>	<p>Trial of VV Impact Tracker tool postponed (no budget; wrong timing at this point in REF cycle). However, impact repository in MySOAS is being maintained.</p> <p>Agreed to postpone decisions on new purchases due to School's budget position. Impact repository in MySOAS continues to be maintained and is adequate.</p>	

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 1

	Enhanced contracts and post award systems in place	Amber Improvements on contracts with joined up spreadsheets; dependency on resource availability for further system improvements; external research finance review completed; implementation of recommendations started Post-Award and Contracts joined procedures still to be discussed and agreed.	Discussions with the contracts team to be had to ensure alignment; aim for start of system implementation by April 2019	Postponed to end of May 2019 due to One PS restructure
	REO contracts team developed into a central contracts function with sound contract approval and review processes in place and a central library of all contracts established	Amber Internal School-wide contracts review and external UK-wide benchmarking exercise completed; Central contracts office approved in principle by EB in May 2018. No further action taken due to no additional resource to enable centralised office. New Head of legal services appointed.		May 2019
Bidding for research funding directed towards global challenges, building on our unique regional and global research portfolio and strengths	Sound post award processes established; improved initiation, management and close-down of collaborative grants	Red External research finance review completed Same as above		
	Grant budgets more effectively used for strategically important support roles eg Research Data Management, Impact and Engagement, where permitted by funders	Amber . Large grant budgets are currently used to support Project Administrator/Coordinator/Manager roles Further review of current grants held needs to take place. Schedule over December/January due to resource constraints. . Work with finance required on annual profiling of budgets	Currently prioritisation of high risk projects	February 2019
Developing a new generation of academic leaders through tailored support for our academic community whether early career researchers	High quality research and enterprise training and development programme in place (face-face and online) with sessions and materials to meet needs of	Green REO Workshop Series takes place each year. Weekly drop in sessions are available for all academic colleagues to focus on electronic submission portals, Research Professional, Worktribe, Impact and Public Engagement, and general research related questions. Online	Online training sessions have been launched in October enabling researchers to access them remotely . Further modules under	Summer 2019

or senior academics striving for large collaborative grants	different audiences - PhD Students, ECRs, established researchers, P.I.s - using external and internal facilitators, including some of our academic staff, 'best practice' scenarios in each session	ethics and impact training offered (Epigeum). Other online training in development . Training on Post-Award matters also being included. Expected to have completed the moodle report and face to face programs by January 2019, depending on resources availability.	development to cover the whole research life cycle	
	Dedicated research impact training programme and materials in place leading to improved impact planning, tracking of impacts and retention of evidence	Green Institutional Research Impact Training Programme delivered during 2017/18.	Written impact guidance now available from MySOAS. Face-face Impact Training programme for 2018-19 advertised (as required in the HR Excellence in Research Award action plan 2018-20). Face-face Impact Training Programme complete (4 workshops were held in Oct/Nov).	End of December 2018
	All researchers (staff and students) have appropriate understanding of ethics and research integrity and have undertaken online Epigeum training	Green Ethics Policy and Procedure have been updated to reflect the requirement for academic staff to now complete the Epigeum online course prior to a research grant starting and have been re-drafted to ensure DPE 2018 compliance. Research Governance Officer has been proposed as a permanent All PGR students have to pass the online Integrity course before the upgrade process. This is mandatory and a good take up of PGR and PGT	Research Governance Officer has updated all Research ethics documents (assessment toolkit, policy, procedure, Investigations in to the allegations of misconduct, code of conduct for using personal data, PhD forms)	March 2019

		<p>students have passed the course already.</p> <p>There is a relatively low number (c.15%) of research staff who have passed the course.</p> <p>There has still been no School wide training provided for any staff member or student in relation to GDPR. In spite of updating the forms there is significant risk that students and staff have not been appropriately trained in how to manage personal data.</p>	Research Governance Officer	
	Every large grant holder to have received appropriate support and training to be capable of managing their grant(s) successfully	<p>Amber</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Kick off meetings in place . Kick-off meetings format to be reviewed with the Pre Award team, as some processes have now changed 	Working Meeting with Pre-award and post-award to be held in late October 2018	November 2018
	Mentoring provision for academic and research staff in all departments	<p>Amber</p> <p>Mentoring Guidance published and circulated to Departments 2017</p> <p>Revised draft mentoring guidance circulated for review. Revised SDR trialled in economics and development.</p>	<p>This is an action for HoDs. Work started with MN to facilitate.</p> <p>Mentoring guidance written by Andrea Cornwall.</p>	December 2018
Expanding our national and international presence by engaging with HEIs, industry and the third sector to achieve meaningful and lasting research impact	Impact Case Studies with highest potential for submission to REF formally reviewed	<p>Amber</p> <p>Meetings with Departments and UoAs to agree which ICS have most potential took place during April-July 2018.</p> <p>Agreement reached on 39 impact case studies to be prioritised. ICS leads asked to write and submit drafts by 31/10/18.</p> <p>23 full drafts received as at 30/11/18; December deadlines agreed for 14; 2 no responses (following up).</p> <p>Contract in place with external experts, Bulletin, to formally review impact case studies. Drafts will be</p>	Plans in development for formal review between Jan-March 2019.	<p>March 2019</p> <p>Formal review to be completed by June 2019</p>

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 1

		sent to Bulletin for formal review between Jan-June 2019.		
	Impact/PER Strategies and implementation plans published and implemented	Amber Internal Impact Strategy drafted and feedback received	Impact/PER Strategy has been reviewed by PDRE and circulated to small group for feedback - anticipated it will go to the REC October meeting for further review/approval. Impact Strategy approved at Oct18 REC and circulated. Impact Working Group to work on implementation plan during Jan-March 2019.	December 2018 March 2019 for implementation plan

Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Risk Register				
Objectives	Milestones	Narrative	Mitigating actions	Timeframe
Produce high quality graduates, postgraduates and researchers who understand and engage with the world and the regions in which we specialise	Amber Development and enhancement of curriculum content to ensure attractiveness and distinctiveness of the SOAS 'offer'.	Strategic reviews of all departments have not yet been completed.	Strategic reviews have been scheduled and prioritised throughout the academic session.	July 2019
	Amber Collate and assess module marks by race and other protected characteristics to (1) Present at TELSOC & (2) Share with module conveyors	The data is held and collated by departments at different levels. However, it is not consistently collated for all modules.	Plans are being developed to collect data at different levels.	Feb 2019
	Include racial attainment gap data as part of the APR and as part of the comprehensive curriculum review	It has been agreed however has not yet been fully implemented.	It will be implemented as part of the future APR (July 19) and Comprehensive Curriculum Review (Ongoing)	July 2019
	Amber Reinstate the stipulation that all students must discuss and gain approval of module selections with/from programme convenor or personal tutor prior to sign up	Principles have been agreed however the practicalities of process and how it will be implemented has not yet been established.	A proposal will be presented to Student Outcomes Panel and subsequently Teaching, Learning and Student Outcomes Committee.	Jan 2018
	Red All module outlines to include information on (i) the module's aims and objectives and (ii) requirements for obtaining a 2.1 or 1st on that module.	There is currently insufficient clarity on assessment.	DJ is working with module conveners to secure clarity about the intentions of assessment through inclusive assessment work.	April 2019
	Red Identify how to introduce study skill component into all first-year degree programmes.	This work has not been developed or discussed at the appropriate committee. Need to be discussed at strategic intention, CQAC to discuss balance of courses and TELSOC.	The strategic intention of this objective will be discussed at the next Teaching, Learning and Student Outcomes Committee. The implementation of the programme would be approved via Curriculum	July 2019

			Quality Assessment Committee.	
	Amber Blind marking implementation	All aspects and practicalities of implementation have not yet been identified.	A meeting is being convened to discuss the practicalities of implementation and agree full implementation by the end of term 2.	April 2019
	Amber Draft and agree public statement committing SOAS to reduce its racial attainment gap to no higher than the London median within three years.	A final decision on KPIs has not yet been made.	This will be taken forwards by the Pro-Director Teaching and Learning with the Director.	April 2019
	Amber Produce research/archive on SOAS' colonial legacy.	The process for developing this has not yet been formalised. Discussions have been had to propose funding student led projects to deliver this.	It is proposed that this objective would be more appropriately delivered by Research and Enterprise Committee and Equality and Diversity Committee.	April 2019
	Amber Priority training-unconscious bias training	Discussions have been held with the union to implement unconscious bias training but a timeframe for implementation has not been agreed.	A timeframe will be established and it will be implemented by the end of the summer term.	July 2019
	Amber Embed analysis of departmental racial attainment gaps into the annual data cycle. (See also 1A2 above.)	It has not been clear whether the School has the appropriate data.	A report will go to Teaching, Learning and Student Outcomes Committee confirming the School's data set. A process will be agreed for implementing it by the end of the academic year.	July 2019
Staff and organisational capability for lifelong learning and ongoing renewal.	Red Review of peer observation of teaching (1st Year Modules)	Scope of review and recommendations to be reported Summer 2018. The scope of the project needs to be reviewed.	To be considered at Teaching, Learning and Student Outcomes Committee, a review of the past papers and feedback.	Jan 18
	Amber Consistent and high quality Academic advising	The process was identified as inconsistency.	New guidance was circulated at the start of the academic year. The new processes will be evaluated at EB and Teaching, Learning and Student Outcomes	Jan 18

			Committee to identify improved engagement.	
	Amber Improvement of marking turnaround time. 2017/18 targets set at dept. level in range 80-100%; 100% target in all depts. in 2018/19	The manual process is in place however it is not an efficient use of time and the longer-term aim is to have an automatic process in place which is not yet established.	An audit day is scheduled for January.	Jan 2019
A unique and fulfilling Student Experience	Red Develop multi faith advisory service and activities	Unforeseen circumstances resulted in the delayed recruitment.	The proposal is within the OPS consultation	May 2019

Equality and Diversity Risk Register

Academic Board is asked to **consider** the following Report and **approve** the next steps for the Equality and Diversity agenda.

Executive Summary

The School's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion objectives were agreed in 2016. They were an amalgamation of a series of plans that existed across the School. They are reported on each year with the aim that there is meaningful impact and success by 2020. As previous outlined the objectives are not embedded within the School and the ownership for progress is not shared. This said, there are a number of strong pieces of work underway that contribute to the objectives, but they are not coordinated centrally or reported on consistently which means that impact is not easier to measure.

In addition, the methodology utilised when establishing the objectives has resulted in the objectives themselves being too broad and lacking metrics. This makes it hard therefore to determine whether an objective has been completed, or is being sufficiently progressed. Most of evidence we currently use to measure success is qualitative and experiential. Although this evidence is important, the School's approach also needs to have robust metrics to measure success and impact as well as report against.

The options to improve this are:

1. *Review the objectives with action owners in order to determine meaningful metrics together.*

This would include identifying what resource was required to achieve objectives. Previous attempts to engage with action owners to examine this have resulted in people merely confirming that the objectives are too broad.

2. *Develop a revised EDI plan and objectives.*

This would involve securing considerable engagement across the School to undertake and complete. Additionally, this is a considerable undertaking at the same time as a review of OPS. The development of a revised EDI plan would have an impact on the work of the Diversity Manager who is also currently supporting a number of School wide priorities.

3. *Continue with the current plan and objectives.*

Continue with the existing plan until the OPS review is completed, and align this to the development of the revised SOAS Strategy post 2020

Arvind Sandu and Sally Priddle

Recommendations

1. Consider the progress against the objectives outlined in the report below.
2. Identify which is the preferred option for taking the EDI objectives forwards.

Financial Impact

Depending on the decision of Academic Board, there are potential resource implications for delivering a revised Equality and Diversity plan.

Risks

The risks have been outlined in the executive summary and the risk register below.

Equality implications

Effective and embedded Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Objectives are essential to maintaining the School's values. Without a robust plan that is properly resourced, there will be insufficient progress against the objectives and improvements in the culture and provision of the School will not be achieved.

Consultation

The progress commentaries against the objectives were collated from the objective owners.

A To recruit and teach diverse students we will:						
no	Objectives	Link to strategy	Senior responsible officer	Progress RAG Impact in relation to objective	Risk RAG Impact if objective is not achieved	Progress commentary- contributions made from stakeholders across the School
1	Collect and analyse robust data on our current and future student body	1a 1b	Head of Planning			Data campaign has been launched to collate equality opportunities data. Students data can only be refreshed at time of enrolment which means that we cannot collate data on students already enrolled and therefore cannot create an effective baseline. Our approach is currently not evidence driven.
2	Recruit and support students from the broadest pool	1a 1b	Deputy COO (SAE)			The School broadly performs well against targets for recruiting students from widening participation backgrounds but less well against targets for how well those students do once here (an increasing focus under the OfS).
3	Identify and meet diverse student needs	1a 1b	Deputy COO (SAE)			The School have increased the WP funding commitment for student success measures (such as BME mentoring, and international leadership projects), also ensuring that this is tied into related initiatives across the School and robustly evaluated. The School is also developing a Widening Access & Participation Strategy which will help drive further improvement in all stages of the student lifecycle.
4	Further develop accessible and inclusive practices in our approach to teaching and research	1b	Pro-Directors (Learning & Teaching and Research & Enterprise)			The Inclusive Curriculum Working Group have worked with QA and added an explicit question on inclusive curriculum in this year's Student Evaluation of modules (SEM).

5	Promote an inclusive curriculum	1a	Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching)			The inclusive assessment lab 1 “train the trainers” successfully took place last Friday 30 th Nov. Lab 2 will be on Friday 7 th December. In the 2 nd lab a case study “UG History” will be examined, including issues in assessment and feedback
---	---------------------------------	----	------------------------------------	--	--	--

B To be an employer of choice we will:						
no	Objectives	Link to strategy	Senior responsible officer	Progress RAG Impact in relation to objective	Risk RAG Impact if objective is not achieved	Progress commentary- contributions made from stakeholders across the School <i>More detailed can be found in Annex A</i>
6	Collect and analyse comprehensive workforce data	3a	Director of HR			Systems are in place to collate data however how this data is used and the options for using this a data are not fully explored.
7	Ensure equal opportunity in the recruitment, development and reward of our staff	4b	Director of HR			Policies to improve equal opportunities in recruitment, development and reward have been developed and implemented however the breath of this objective makes it extremely hard to measure impactful progress.
8	Embed inclusive workplace practices that value all employees	3b	Director of HR			The breadth of this objective makes it extremely hard to measure impactful progress.
9	Develop and deliver diversity and inclusion training at all levels of the School	3a 3d	Director of HR			An increasing portfolio of training is being developed. The HR and Equality and Diversity teams are analysing the training needs and how training needs to be tailored.
10	Benchmark our performance as an employer to continually improve our approach	3a 3d	Director of HR			Please see Annex A

C Delivering inclusive central and professional services we will:						
no	Objectives	Link to strategy	Senior responsible officer	Progress RAG Impact in relation to objective	Risk RAG Impact if objective is not achieved	Progress commentary- contributions made from stakeholders across the School
11	Adopt a strategic approach to embedding equality, diversity and inclusion	3d	Director of governance and legal services			Work to develop Equality impact assessment framework is underway. A strategy has been implemented to engage academic committees with their linked equality objectives however shared ownership of progress is not yet embedded.
12	Use inclusive communications and marketing	4b	Head of Marketing and Head of Communications			<p>Majority of the School's content is driven from our staff and student body. This is reflected in the SOAS blog, the prospectus and videos such as vox pops. The School aim not to use stock images and where possible the marketing team try and recruit a diverse range of students and staff when we call out for jobs or casting calls.</p> <p>Communications have also had specific diversity focus for high level comms - eg BME representation in senior roles and BME attainment gap have been key themes for the Director in public speeches.</p> <p>In relation to media training, the School aim to ensure that they reach out to staff groups who may be underrepresented in the media and have put forward staff for specific diversity projects - eg the BBC World Service Expert Women initiative earlier this year.</p>

ACADEMIC BOARD 12 December 2018
AB 18/19 2D
Appendix 3

13	Provide accessible buildings and facilities	5d	Head of Estates			<p>The Compliance and maintenance team are working to identify a number of projects that can push forward the accessibility Audits findings from 2017/18.</p> <p>The grade 2 status for much of the School's property stock, presents the School with a unique challenge. Therefore, the team are focused on identifying the areas which can have the greatest impact on extending SOAS's accessibility to all visitors and members of the community but ensuring that the work is cost effective and can be budgeted for, barring in mind the current financial position.</p>
14	Practice responsible procurement	4b	Head of Procurement			Policy in place.
15	Comply with our legislative obligations	5f	Director of governance and legal services			The School is compliant however this is an ever-changing area so requires ongoing resource and monitoring.

**Report on Progress on Equality and Diversity Strategy for the Academic Board
December 2018**

6. Collect and analyse comprehensive workforce data

Annual pay gap report on gender, race and disability.

On top of the gender pay gap (legal requirement) in March 2019 we will also be reporting on the ethnicity pay gap. The data is being finalised this week, with the draft action plan to be ready before the Christmas break.

Introduce systems to ensure equity in flexible working requests

The policy is being revised by human resources, in discussion with our trade unions.

7. Ensure equal opportunity in the recruitment, development and reward of our staff

Increase the percentage of women in senior academic and professional roles

And

Increase the percentage of BME staff in senior academic and professional roles

KPI13a	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18*
Percentage of female staff (academic and professional) at grade 9 and above			40.0%	42.5%	41.5%
Percentage of female staff across the population of the school	52.20%	51.60%	52.70%	53.00%	56.0%
KPI13b	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18*
Percentage of BME staff (academic and professional) at grade 9 and above			26.00%	25.00%	27.2%
Percentage of BME staff across the population of the school	41.60%	40.00%	40.00%	37.00%	41.6%

The percentage of women in senior roles dropped in 2017/18 (data for June 2018) despite greater success rates in appointments and promotions. However, data for November 2018 indicates that women in both academic and professional positions at grade 9 and above make up 42.5% of all posts at those grades.

The June 2018 data indicates the increase of BME academic and professional staff at grade 9 and above to 27.2% of all posts at that grade. The November 2018 data is even more encouraging with 29.3% of all staff at grade 9 and above being from BME backgrounds and as much as 31.5% of academic staff at grade 9 and above being from a BME background (Academic includes: Teaching and Research; Research only, Teaching only, HoDs, Teaching & scholarship fractional and GTA).

Produce annual workforce profile report

Report is produced every year by Diversity and Inclusion Manager and published in June

Review of approach to recruitment and selection to ensure equity and inclusive practice.

New recruitment and selection, acting up and secondment policies have been introduced.

Produce qualitative research with (female) academic staff to discover reasons for not applying for promotion.

Caring and Careers is a cross School group which was born out of focus groups conducted in June 2018 around issues of maternity leave. In October and November 2018 they conducted a series of consultation events looking at issues of career development of part time staff (including teaching only staff), smoothing processes around going for and returning from maternity/ adoption/ surrogacy / shared parental leave, and family friendly time-tabling. In November a number of focus groups took place as part of the Athena SWAN work investigating working conditions for women, which will supplement the results of the Athena SWAN Working@SOAS survey which was also conducted in November. The results are being analysed in December and will feed into the Athena SWAN submission.

8. Embed inclusive workplace practices that value all employees

Review current support for staff returning from maternity/paternity or long term leave

A draft checklist for managers has been created and comments have been collected, it will be presented to the Caring and Careers group and MEDE group for approval in January 2019 before being published.

A promotional leaflet for family friendly benefits has been approved and is being printed out this week and will be circulated before the Christmas break and early next year. We are also working on a calculator which will help staff estimate whether it is more beneficial for them (in financial terms) to stick to maternity/ adoption/ surrogacy leave or switch to shared parental leave.

EIA built into review programme for HR polices

New EIA training session will be organised in term 2 (early 2019), initially for REF panel members and the HR team.

9. Develop and deliver diversity and inclusion training at all levels of the School

Review EDI training options including mandatory requirements

The Equality and Diversity Advisor with expertise in E&D training has updated the Equality Overview training for new starters which now includes trans awareness training, Unconscious bias training sessions have also been put on in December, January and February.

10. Benchmark our performance as an employer to continually improve our approach

Consider dedicated staff groups

Women and BME staff groups are currently being developed as part of the Promotion Done Better group. With both having had their first meeting in term 1 of AY 2018/19. However, there is a need to set up broader staff networks/ group – which may incorporate the work of the Promotion Done Better groups.

Survey staff on approach as an equal opportunities employer

Athena SWAN survey Working@SOAS ran in November 2018 and is currently being analysed with the report expected before the Christmas break.

Contribute to external accreditations

Athena SWAN – the new Athena SWAN self-assessment group was constituted in September 2018 and is chaired by the Director and co-chaired by Gina Heathcote. The submission deadline is end of April 2019. The supporting data for the submission is in hand and the group are currently working on the narrative and the action plan. There will be an informal mock assessment panel with external colleagues organised at the end of January 2019.

Committee	Student Experience & Engagement Committee
Chair	Angus Lockyer
Date of meeting	22/11/2018
Attendees	17 out of 25
Priorities agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFCELS to be included in further discussions regarding the Safeguarding Policy for Under 18s. • Ian Pickup to provide an update on negotiations between Estates and Facilities with regards to Accommodation Services being moved under the One Professional Services restructure. As this was also linked to student wellbeing, Lydia Pell to be included in the SEEC membership. • The SU had secured funding of 20k for the mental health fund and were now looking into initiatives to invest in. SU to liaise with Prof. David Moss (Dept. of Anthropology and Sociology) who has led on mental health initiatives for the school and will be best placed to advise. • The committee approved the formation of a SEEC Working Group including representatives from EDI, Library Services and the SU. This work would be led by Monika Nangia and would go before TeLSOC for approval. • It was agreed that EDI objectives currently lacked robust matrix in which the institute could be measured against its achievements in addition to which actions needed reporting on. The Committee agreed to redefine the matrix which would then be monitored by SEEC. • It was agreed that Estates and Facilities would present at the January committee and report back how they intend to better communicate issues that have been logged/received and actioned. • In addition, Estates and Facilities to send the SU a report concerning an investigation of an incident that occurred within halls of residence. The report outlines how the incident occurred and what has been done to mitigate going forwards.
Any issues to raise with academic board	None reported.

Committee	TeLSOC
Chair	Deborah Johnston
Date of meeting	05/12/2018
Attendees	25 out of 32
Priorities agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TeLSOC to receive feedback from the SU over student response to the 'You Said, We Did' campaign; • CQAC to prepare, for TeLSOC, a report at the end of the academic year on effectiveness and statistics on Suspension of Regulations requests; • Roll-out of blind marking across SOAS; • The Careers Service will compile and send an annual report on graduate outcomes to TeLSOC; • A report on attendance monitoring to be prepared by SOP and then presented to TeLSOC;
Any issues to raise with academic board	No representatives from the Department of Finance & Management, Politics or Law have attended TeLSOC so far in this academic year.

Policy on Practice-Based Appointments

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

Executive Summary

The aim of this proposal is to encourage a more strategic approach to the integration of practical or professional expertise with the School's core activities – teaching, learning and research – the School will create the following practice-based roles:

- Professor of Practice
- Global Fellow
- Distinguished Community Fellow

The titles will be conferred on individuals who draw upon their practical or professional expertise in a field outside of academia to contribute to the mission of the School. Each role is explained in more detail below.

Stephen Hopgood, Pro-Director International

Recommendations

1. Approve the development of 3 new practice-based roles.

Financial Impact

1. As outlined, there would be financial implications for teaching posts and fixed term placements at the School might have expenses costs.

Risks

1. Anyone representing SOAS would need to uphold the School's values. It would be harder to hold people to account for the School's values who are not directly employed by the School.

Equality implications

A process would have to be implemented to ensure that nominations and approvals were regularly analysed to ensure that there is equal representation and processes do not adversely impact any group of people

Consultation

This paper was discussed and approved in principle by Executive Board on 26th November 2018.

POLICY ON PRACTICE-BASED APPOINTMENTS

1. Overview

To encourage a more strategic approach to the integration of practical or professional expertise with the School's core activities – teaching, learning and research – the School will create the following practice-based roles:

- Professor of Practice
- Global Fellow
- Distinguished Community Fellow

The titles will be conferred on individuals who draw upon their practical or professional expertise in a field outside of academia to contribute to the mission of the School. Each role is explained in more detail below.

2. Role outlines

2.1 Professor of Practice

The title of Professor of Practice will be conferred for a defined but renewable period on persons who have achieved the highest distinction internationally in a practice or profession of relevance to the SOAS mission.

Professors of Practice may not have traditional academic backgrounds but will contribute to the mission of the School by drawing on their practical or professional expertise. They are expected to teach in their area of expertise and engage in other activities in the School that might include research, consultancy and ambassadorship.

Professors of Practice are not members of the School's academic staff and will normally be unpaid. However, a range of expenses (e.g., accommodation) will usually need to be provided for such high-profile individuals and these will be subject to negotiation. In certain circumstances it may also be appropriate for role holders to be paid for the teaching that they are undertaking – see 'Benefits and Privileges' below.

It is envisaged that the School will, except in exceptional circumstances, have a limited number of Professors of Practice at any one time.

The term of these Professors of Practice will vary but will always be fixed, and renewable. Specifically, they might well return to the School annual to teach and be present, or they might attend only for one short period of time – 2-3 months.

2.2 Global Fellow

The title of Global Fellow will be conferred for a defined but renewable period on persons who have achieved high recognition in a practice or profession of relevance to the SOAS mission and who wish to actively work with the School in pursuit of a common goal.

Global Fellows need not have traditional academic backgrounds but should contribute to the mission of the School by drawing on their practical or professional expertise and networks. They will undertake activities including research, consultancy, knowledge exchange and fund-raising. They may undertake a limited amount of teaching, but this is not required nor expected. They need not be resident at SOAS beyond their auguration for any period of time and might well fulfil their role as SOAS Global Fellows while ‘at large’.

Global Fellows are not members of the School’s academic staff and will normally be unpaid. In certain circumstances it may be appropriate for role holders to be paid for the teaching that they are undertaking – see ‘Benefits and Privileges’ below.

There is in principle no limit to the number of Global Fellows the School might appoint. They would hold these positions for three years, subject to their activities continuing to positively further the School’s values and mission and are renewable for a further period of up to three years.

2.3 Distinguished Community Fellow

Distinguished Community Fellows will be similar to Global Fellows but without necessarily having a high public or international profile. They might be working within London institutions – schools, the government, the public service, hospitals, unions, sports – or contributing in other ways to the life of the UK and the community on which SOAS draws for its students and inspiration. The School will actively publicise this scheme and will seek out nominations for such Fellows and will see their appointment, as well as fostering close links between the DCFs and the School, as a key strategy in encouraging a wider debate on ‘Global Britain’ with SOAS as a pivotal voice.

3. Relationship of new roles to existing categories

There are two existing sets of honorary titles and entitlements in the gift of the School: *research associates and visiting scholars* (and an array of similar categories), and *honorary appointments*. The scheme of research associates and visiting scholars was the subject of an earlier EB paper in autumn 2018 where the decision was made to defer an overhaul of its complex and inconsistent implementation until a new Head of Library Services is appointed.

In relation to honorary appointments – the award of an honorary degree or of an honorary fellowship – it is assumed that Distinguished Community Fellows will not as yet have reached the level of esteem within their chosen fields to be eligible for our most prestigious awards. This does not mean that we might not choose in certain circumstances to award such titles to them. Global Fellows will have, it is assumed, a wider international role for the School and might or might not be of sufficient stature to be awarded honorary degrees or fellowships. These would not be mutually exclusive. They might well already be recipients of such awards. Professors of Practice will, it is assumed, be of such stature and might in some cases already be honorary degree holders or fellows of the School.

4. Appointment Procedures

4.1 Professor of Practice

Professors of Practice are hosted in an academic department or potentially in a regional institute (in which case teaching arrangements will need to be agreed with academic departments before final approval is given).

Nominations are made by the relevant Head of Department, Institute Director or a Pro-Director to a dedicated sub-committee of Executive Board and referred if deemed suitable to EB as a whole for approval. Appointments are reported to Academic Board.

To nominate an individual for appointment as a Professor of Practice, a Head of Department, Institute Director or PD will submit to the EB subcommittee:

- (i) A statement outlining the candidate's practical or professional achievements, their significance to the School's mission, and their expected contribution to the School during their tenure;
- (ii) The candidate's curriculum vitae or similar biographical information if a CV is not appropriate.

Before the application is submitted to the subcommittee, the proposer should ensure that it has been discussed widely within the department or institute and with other relevant stakeholders in the School, including the Pro-Directors.

Applications should be submitted to the subcommittee at least six weeks before the appointment is expected to commence. After approval by the Executive Board subcommittee, and then by EB as a whole, candidates will receive formal notification of their appointment from HR.

Where nominations are rejected by the Executive Board subcommittee, the nominating Head, Director or Pro-Director will receive a written explanation. In certain circumstances – e.g. when the nominee is a recognised professional or practitioner in a field relevant to the School’s mission but has not achieved sufficient distinction to be appointed a Professor of Practice; or when the nominee is expected to contribute to the School’s activities but not to teach in the School – the title of Global Fellow may instead be awarded. However, it is anticipated that in order to avoid bad publicity and potential embarrassment, candidates who progress to the formal approval stage will already have been the subject of detailed private discussions between the various interested parties in the School.

4.2 Global Fellows and Distinguished Community Fellows

Global Fellows and DCFs can be linked to an academic department or regional institute but need not have a specific connection in this way – they can simply be Global Fellows of SOAS as a whole. Appointments are proposed by the Director and Pro-Directors and approved by the above-mentioned EB sub-committee before being confirmed by EB as a whole. These decisions will then be reported to AB. Nominations can be made by anyone from within the School. A statement of support for the appointment and a CV must be provided by the School member who will submit nominations to the Director or one of the Pro-Directors of SOAS. The statement of support must be clear about the expected contribution of the nominee to the School’s mission, and how the nominee’s career or public service qualifies them for such an appointment.

5. Period of appointment and renewals

The initial period of appointment for Professors of Practice will usually be between one month and three years, renewable twice. Global Fellows and DCFs will be appointed for up to five years, renewable once.

Executive Board may, at its discretion, terminate an appointment without notice before the end of the appointment period. This right to terminate particularly applies where a continuing relationship between the individual and the School brings reputational risk to the School. There will be no right of appeal against such a termination.

6. Duties and Responsibilities

Professors of Practice are expected to teach and engage in a reasonable manner with teaching-related administration during their term of appointment in the School. Specific teaching commitments should be agreed between

Heads of Department or institute Directors and each candidate at the time of their appointment and should not in general exceed four hours per week, except where required by visa regulations.

In addition to teaching and teaching-related administration, Professors of Practice are expected to participate more widely in the life of their host department / institute and the School, engaging in other activities that might include research, research impact, consultancy, knowledge exchange, and acting as School ambassadors. These wider commitments should also be discussed and agreed between Heads of Department or institute Directors and each candidate.

Global Fellows are expected to contribute to the mission of the School by drawing on their practical or professional expertise to advance the School's mission more widely. If resident, they are expected to play an active part in the life of the School through activities that might include research, research impact, consultancy, knowledge exchange and fund-raising. They might also undertake a limited amount of teaching in their area of expertise, although this is not expected nor required.

DCFs are likewise expected to contribute to the mission of the School by drawing on their practical or professional expertise to advance the School's mission more widely. They are also expected to participate in SOAS events as and when appropriate and to foster links between SOAS and its wider UK and international community.

7. Benefits and privileges

Professors of Practice have the same benefits and privileges as other members of academic staff.

The privileges include:

- (i) Full library membership, without fees;
- (ii) Membership and use of the Staff Common Room;
- (iii) An individual School IT and email account;
- (iv) Staff-level access to the School campus and facilities;
- (v) Use of the School's affiliation in giving public lectures or submitting material for publication;
- (vi) Shared office or desk space in the host department or institute, as required and only if available.

The host department or institute will be responsible for any costs incurred through the provision of these privileges. The appointment of a Professor of Practice or Global Fellow does not entitle the department or institute to claim additional office space or other resources from the School.

Professors of Practice and Global Fellow appointments will normally be unpaid. In certain circumstances, it may be appropriate for appointees to be paid for the teaching that they are undertaking. Appointees who undertake teaching for which they are to be paid will usually be issued with a fractional teacher's contract, which will be regarded as a separate appointment from that of Visiting Professor of Practice or Professional Practice Fellow, except where visa requirements necessitate a single appointment. Any such arrangements will need the approval of the Pro-Director responsible for that Department or institute.

8. Visas and sponsorship

Candidates for any of the above positions who are not nationals of the European Economic Area (EEA) should contact the HR Directorate to discuss visa requirements, particularly if they receive or intend to receive financial support of any form from a formal source of funding such as the government, a university (including SOAS), a research council or a charitable organisation

9. Applications for External Funding

All holders of practice-based appointments should follow existing School procedures governing external funding applications. Where an application for external funding is planned by a Professor of Practice or Global Fellow or Distinguished Community Fellow prior to their appointment, this should be discussed in advance with the host department or institute and, in the case of Professors of Practice, highlighted in the department or institute's application on behalf of the candidate. As Professors of Practice, Global Fellows and DCFs are not employees of the School, external grant applications must cover full economic costs. The Research and Enterprise Office can provide more information.

SUPPORTING THE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT FUND AT SOAS

AB is asked to **consider** the recommendations in the following paper.

Executive Summary

Students turn to individual academics and to their departments, in order to request financial support for various personal and professional development opportunities. This ranges from attending symposia, to undertaking fieldwork abroad, to developing research and other projects.

Examples of previous requests:

- Eritrean asylum-seekers in Accra research (PGT Development)
- USLS (Humanitarian Affairs) Symposium (PGT Development Economics, 2017; PGT Law, 2018)
- Fund for attending conferences (PGT Linguistics)

A need has been identified for funding for a Student Development Fund (SDF), that should be open exclusively to UG and PGT students. These year groups specifically since the Doctoral School already offer 'Conference funding' for PGR students, for conference-related activities: <https://www.soas.ac.uk/doctoralschool/conference-funding/>, as well as the fact that while PGR comprise 15% of the student population, UG and PGT comprise X% and Y% respectively.

It is furthermore noted that the project should interact with other priorities and agendas at SOAS. The authors of this paper recommend that the following are prioritised in the design of the SDF (*should be read as School Priority/ SU Priorities*) - see here:

<https://soasunion.org/yourunion/priorities/> :

- Widening Participation (for current SOAS students)/ Welfare: Financial Support and Closing the BME Attainment Gap <https://www.soas.ac.uk/widening-participation/file80294.pdf> <https://www.soas.ac.uk/widening-participation/>
- Decolonising SOAS Vision/ Decolonising the Curriculum <https://www.soas.ac.uk/decolonising-soas/>

It will be helpful if it funds activities that can be linked to the attainment of the learning aims and objectives or learning outcomes of the applicants program of study.

It is recommended that the SDF should be a once-only award open exclusively to students from a BME and/or WP background, who are seeking assistance for funding for projects consistent with the School and Student Union Decolonising programme and that awards of no more than £XXX be given out.

Under this design, it is hoped that a minimum of around 40 students could be supported to further their personal and professional development. Recipients of the award should be encouraged to publicise their experiences through a blog and there could be a commemoration evening for the recipients to share their experiences, and seek support for furthering what they have begun to build. These are just some examples of directions in which the project could be taken.

It is envisioned that the SDF should be for personal and professional development activities that are not of a solely academic nature, for example conferences, as departments could reasonably be expected to fund these. The SDF also should not cover activities that can be funded within

departments at SOAS, or through recognised channels of external sponsorship. Students are only eligible to make one claim, and should applications exceed availability of funding, students would submit written applications for how their chosen activity relates to Decolonising, for the panel to decide.

Recommendations & Next Steps

1. That a working group be set up to bring the SDF to fruition, comprised of, and not limited to, the following: the Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) and/or the Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise), the Co-President Democracy & Education and/or the Co-President Equality & Liberation, the Deputy Chief Operating Officer (Student and Academic Experience) and another member of staff from Widening Participation, a member of staff from Student Advice and Wellbeing, a member of staff from Careers, Associate Director of Student Inclusion & Welfare, a staff member from Comms, two other student representatives and a revolving panel of academics.
2. The aim is to work towards rolling out the initiative for Term 2 in Spring 2019 and open applications until the end of Term 2, or whenever the funding is exhausted. (Provisional plan).
3. Relevant research, surveys and initiatives should be consulted in the drawing up of the fund's design. For example, the student researchers on the 'Bursaries' WP Project (Comfort Enoch-Moye and Lavinya Stennett) should be consulted for clarity on which students the fund could be focussed for. To take another example, the Decolonising working group could be consulted with regard to what student activities the fund could be focussed for.
4. We need to ensure we do not reproduce what our internal depts (such as LTD) already or are qualified to offer (judicious use of the small pot of funds we have for this purpose).
5. It will remain an open question how flexibility for allocation of funds should be built into the design of the SDF. Since students will apply to initiatives that have different deadlines, it may be wise to allocate on a monthly basis, however this creates questions of whether the panel will have the capacity to convene monthly. What to do if one month is very popular, resulting in lots of competitive applications - and the next more scarce, resulting in allocation to applications which would not have made the cut the month before? How retroactively should awards be made, and what is the time window for compensation? These are all things which need to be ironed out.
6. The payment for a trainer to come into SOAS to train a cohort or group of students, etc - should be taken into consideration. We can focus on train-the-trainer events to help build in-house capacity for programs/events on generic skills we may wish to run regularly/yearly and that will enhance transferable skills for our students.
7. Additional research and precedents elsewhere:
https://www.ucl.ac.uk/studyabroad/options/other_opportunities/funding_accordian/santander_universities_mobility_bursary_information_sheet

Financial Impact

A grant from the School - amounting to £20,000 - is requested to launch the SDF in this first pilot year.

Risks

Equality implications

The capacity to develop this initiative hinges on the School's support for and championing of the broader work of Widening Participation, Decolonising SOAS and the Students' Union. If executed well, the initiative would contribute towards the furthering of the objectives of the priorities outlined in the Executive Summary.

Consultations

Writing of proposal: Hau-Yu Tam
 Input: Deborah Johnston, Hau-Yu Tam, Emilia Onyema
 Initial idea: Deborah Johnston

SDF-WP

<u>Research/need to know</u>	<u>Design of fund and who administers</u>
<u>Award</u>	<u>Follow-up</u>

SDF- Decolonisation

<u>Research/need to know</u>	<u>Design of fund and who administers</u>
<u>Award</u>	<u>Follow-up</u>

Education-focused (Teaching and Scholarship) Career Route at SOAS: December 2018

*AB is asked to **agree** the recommendations in the report.*

Executive Summary

AB has agreed the development of an education-focused academic career route for consultation at SOAS. The aims would be to: create new career opportunities; increase the capacity for leadership in teaching and learning; and, increase our teaching capacity.

This paper updates on this initiative since AB agreement in June. It sets out recommendation, the next steps and timeframe for this proposal.

DEBORAH JOHNSTON

Recommendations & Next Step

1. To agree the establishment of an Education-focused Career Route, from Grade 8 to Professorship.

Next steps:

1. There will be an application period in term 3 for individuals who find this of interest.
2. Subsequently, applications will be included in the annual promotion round year.
3. The route should have an interim evaluation at the end of 2019/20, and a full evaluation at a three-year point (the end of 2021/22). This evaluation should investigate application and take-up of the route, looking at the progression, seniority and workloads of those on the route.

Risks

- *This will put additional burden on HR colleagues in the preparation of application materials and finalising job descriptions at what is already a busy time.*
- *If applications are not completed and assessed promptly in term 3, this will lead to uncertainty for applicants and for Heads of Department.*
- *There will need to be effective briefing around the route so that potential applicants are clear on the process and means of assessment.*
- *Overtime, if a low level of applications or successful applications are made, the route should be re-designed.*

Equality implications

Applications and outcomes on this route should be analysed in terms of the characteristics of applicants. The data should be compared to data on the overall make-up of SOAS, and on the profile of applications/outcomes on the Research and Teaching route. Specifically, if clear gender or racial imbalances were found, this should provoke investigation by both AB and Equality and Diversity Committee, as could be emblematic of biases in the process or wider environment.

Consultations

This issue has been discussed:

- *in the academic strategy working group, and at TELSOC in October 2018.*
- *at Academic Board in June 2018 and October 2018.*
- *With some UCU representatives in September 2018.*
- *At Senate in November 2018.*
- *At EB, twice.*

Education-focused Career Route at SOAS: December 2018

Background

In June and October 2018, AB agreed to support the investigation of the establishment of an education-focused career path at SOAS to:

- To help develop pedagogy and teaching leadership at SOAS
- To change the cost base of teaching and help with our sustainability
- To assist with fairness and career progression for those who are excellent in teaching but whose career progression have been impeded by insufficient research or a decline in their research interest, but subject to the needs of the School.
- To provide a career-route for those on teaching-only contracts

At the same time, it was recognised that the majority of teaching would still be carried out by staff on Research and Teaching routes – and that this initiative will aim to increase the recognition and reward of teaching excellence for all staff.

In October 2018, AB saw: a draft job matrix; a draft job description for a senior lecturer; agreed promotion criteria; switching rules (into the scheme); application rules for grade 7; and the switching process and panel.

In the October 2018 AB and in the November Senate, the following questions and concerns were raised:

- What criteria would be applied to colleagues seeking to switch from the Education-focused route into the Research and Teaching route at a subsequent stage?
- That applications to the route must be voluntary and must not be reflective of pressure on individuals.

These points are both elaborated on below, with suggestions made.

Characteristics of the route

In June and October, AB agreed several core characteristics. For the avoidance of doubt these are set out in detail below.

- Transfer into the route must be voluntary.

This should be ensured by the requirements for applications to come from individuals, along with a personal statement establishing the motivation for application.

- It must start at Grade 8 and provide a way for progression to Professor, with equivalence in pay and contribution at all levels.

The number of applications, outcomes and progression on the route should be monitored in each cycle – and evaluated at the end of the first year and at the end of the third year.

- Those appointed to the education route must be offered support similar to the research allowance and sabbatical provision to enable them to update and advance

their knowledge of their discipline, push forward innovative teaching and engage in activities concerned with teaching and pedagogy.

Those on the Education focused route will be eligible to apply for sabbaticals in line with those on the Research and Teaching route. They will be eligible for a development allowance in line with the research allowance available to colleagues.

- Workloads must be manageable.

Those on the Education-focused route will work to a 70:30 split between teaching and administration.

- As most teaching will still be carried out by those on the standard career route, there needs to be parity of terms in the criteria for teaching excellence across both routes.

The Academic Performance Framework for teaching on both routes will be the same and will recognise and reward excellent teaching.

- The Academic Performance Framework for the education-focused route will highlight teaching, leadership and administration. The opportunities for progression on the Education-focused route should be clear and achievable. Recognition should be given to two routes for leadership – pedagogic leadership through scholarship and through leadership of departmental, SOAS or national initiatives.

The Academic Performance Framework for the Education-focused route will consider three domains: teaching, leadership and administration. Progression through the grades might be expected to be attained by demonstrating excellence in two domains and satisfactory in a third (domains potentially being: teaching and learning; leadership; administration).

- Flexibility is important and to achieve this, there must be clear criteria regarding switching from one route to the other.

An applicant on the Research and Teaching route seeking to move to the Education-focused route must be able to meet the core education criteria and at least the threshold criteria on administration and leadership at the relevant level.

An applicant on the Education-focused route seeking to move to the Research and Teaching route must be able to meet the core teaching criteria and at least the threshold criteria on administration and research (publication only) at the relevant level.

- There needed to be clarity for colleagues presently in Grade 7 job families to apply to Grade 8 entry on the route

The applicant must demonstrate an ability to meet: the threshold education criteria at the next level; several of the core and/or specialist education criteria at the next level; and at least the threshold criteria in two domains (administration, leadership) at the next level.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The main recommendation here is that:

- Academic Board agree to the establishment of the Education-focused route as set out above.
- Academic Board to ask for the development of a sabbatical and development allowance application system, to allow comparability between the Education-focused and Research and Teaching routes.

Next steps:

- There will be a switching period with applications assessed by a switching panel in term 3 2019. All individuals who want to go on the education-focused route will be in place by July 2019.
- On-going switching will take place in the promotion round each year.
- Developing guidance and briefings to increase comfort with the route.
- Develop further support on completion of a teaching portfolio and to improve the understanding of the recognition of teaching in the promotion
- To run a survey of perceptions of teaching recognition and reward.

DEBORAH JOHNSTON

SCHOOL OF FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

AB is asked to **consider** the attached report of the School of Finance & Management Review, in particular the conclusions and recommendations in sections 9 and 10 that relate to the department's future academic direction

Executive Summary

The School of Finance and Management (SFM) Review combined SOAS's new Comprehensive Departmental Review (CDR) process with a taskforce appointed by Executive Board in May 2018 to 'oversee rapid change in on-campus and online teaching and research' in the department. The review considered each of the CDR's key areas of focus: Teaching, Learning and Student Experience; Research; People; Voice; and Infrastructure. Additional stress was placed on the Executive Board taskforce's concerns with the broader strategic direction of the department, including its financial performance and vision for the future. The attached report provides an account of the review day, followed by the conclusions and recommendations of the panel. The report is final except for the correction / clarification of any factual errors.

Sponsor – Stephen Hopgood

Recommendations

The report contains substantial recommendations on the department's academic future – see section 10

Financial Impact

The department is forecast to make a loss of almost £800,000 in 2018-19, having already made a loss in 2016-17 and 2017-18. The recommendations in the report include the development of a new vision and strategy to restore the department's financial sustainability, alongside the delivery of improvements in other areas. Recommendations to this end include cost reduction and income raising initiatives.

Risks

The significant changes recommended in the report risk unsettling staff and lowering morale. Appropriate support mechanisms will be put in place for affected staff.

Changes to the department's teaching and learning must be carried out without disadvantage to current students. The recommendations are intended to improve teaching, learning and student experience in the longer, medium and as far as possible short term.

Consultations

Previous discussion at EB (May 2018)

SFM taskforce (May – September 2018)

CDR panel (September – December 2018)

Ongoing communication with the department and PS colleagues

Equality implications

Equality implications of specific recommendations will be considered further prior to enactment. Some recommendations (e.g. academic workload model) are designed with positive equality implications in mind. No negative equality implications are envisaged.

School of Finance and Management Review
30 October 2018

Final Report

Contents

1. Panel members and attendees
2. Introduction
3. Overall performance of the Department (Session 1)
4. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught programmes (Session 2)
5. REF, research grants and Postgraduate Research programmes (Session 3)
6. Online / blended learning, partnerships and other income streams (Session 4)
7. Voice and infrastructure (Sessions 5 and 6)
8. Vision for the future of the department (Session 7)
9. Conclusions of the panel
10. Recommendations of the panel

1. Panel members and attendees

1.1 Panel members

Stephen Hopgood, Pro-Director (International) (chair)
Deborah Johnston, Pro-Director (Teaching & Learning)
Andrea Cornwall, Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise)
Sandra Dawson, External
Veronica Hope Hailey, External
Jonathan Michie, External (in absentia)
Victor Murinde, Departmental Representative
Alberto Asquer, Departmental Representative
Kofi Adjepong-Boateng, Board of Trustees

1.2 In attendance from the School (SOAS)

Graeme Appleby, Deputy COO
Sally Johnson, representing the Director of Student and Academic Support
Jenni Rhodes, Academic Registrar
Richard Appleby, Interim QA Manager
Susan Clucas, Director of Planning
Robert Ivermee, Project Manager
Chloe Weanie, Secretary nominated by QA

1.3 In attendance from the Department (SFM)

Reinhard Bachmann, Head of School
Laurence Harris, Professor of Economics
Christine Oughton, Professor of Managerial Economics
Helen Macnaughtan, Senior Lecturer in International Business and Management
Yoshikatsu Shinozawa, Senior Lecturer in Financial Studies
Gary Schwarz, Reader in Public Policy and Management
Sahar Rad, Lecturer in International Management
Richard Story, Department Manager
Matthew Jaggard, Department Academic Officer
Luke Dillon, Online and Distance Learning
Wilbur Moser, Online and Distance Learning

2. Introduction

The School of Finance and Management (SFM) Review combined SOAS's new Comprehensive Departmental Review (CDR) process with a taskforce appointed by Executive Board in May 2018 to 'oversee rapid change in on-campus and online teaching and research' in the department.¹ The review considered each of the CDR's key areas of focus: Teaching, Learning and Student Experience; Research; People; Voice; and Infrastructure. Given time constraints, however, some aspects of the CDR were condensed. Additional stress was placed on the Executive Board taskforce's concerns with the broader strategic direction of the department, including its financial performance and vision for the future.

The composition of the review panel broadly followed that of a CDR panel, minus the student representative, with the addition of two departmental staff representatives and a representative of the Board of the Trustees. Professional Services colleagues named as members of the Executive Board taskforce were invited to be in attendance. In place of a Self-Evaluation Document (SED), the department completed a response to questions raised by the taskforce in preparation for the review.

The approach taken to the review was discussed and agreed with the department in advance of the review day.

¹ In this report, the term 'department' is used to refer to the School of Finance and Management, while the term 'School' refers to SOAS.

3. Overall performance of the department (Session 1)

3.1 Key concerns of the panel

The chair introduced the key concerns of the panel, as discussed during its pre-meet, and noted the related data in the review information pack. The key concerns were identified as:

- **Vision and purpose:** What makes SFM important and distinctive, in light of the major competition in London, the UK and internationally? What is the rationale for a department of Finance & Management at SOAS? What is the department's distinctive offering for students? What do prospective students want, now and in the future? What is the department's vision for its place in the intellectual landscape as shown by research, engagement and teaching?
- **Financial performance:** The department is forecast to make a loss of almost £800,000 in 2018-19, having already made a loss in 2016-17 and 2017-18, with losses covered by the rest of the School. By contrast, departments of finance, management and business at other institutions in the UK usually return a significant surplus to the centre – in some instances following initial investment from the centre, as part of a plan for growth. There is no viable financial plan to reach a point where the department contributes to the School.
- **Recruitment:** The department has major recruitment problems, with recruitment in decline since the UG recruitment gap was lifted nationally. 2018-19 UG enrolment is forecast to be 31.5 below target for Home/EU students and 9.5 below target for Overseas students, with just 48 enrolments in total. Home enrolments have now missed targets significantly for two years. PGT enrolments are forecast to be 6 below target overall, 8 below target for Overseas students.
- **Non-continuation:** Rates are very high compared to other departments of the School and other institutions. Non-continuation problems date as far back as 2012-13 – with UG non-continuation in the department at 19.8% in the period 2012-13 to 2016-17, compared to a SOAS average of 13.6% – and suggest major issues with programmes, student support and student outcomes.
- **Student experience:** TEF metrics have been a source of concern. The department has failed to put students at the heart of its activity and offer them something of quality.
- **Staffing:** What is the right staffing configuration within the department? In a small department, it is very hard to be excellent at teaching and research. What proportion of staff should be research active?
- **Leadership:** Does the existing leadership have the vision, motivation and capacity to effect changes required in the department?

3.2 Opening remarks from the department

In his opening response to the panel, the Head of SFM acknowledged the issues raised – in particular with financial performance, recruitment and non-

continuation. He noted that both on-campus and distance learning have been on a downward trajectory for at least the past two years.

In explanation of the department's under-recruitment and subsequent financial deficit, the department noted that the decision was taken at School level to keep UG entry tariffs high. Competition has increased; competitors have invested heavily in expansion and marketing while SOAS has not. The department has no control over its marketing activities and there has been little focus within the Development Office on fundraising for SFM. The department suffers from the fact that Finance and Management are not subjects associated closely with the SOAS brand.

The USP of SFM, the Head suggested, was its combination of disciplinary teaching with expertise about SOAS's specialist regions – as evidenced by the recent appointment of new staff and the establishment of links with partners in China. The distinctiveness of this selling point was challenged by the panel: Is SFM really unique among finance and management departments in focusing on Asia, Africa & Middle East? Why, given the growth of business schools in Asia and Africa, should students come to SOAS? An alternative USP was then suggested: that the department focuses on the study of finance and management in Asia and Africa in a classroom environment that is international and predominantly British / European.

4. Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught programmes (Session 2)

4.1 Non-continuation and student experience

The Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching) asked the department to explain the reasons for its high non-continuation rates and the remedial actions that it proposes to take. In discussion it became clear that the department was not sure of the reasons; no systematic attempt has been made to collect data from students or discuss the issue at staff-student forums. The following reasons for non-continuation were suggested, after more specific questions and prompts from the panel:

- The lowering of entry requirements and subsequent reduction of the quality of students admitted
- Difficulties with BTEC students: 25% non-continuation rate among first year BTEC students
- The demands of quantitative modules: Are catch-up maths classes required, particularly for BTEC students? Are quantitative modules too demanding? How can the demands of employers for quantitative skills be balanced with mixed student abilities?
- Pedagogical methods: Students may require better teaching and closer guidance than they are currently getting. Reading lists may need to be shortened; syllabi should be adjusted to student needs.
- Assessment methods: Should the department introduce more formative assessments? Should it move away from end-of-year exams?
- Student support: Students today require more support than in the past. The department has a small number of student support staff. Giving advice on open options is difficult now that sign-up is on-line.
- The demands of studying a language, for programmes with language component.
- Years abroad: Students require better support.
- Students who come to SFM have often not chosen SOAS as their first choice and are therefore more likely to leave without completion. Some students receive employment offers before finishing their studies.

The panel observed that the reasons suggested concerned not just non-continuation but the student experience more widely. Many of the departmental representatives present, it was noted, appeared to have little detailed knowledge of aspects of the student experience in their own department – an indication that major cultural change is required in the department. Very few recovery actions appeared to have been put into effect.

4. 2 UG programmes

Possible changes to UG programmes that might boost recruitment and improve the quality of teaching and learning were discussed. Members of the department were unsure whether recruitment would be aided by emphasising the regional focus of programmes to a greater or lesser extent. Some suggested that SFM possessed more regional expertise than departments at other institutions and should stress this in its programmes and marketing.

Others suggested that students, particularly at UG level, might want more generic programmes (i.e. without regional focus) and perform better without the dual demand of learning about disciplines and regions. To this end, the BSc International Management programmes focused on particular regions might be discontinued or replaced by a series of pathways feeding into the BSc Management (which might be renamed 'Global Management' or 'International Management'). The panel noted with concern the fact that SFM offers so many different UG programmes, most of which do not have a sufficient number of students. The BSc Accounting and Finance has failed to recruit well, it was noted, and might be discontinued.

The advantages of accreditation for UG programmes, especially the BSc Accounting and Finance, were discussed. Accreditation, it was noted, may work to accelerate progress on curriculum reform by concentrating effort towards an externally imposed set of standards and a deadline for achieving them. An alternative suggestion offered was to return to the delivery of BA programmes in place of BScs.

Other suggestions included the development of joint degrees with other departments combining international management with another subject area; and the introduction of entrepreneurship and management modules for final year students on other programmes. SFM, it was noted, currently teaches on its modules the smallest number of students from other departments of any department in the School.

4.3 PGT programmes

Potential changes to PGT programmes were also considered. The panel asked what distinguishes PGT programmes in the department from UG. Should the department focus mostly or exclusively on PGT programmes in the future (as before 2009)? Should the department's regional expertise be emphasised at PGT level but not at UG? Would pathways from UG to PGT increase continuation between the levels?

A significant change proposed by the department was the introduction of a broad MSc International Management, without regional focus; students taking a certain proportion of modules focused on a specific region would enter a regional pathway and could graduate with that region in their degree title should they so wish. Other proposals were the introduction of an MSc in International Marketing (previously rejected at Executive Board because the paperwork was incomplete); and the re-design of the MSc Finance as MSc International Financial Management. The panel pushed the department on the possible introduction of an MSc in Entrepreneurship, Strategy and Innovation with specialist pathways, including in Social Entrepreneurship, but the response from the department was non-committal. As for UG programmes, the advantages of PGT programme accreditation were discussed, which might be combined with changes to pedagogy such as practitioners (e.g. accountants) teaching in the department on a short-term basis.

In relation to both UG and PGT programmes, the department was asked what actions it is taking to improve employability, a TEF negative flag. The department raised work placements as one possibility but noted the organisational challenges that this would entail. No other significant measures to improve the offer to students in relation to employability were proposed.

4.4 Financial viability of teaching model

The department noted that its regional UG and PGT programmes share a common core so the additional cost of each programme is small. The panel proposed that economies of scale and scope across different degree programmes be considered further, taking into account both on-campus and distance learning programmes. Data on the sustainability of specific SFM modules was then considered. The panel noted that SFM has a much lower student-to-staff ratio than the sector average. Though the individual modules modelled appear to be financially viable, the low student-to-staff ratio may not be financially sustainable. Non-continuation and student satisfaction rates also suggest that it is not delivering the quality in teaching and learning that would be expected.

5. REF, research grants and Postgraduate Research programmes (Session 3)

5.1 Research

The department outlined what it considered the strengths of its research performance: its research grant applications (13 applications last year) and awards (36% success rate), including from ESRC, DFID and AXA Research Fund; its research outputs; and its preparations for REF2021.

The chair pointed out that in spite of major successes like the AXA chair, and the impressive grant capture of some staff, overall research income has been relatively low. SFM staff do not regularly win grants to cover their costs or compensate for low student numbers, which should be expected in a department with a high number of professorial staff. The Head of School responded that the department was working closely with the Research and Enterprise Office (REO) to secure more funding and maintained that research income was reasonable for a department of its size and FTE.

The department was asked to explain its preparations for REF2021, beginning with its research environment. What themes was it focusing on? How many specialist clusters did it possess? The Head noted that the department hosted two research centres. When pushed to explain the research environment in more detail, colleagues proposed four possible specialist clusters: Public Administration, Finance, International Business and Trust. The panel's sense was that little planning had gone into the development of these clusters, however. The department did not, in the view of the panel, provide a coherent and united narrative on its research environment. Some of the identified research clusters are not as active or as externally visible as might be expected.

The Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise) questioned the department on other areas requiring improvement, including the low enterprise engagement of senior staff; and the limited participation of staff in cross-departmental collaborations (e.g. with Economics). The department, it was noted, had so far failed to engage as required in the process of developing draft impact case studies for the next REF.

5.2 PGR

SFM PGR recruitment is consistently low in comparison with the rest of the School. Why does the department not attract more students? In explanation, the Head of School noted that students not of a suitable calibre were often turned down; that Doctoral School processes resulted in lost candidates; that limited SOAS scholarships were available; and that PGR study is not a common route into employment for those taking Finance and Management Studies. The first, it was noted, was a problem that the department's MRes was designed to address.

The panel noted that though PGR recruitment was not a way to secure the department's financial sustainability, it was important for its reputation and research environment. The launch of a practitioner PhD combining on-campus and online learning was discussed.

6. Online / blended learning, partnerships and other income streams (Session 4)

6.1 Online / blended learning

The Director of CeFiMS (an SFM member of the Panel) provided an overview of SFM's online and blended learning provision. CeFiMS, it was noted, has about 2000 students from 180 countries, with 300-400 new students per year and a turnover of about £2.3 million. The delivery model was clarified following a question from the panel: staff costs are approximately £500,000 for SFM staff and £300,000 for external tutors employed to deliver modules. Two years ago the centre offered 8 MSc programmes. It now offers 8 MScs, 8 PG Diplomas and 8 PG Certificate programmes. It is unclear at this stage if this expansion and the related re-working of the PGT credit framework will have a longer term positive impact on application numbers.

Major issues identified by the Director were marketing, business development and partnerships. At present, it was suggested, CeFiMS has little control or input into marketing, which needs to be more specialised, targeted and 'relational', including better links with large employers; CeFiMS also has no business development budget, while the School's partnership approvals processes are unwieldy. The Director made a series of proposals for the development of CeFiMS activity: the launch of a Distance Learning PhD; the launch of Executive Education courses (many of which could be developed from existing modules); and the development of blended learning, with on-campus modules made available on online programmes and vice versa.

The Chair asked for an explanation of the recent fall in CeFiMS income (from £3.5million to £2.3million). CeFiMS, it was stated, has a good sense of what its market currently is: students come from a range of business backgrounds; they want to increase their qualifications and career opportunities; many are from regions where they can't easily come to London to study at SOAS. The three main UK competitors are Leicester, Edinburgh Business School and the Open University. The need to better advertise the centre's conversion programmes (i.e. programmes for a non-specialist intake) was discussed, along with the possibility of awarding degrees through the School rather than the University of London. The number of modules taken by students each year has dropped, it was noted, from 3.5 to 2.5. Should more administrative support be put in place to make sure that students sign up and pay for modules? Alternatively, should the centre move to a pay-up-front model to ensure that students complete programmes?

The question of cutting delivery costs was then raised. One way of doing this recommended by the 2015 Distance Learning review was stopping the practice of sending out printed course materials, which costs the School in the region of £150,000 per year. Why had SFM not implemented this recommendation? Members of the department suggested that the receipt of printed materials was a USP of CeFiMS distance learning programmes appreciated by students; that not all texts used for teaching were available in electronic format; and that some students were based in areas without reliable

access to the internet. Alternative ideas like the posting of material on USBs or the use of local printing were considered, along with the development of a dual model, where students choose between online-only and print and online options, with higher fees for the latter. The point was made by the Panel that there might be a wider market for CeFiMS with potential students deterred by the out-dated delivery model.

Alongside the development of blended learning, other ways of improving CeFiMS delivery and better integrating CeFiMS with the School were considered. These included putting the application process entirely online, improving the resources and functionality of the VLE, and improving student pastoral care. The quality of distance learning data and reporting must be improved, while a more accurate appraisal of the financial performance of CeFiMS calls for the introduction of an academic workload model.

6.2 Partnerships, TNE and other revenue streams

The panel and department considered the need for SFM to exploit international partnerships to greater benefit, including for student recruitment and the development of TNE. SFM, it was noted, has recently initiated talks about new partnerships with universities in China (CUFE, Southwest University, SW University of Political Sciences and Law, USTC), but the anticipated gains have not yet been realised. A priority is to deliver TNE in China and India that combines distance learning and on-campus provision.

The panel noted that the department is working with the School in the new TNE initiative to deliver programmes at Ngee Ann Academy (NAA) in Singapore. Two variances of the International Management UG degrees will be offered in the first instance – BSc International Management (Japan and Korea) and BA South East Asian Studies and International Management – with the possibility of increasing provision over the coming years. Members of SFM staff will be involved in the first round of teaching, which is set to begin in February 2019.

The department, it was noted, has considered the launch of new revenue streams from Executive Education, which might begin with the re-orienting of existing SFM summer schools towards an Executive market. Executive Education short courses for students from China might be launched as a first step towards the development of an on-campus Executive Programme. The delivery of Executive Education courses, it was suggested, should combine on-campus and online learning. The department's international alumni network should be built-up and used to better effect.

7. Voice and infrastructure (Sessions 5 and 6)

7.1 Academic staff

The department pointed out that it is small in terms of academic staff numbers, relative to competitor departments. It can therefore be difficult to achieve economies of scale and scope in teaching and learning. Responding to a question from the Panel, the Head of School noted that staff are attracted to SFM because of SOAS's reputation, the department's critical approach and the lighter teaching loads than at other institutions. The Head continued that the department has no need for a workload allocation model because of the collegial atmosphere between staff. This assertion was challenged by the panel: the need for a workload model covering on-campus and distance learning teaching had been established during the previous session, it was noted. If some colleagues felt that no model was necessary, it was perhaps because of the department's low student numbers. To provide transparency in workloads and fairness in the allocation of teaching, a workload model is required, the panel suggested.

The department was then asked about the major concerns or worries of staff. The Head of School noted that the department had been unhappy about the initial establishment of a taskforce to oversee 'rapid change' in SFM. The assumption behind the taskforce, he noted, was that SFM did not possess the desire to change itself. In fact, staff want to improve the department and have welcomed the opportunity subsequently provided by the CDR process to consider necessary changes. Naturally, the Head noted, colleagues in the department are concerned about the School's financial situation and the retention of staff: two members of staff have left and not been replaced while another two are on fixed-term contracts. The department suggested that the recruitment of additional academic staff might lead to enhanced reputation and visibility, economies of scale in research and teaching, and improved financial performance.

7.2 Professional Services support

To better support its teaching and learning, the department suggested that it requires an additional student support officer for on-campus provision, which would bring it into line with some other departments. An additional student support officer is also required for CeFiMS, it added, to ensure that the average number of modules taken by students each year increases to 3.5. SFM's teaching and learning provision is more complex than that of other departments, it was noted, because of the mixture of on-campus and online learning, the TNE initiative in Singapore, plus the proposed expansion into Executive Education, which may require a dedicated Programme Director and administrative support. The Singapore TNE business plan does contain extra resource for SFM dedicated to the Singapore programme.

With respect to Professional Services more widely, the department repeated its contention that the centralised marketing of its on-campus and online programmes was not effective. It requested control over its own marketing

activities, through the devolution of its marketing budget, the appointment of a dedicated marketing officer and the more extensive use of agents. More effective use of social media and better marketing in-region would result, it suggested. Alongside this investment, the department suggested the appointment of a member of staff dedicated to handling SFM enterprise contracts; and another dedicated to SFM external engagement and fundraising. Most business schools, it noted, operated with a large degree of autonomy from their universities.

The panel noted these requests. Members of the panel did not reach an agreement about whether or not autonomy from the centre (e.g. over marketing) is a precondition for a successful department. Recruitment difficulties, it was observed, related to the products (e.g. degree programmes) being marketed and not simply to their marketing.

8. Vision for the future of the department (Session 7)

In the final session of the day, the department was given a further opportunity to outline its vision for the future.

The Head of School repeated that the distinctiveness of the department lay partly in its combination of disciplinary teaching with a focus on SOAS's specialist regions. He added that the department was committed to 'critical studies' in management. The review day, he acknowledged, had made clear the need to think further about the department's identity and offering to students, with external factors and market opportunities in mind.

Other departmental representatives noted that SFM has grown organically over recent years without an agreed vision and direction. That the department should offer something distinctive to competitors while consistent with the wider SOAS vision was re-stressed.

Actions that the department could take in the immediate and short term to address its biggest challenges were identified as follows:

- Recruitment activities for 2019/20, including efforts to convert offers into enrolments
- Setting of 2019/20 targets (now completed)
- Work to improve retention rates, including new student engagement activities
- Development and submission of impact case studies (now in progress)
- Curriculum change: analysis of modules and reduction of existing offering; changes to programmes for 2018-19
- NSS strategy planning and delivery
- Marketing improvements: the department to liaise with Marketing and advise on how marketing can be improved

9. Conclusions of the panel

After the final review session, members of the panel and those in attendance from the School (SOAS) met to discuss their conclusions and recommendations.

The panel observed that the department had not appeared well prepared for all parts of the review, although departmental contributions to some sessions (e.g. on Online Learning) were prepared thoroughly. Members of the department had not displayed a good understanding of the issues that the department faces or how to address them. Although some interesting suggestions for change had been made (e.g. the rationalisation of UG and PGT programmes), the department had not offered many coherent or convincing answers to the questions posed to them or understood the imperative to articulate a convincing vision for the future.

The following main conclusions were then drawn:

- **Vision and purpose:** The department does not possess a shared understanding of its identity or purpose. While SOAS *could* make an important and distinctive contribution within the fields of finance, management and business studies – and also develop innovative interdisciplinary teaching – the department currently fails to define and distinguish itself within competitive and fast-changing domestic and international markets. The department's offer to students lacks coherence and originality. With this absence, it is difficult to attract and retain good students or staff.
- **Teaching and learning:** The department hosts programmes and modules with academic value and staff who make important teaching and learning contributions. However, serious problems exist with current teaching and learning provision, including the over-proliferation of programmes and modules; low and falling recruitment, especially at UG level; and very high non-continuation rates, which indicate major issues with teaching, learning and the student experience.

The department is unsure what broad direction to take to improve its offer to students: e.g. programmes to be introduced and discontinued; the balance between UG and PGT provision; greater specialisation, accreditation and/or regional focus versus more generic offerings. It does not understand the reasons for or know how to remedy the major issues of low recruitment and high non-continuation. Changes to marketing, as proposed by the department, are unlikely to significantly improve recruitment until the products marketed to students (programmes and other courses) are re-thought and revised.

- **Financial sustainability:** The department does not have a clear and credible plan to reverse its significant and growing deficit. While members of the department recognise the seriousness of their financial situation, most solutions proposed centred on adding more

programmes, academic staff, support staff and marketing spend in order to attract and retain more students. Few convincing proposals were made to raise income from teaching and research, achieve economies of scale in teaching delivery, or otherwise reduce the department's costs.

- **Online and blended learning:** Online and blended learning is a vital element of the department's teaching and learning offer and represents one of its better opportunities for improved financial performance. To this end, efforts should be taken to restore CeFiMS income to its previous levels and to lower delivery costs. CeFiMS should consider entering into new markets that have not yet been explored, developing innovative and attractive programmes for them. A convincing case was *not made* for why all programmes cannot be delivered entirely online. The proposal to introduce a distance learning PhD should be carried forward.
- **Research and PGR:** The department contains some outstanding researchers. The number of research grant applications and amount of research income is satisfactory for the department's size. However, the department's research environment and specialisms are not clearly defined. The research performance of individual staff does not appear substantially affected or enhanced by the departmental environment. The department's recent lack of engagement in the development of possible REF impact case studies is a concern.
- **Other income streams:** Plans for the development of new income streams, in particular Executive Education and further TNE initiatives, should be advanced.

The panel was asked to award the department a rating based on the CDR guidelines:

1. Department is making commendable progress;
2. Department is making acceptable progress;
3. Department is making progress but further improvement is required;
4. Department is not making acceptable progress.

The two external members of the panel present declined to award a rating, noting that their conclusions concerned the overall performance of the department and its capacity for improvement, rather than the department's progress towards specific goals. The two departmental representatives on the panel recommended a rating of 3 – that the department “is making progress but further improvement is required.”

Other members of the panel felt that a rating of 4 was justified – that the department “is not making acceptable progress”. In other commercial environments, it was noted, an organisation performing like the department would be taken over, merged or shutdown.

In the immediate term, the panel concluded, a number of critical actions should be taken to improve the department's performance (see the actions in section 8). In the medium to longer term, substantial changes are required (see the recommendations in section 10); small revisions to the status quo will not be sufficient to effect the required improvement.

Among the actions that ought to be seriously considered was, in the view of most panel members: change in the department's internal organisation; the bringing together of parts or all of the department with other academic units of SOAS; and a review of the department's existing staff profile. These actions should be considered in relation to the School's overall strategy for the disciplines concerned.

10. Recommendations of the panel

The recommendations of the panel – in addition to the immediate and short-term actions agreed with the department (see section 8) – are as follows:

1. Vision and purpose:

- 1.1 The department should redefine its vision and purpose, developing an identity that is distinctive relative to domestic and international competitors and contributes to SOAS's wider vision for the future.
- 1.2 This vision and purpose should be shaped by a clear intellectual strategy for teaching learning and research, market intelligence and a robust analysis of the external environment in which the department operates, taking into account the demands of students, employers and other stakeholders, now and in the future.
- 1.3 The future of the department as a discrete academic unit should be considered further, with the bringing together of parts or all of the department with other academic units of the School explored fully. Combining SFM with other department(s) should be considered within the strategic vision for business, management and finance in SOAS, with a view to also providing cost savings, efficiencies in teaching and administration, and economies of scale.
- 1.4 The possibility of establishing a SOAS Business School in place of SFM should be considered as part of the department's redefinition of vision and purpose. However, the department is not in a position to be transformed into a Business School until other fundamental issues highlighted in the review have been addressed.

2. Teaching and Learning

- 2.1 The curriculum and pedagogy of SFM should be overhauled at UG and PGT level following extensive demand-side analysis to ensure that the needs of students and other stakeholders (e.g. graduate employers) are being met and the department's new vision is delivered.
- 2.2 The design of new curricula and pedagogical methods should focus less on academic content and more on integrated offerings for students that may include alternative assessment methods; credited work placements and internships; study abroad opportunities; accreditation of programmes; and practitioner-led teaching. An emphasis should be placed on graduate employability within a coherent framework of student development and experience.
- 2.3 The department need to rapidly undergo a culture change to ensure that its vision and activities prioritise the wellbeing and success of students. Improving the student experience and lowering non-continuation rates is essential.
- 2.4 The department's existing collection of UG programmes should be simplified through the discontinuation of low recruiting programmes.
- 2.5 The department and School should consider stopping UG teaching in SFM and concentrating on PGT and PGR provision.
- 2.6 At PGT level, programme changes for further consideration should include the introduction of an MSc International Management without regional focus, an MSc International Marketing and an MSc in

Entrepreneurship, Strategy and Innovation; and the re-design of the MSc Finance as an MSc International Financial Management.

- 2.7 The number and nature of modules taught at UG and PGT level should be reconsidered, with the rapid discontinuation or combining of modules with low enrolments.
- 2.8 SFM programmes and modules should be integrated more closely with the wider School, e.g. through SFM students taking modules in other departments and students in other departments taking SFM modules. The possibility of developing management modules for students on programmes outside of SFM should be considered.
- 2.9 Changes to the marketing of the department's programmes should be considered as part of the department's new vision and purpose. The department should consider how best its programmes can be marketed.

3. Research

- 3.1 The department should accelerate its preparations for REF2021, thinking carefully about its research environment and impact case studies.
- 3.2 The department should improve the quality and quantity of its PGR recruitment, while recognising that PGR recruitment cannot act as a basis for restoring its financial sustainability.
- 3.3 The department should move forward with plans to introduce a practice-based PhD.
- 3.4 Academic (teaching and research) staff must work to deliver the department's required improvements in teaching and learning alongside research; research should not be prioritised over teaching and learning.

4. Online and blended learning

- 4.1 The department should move forward with plans to introduce a PhD by online learning.
- 4.2 CeFiMS should transition to the delivery of its teaching entirely online (i.e. ceasing the practice of sending out printed course materials).
- 4.3 Other means of lowering delivery costs should be considered further.
- 4.4 Blended learning opportunities should be increased, with on-campus modules made available on online programmes and vice versa.
- 4.5 Other initiatives to raise CeFiMS income should be explored further, e.g. the launch of online Executive Education courses.

5. Other income streams

- 5.1 The department should move towards the delivery of Executive Education courses as part of its curriculum and pedagogy overhaul, thinking carefully about niche, competition, pedagogy, costs and staffing.
- 5.2 The department should continue to work closely with the School on efforts to develop TNE.
- 5.3 Opportunities for staff to engage in Enterprise activity should be more actively sought.

5.4 The department should consider how to improve fundraising and communications. The department's international alumni network should be built-up and used to better effect.

6. Staffing

- 6.1 The ideal size and shape of the department should be reviewed, including the proportion of academic (teaching and research) and teaching-only posts.
- 6.2 The department should review its existing programmes and modules in order to address its financial deficit and allow for the articulation of a new departmental vision.
- 6.3 The department must engage fully with the School's academic workload model.

7. Organisation of change

- 7.1 The department should immediately review whether its current organisation ensures effective leadership and structure for the definition and delivery of a new vision and changes related thereto.
- 7.2 The development of a new vision and purpose for the department should be underpinned by a clearly evidenced plan with a coherent and realistic timeline and resources, including project support.
- 7.3 Professional Services areas should be engaged to support the department in delivering these recommendations, as required.