# ACADEMIC BOARD

## OPEN AGENDA

30th January 2019  
(SG36, Conference Suite, Paul Webley Wing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 3 A</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>[Attached]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 3 B</th>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>[Attached]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 3 C</th>
<th>Matters Arising/Matters for Report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 3 D</th>
<th>Research and Enterprise</th>
<th>[Attached]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Strategy Risk Register</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 3 E</th>
<th>Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>[Attached]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of SIS</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        | School of Finance and Management action plan and timeframes | [Attached] |
|                        | To approve                                                 |            |

|                        | Languages review: recommendations, action plan and timeframes | [Attached] |
|                        | To approve                                                 |            |

|                        | Options for Hebrew University provision                   | [Attached] |
|                        | To approve                                               |            |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 3 F</th>
<th>People and Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Code of Conduct</td>
<td>To approve: Revision to code of conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Respect at SOAS policy</td>
<td>To approve: Revised policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Promotions</td>
<td>To approve Professor Francesca Orsini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of AB member to Resources and Planning Committee</td>
<td>To approve Nomination: Narguess Farzad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Oral updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Oral updates]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Board

Open Agenda

Wednesday 12th December (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, Andrew Newsham, Christine Wise, Paula Sanderson, Ian Pickup, Deborah Johnston, Steve Hopgood, Shane McCausland, Tania Fraizer, James Caron, Julia Sallabank and Sally Priddle.

Apologies: Andrea Cornwall, Richard Alexander, Reinhard Bachman, Sarah Pett, Silke Blohm and Hong Bo

AB 2018/19 2 A Minutes

AB noted that the minutes needed to be reviewed by the Chair of the Committee. AB approved the minutes subject to drafting amendments made by the Chair.

AB 2018/19 2 B Action Points

AB 2017/18 5 E- Academic Links with Hebrew University

The options for maintaining links with the Hebrew University and utilising alternative providers has been costed and assessed. It was agreed that this paper would be brought to the Academic Board meeting in January 2019.

Action: Hebrew University options paper to be considered at January AB.

AB 2017/18 1 G- Attainment gap action plan recommendations

The data on attainment gaps had been collated and it was essential that it was shared to ensure all stakeholders understood the scale of the issue and how it would be addressed. It was important that activities having significant impact were shared across the School. A full report on strategies and impact would be returned to a future Academic Board.

Action: Provide attainment gap strategy and impact report to future AB.

AB 2018/19 2 C Matters Arising/Matters for Report

No matters were raised.

AB 2018/19 2 D Updates on School Strategic Plans and Committee priorities

Research Strategy Risk Register

AB noted that the Pro-Director Research had sent their apologies to the meeting. Any immediate questions on the register should be raised with the Pro-Director. The Risk Register would be reported on and discussed in detail at the next Academic Board.

Action: Include Research Strategy Risk Register on the agenda for the next Academic Board.
Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Risk Register

AB noted that blind marking would be in place in term 2. Further work was required to embed study skills into modules and programmes. Peer observation was progressing but needed further work to have the intended impact.

Equality and Diversity report

AB noted the progress against the EDI objectives. AB noted that the current EDI objectives were vague and did not lend themselves to quantifiable impact measures. AB were asked to consider options for improving the tracking and impact of the EDI objectives.

AB agreed that the EDI objectives should be revised and aligned with existing School projects. A revised plan would be returned to Academic Board in the Spring term.

Action: Provide AB with revised EDI objectives in the Spring term.

Reports from new Academic Committee Structure

AB noted that the new committees were not clear on processes and papers were being submitted either incomplete or of poor quality.

AB agreed that there needed to be clarity on process. These processes needed to be reviewed to identify if there was any flexibility to enable faster implementation of agreed recommendations.

AB noted that the CMA legislation did impact the School’s ability to be flexible.

Action: Review programme and module change processes and identify whether there was room for any flexibility.

AB 2018/19 2 E Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators

AB noted that the Scholarships paper and review of SIS would be reported to the January meeting.

Review of Finance and Management

AB noted that the report was the first substantive outcome from the academic strategy. The report outlined a series of recommendations which needed to be reviewed, prioritised and implemented. AB noted that the Head of Department had not been present for the discussion at EB and was not present in AB, however he had had the opportunity to feed back on the report. The Head had reported that although he disagreed with the tone of the report he and the Department supported all recommendations. AB noted that the Department needed the equivalent of ‘special measures’.

AB asked for clarification on the specifics they were asked to approve. It was clarified that AB were being asked to endorse the recommendations to enable prioritisation and the development of an action plan.

AB asked for clarification on how the recommendations would be implemented, action owners and timeframes.
AB asked what data had been utilised to inform the review and it was agreed that the data pack would be circulated.

**Action**: Circulate SFM data pack.

AB approved the development of an action plan.

**Action**: Provide detailed SFM plan to next AB.

**Professor of Practice**

AB noted that the report proposed to introduce a further category of honorary award in the School. The aim would be to bring high profile people into the School to teach and participate in high profile events.

Global Fellows would be overseas representatives and ambassadors of the School.

Distinguished community fellows would be outstanding people in the local community and the title would provide a way to recognise them and integrate them into the life of the School. Successful candidates would have worked in areas that aligned with SOAS’ values.

AB noted that there would be a maximum of 3 Professors of Practice at one time. The financial support would ideally be provided by external funders. AB discussed the financial implications of having Professors of Practice and how consistency would be achieved. AB asked for clarification on the financial framework and how the roles would be supported if external funding was not secured.

**Action**: Provide financial framework and how the roles would be supported if external funding was not secured to a future meeting.

AB agreed that student engagement in the process was required.

AB noted that all appointments would be made with the agreement of the Head of Department.

AB approved the proposal in principle and asked that the financial framework and further information was provided at a future meeting.

**Student Development Fund**

AB noted that the report proposed a fund for students to engage with developmental activities, including conferences. The fund would be for undergraduates and taught masters students. The applications would be for a maximum of £500 and would prioritise students from a widening participation background and link to the School’s decolonisation agenda. Students would be able to receive 1 award and would have to demonstrate how their work would support the decolonisation agenda.

AB noted that some departments already had funds to support students in this way, but this support was not consistent across departments. It was agreed that students needed to have access to same opportunities, regardless of department. All funding needed to be transparent and the opportunity well-advertised.

**Action**: All Heads of Department to share what funds have been provided to students to support their development.

AB discussed whether group awards would be considered and the need to have a framework for group and individual awards.
AB agreed that group awards would be allowed.

AB agreed that the scope of the awards should not be limited, WP and decolonisation could be prioritised but the awards should then be opened up to a wider audience. The link to the School’s values should be maintained.

**Action**: Provide a paper that sets out all funds and grants available. What would continue in its current form, what discontinued and what would go through this fund. Paper to address eligibility and values.

**Education focused career route**

AB noted that this report had been discussed at the October meeting and was brought back to AB to provide additional information and request for final approval. The proposal was an academic focused route from Grade 8 and would have sabbatical and a development fund attached. There would be clear progression and an expectation that colleagues would focus on teaching and leadership with time for administrative tasks.

AB discussed the routes for G6 and G7 staff.

**Action**: Provide AB with a report outlining the process for G6 and G7 staff.

AB discussed concerns about using a business plan to support applications from G7 to G8. It was agreed that colleagues would need to demonstrate that they had fulfilled levels of excellence in the same way the promotion process worked currently.

AB discussed the title and whether this would appeal during recruitment. It was agreed that colleagues would have education after their title for internal purposes but would retain their normal title externally.

AB discussed the ability for staff to switch from the education route back to a joint teaching/research route they did not have the opportunity to demonstrate strong research. It was agreed that teaching related publications would be considered.

AB discussed how teaching excellence would be measured. AB noted that the sabbatical and development fund would enable staff to engage with strong teaching practice and up to date research. Teaching would still be informed by the latest research.

AB discussed the potential implications for the REF and how strong research colleagues would be secured through recruitment.

AB discussed the current issue around valuing research and teaching equally.

**Workload model**

AB noted that this paper would be brought to the next meeting.

**Action**: Include Workload Model on the next AB agenda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th June 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Policy Implementation</td>
<td>Provide further guidance for staff working with under 18s.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>An under 18s working group has been established, the policy will be revised and returned to Academic Board at the March meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2017/18 5 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st October 2018</td>
<td>Revised Research Strategy Risk Register to be reported to next AB.</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2017/18 1 F</td>
<td>Develop research career route.</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>DJ/AC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education focus career route</td>
<td>Provide a Singapore School presentation for AB.</td>
<td>30/01/19</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>This item will be rearranged for March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2017/18 1 G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Hebrew University options paper to be considered at January AB.</td>
<td>30/01/19</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td>Provide attainment gap strategy and impact report to future AB.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Not yet due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2018/19 2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Diversity report</td>
<td>Provide AB with revised EDI objectives in the Spring term.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Not yet due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2018/19 2 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from new Academic Committee Structure</td>
<td>Review programme and module change processes and identify whether there was room for any flexibility.</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>DJ/JR</td>
<td>A review group has met to look at the current processes and how they could be adjusted to better support changes. A proposal will be submitted to AB in the Summer term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2018/19 2 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Review of Finance and Management</td>
<td>Circulate SFM data pack.</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 2018/19 2 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Review of Finance and Management</td>
<td>Provide detailed SFM plan to next AB.</td>
<td>30/01/19</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
<td>Provide financial framework and how the roles would be supported if external funding was not secured to a future meeting.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Not yet due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development Fund</td>
<td>All Heads of Department to share what funds have been provided to students to support their development.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>DCOO (Student and Academic Experience) has been asked to coordinate with all Department managers to identify what provision is in place in each department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development Fund</td>
<td>Provide a paper that sets out all funds and grants available. What would continue in its current form, what discontinued and what would go through this fund. Paper to address eligibility and values.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Not yet due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education focused career route</td>
<td>Provide AB with a report outlining the process for G6 and G7 staff.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Not yet due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload model</td>
<td>Include Workload Model on the next AB agenda.</td>
<td>30/01/19</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

SOAS offer 11 doctoral scholarships annually. This year, a part of funding for these scholarships is reserved for a partial contribution to CHASE, a commitment made by Richard Black. The proposal is that for the remainder of the scholarships priority is given to black African, mixed and Caribbean heritage students resident in the UK as part of SOAS’ contribution to addressing racial disparities in higher education and decolonising research. The proposal, supported by EB, is to do this on a pilot basis for one year, evaluate it and then decide on whether to continue this pilot in subsequent years.

Sponsor: Andrea Cornwall and Alfredo Saad Filho

Recommendations & Next Steps

SOAS doctoral scholarships to be advertised with the wording “priority will be given to candidates of black African, mixed and Caribbean heritage”.

Financial Impact

None, we were due to give these scholarships and budget has been set aside for them.

Risks

None. Positive reputational benefits (cf. UCL’s recent move to dedicate scholarships to black British students).

Equality implications

Does not contravene equal opportunities, as indicating a priority is permissible in relation to under-represented groups.

Consultations

Decolonising SOAS Working Group.
SOAS doctoral scholarships offer us a way to make a positive contribution to creating a more diverse pipeline of academics in the context of the dominance of UK higher education by white academics.

Black academics are significantly under-represented in UK higher education, constituting just 1.1% of the total number of academics in the UK. This is less than a third of the number that would reflect the population as a whole. Barriers to promotion, recognition and inclusion for BAME academics are well documented. Academics of African and Caribbean heritage are especially under-represented in relation to academics from other ethnic minorities.

Of the UK’s 14,205 male professors, more than 12,000 are white, while only 90 are black

A number of scholarships exist at the undergraduate level aimed at supporting black British students, especially those from first generation backgrounds. There are as yet few such schemes for post-graduate education.

Different organisations aim their scholarships at different groups. Some target black African, mixed and Caribbean students, and young men of African/Caribbean heritage. Others are for African/African-Caribbean and Asian minority groups, in one case specifying students of Pakistani or Bangladeshi heritage. In addition, many universities offer support for asylum seekers and refugees, including SOAS, but few extend this support to doctoral level education. International students from the global south are able to access a limited range of opportunities for funding. These include Commonwealth Scholarships, including split-site

---

1 https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/sep/07/uk-university-professors-black-minority-ethnic
2 https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2017/nov/16/do-universities-have-a-problem-with-promoting-their-bame-staff
3 https://robbieshilliam.wordpress.com/2014/07/28/black-academia-in-britain/
5 https://www.thescholarshiphub.org.uk/blog/ethnic-minority-scholarships
6 https://www.windsor-fellowship.org/ucl-research-opportunities
7 https://www.undergraduate.study.cam.ac.uk/stormzy-scholarship;
https://www.bankofenglandearlycareers.co.uk/our-programmes/african-caribbean-scholarship/
8 https://www.amosbursary.org.uk/
9 https://www.windsor-fellowship.org/ucl-research-opportunities
10 http://www.star-network.org.uk/index.php/resources/access_to_university
scholarships, The Charles Wallace Trust (for India, Bangladesh and Pakistan), and the Open Society Foundation.

A concern expressed by a delegation of VCs visiting SOAS last term is that doctoral training of African students in the UK contributes to the brain drain in Africa, and that our support may be better placed in advocating for and hosting split-site scholarships.

The proposal is that we prioritise giving our SOAS doctoral scholarships to students of black African, mixed and Caribbean heritage who are resident in the UK, giving priority within this to those who are the first in their families to pursue doctoral education. We would offer successful applicants a fee waiver plus a stipend for living expenses.

Decisions will be made by a School committee constituted for this purpose, with representation from each department.

In addition, rather than using our limited funding to support international doctoral scholarships, we will actively pursue an expansion in our capacity to host split-site scholarships, including through an application for a partnership programme with the African Research Universities Association (ARUA) for DFID/Commonwealth support for mutual capacity development in doctoral education. As part of this commitment, we will dedicate funds from our doctoral scholarships scheme in 2020/21 to support the SOAS/UK costs of split site doctoral scholarships with ARUA universities which we will work on establishing over the next year.

EB might also consider whether a proportion of the doctoral scholarships could be given to extend our SOAS Sanctuary Scholarships to cover scholarships for doctoral education. This, however, might be better done via widening the Sanctuary Scholarships programme and using its existing external fundraising mechanisms to support these scholarships.

11 http://cscuk.dfid.gov.uk/apply/phd-scholarships-low-middle-income-countries/
12 http://www.wallace-trusts.org.uk/
13 https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/grants/civil-society-scholar-awards
14 From the Sanctuary Scholarships criteria: ‘people who already live in the UK. Displaced people who may have: i) refugee status; ii) humanitarian protection status; iii) discretionary/limited leave to remain on human rights grounds; iv) submitted an asylum claim in the UK’. https://www.soas.ac.uk/registry/scholarships/soas-sanctuary-scholarships-201819.html
Doctoral School Experience Panel Terms of Reference

AB is asked to approve the recommendations in the report

Executive Summary

This paper establishes the rationale and terms of reference for the Doctoral School Experience Panel, as part of the restructuring of the Doctoral School.

The aim of the Panel is to be a sounding board for proposals to improve supervision and other processes at the Doctoral School, resolve issues earlier and informally, and reduce the number of formal complaints received about PGR processes in general, and supervision in particular.

The panel will be open to PGR feedback, suggestions and concerns, and will seek to identify informal resolutions, usually working through smaller and more flexible sub-panels. Feedback from these meetings will be used to inform policy amendments and improvements in practice across the Doctoral School.

This panel would not replace or supersede the complaints procedure and all PGRs would retain the right to submit a formal complaint whether they had spoken to this panel or not. However PGRs would be encouraged to meet this panel before submitting a formal complaint to try and resolve any issues informally.

EB Sponsor: Alfredo Saad-Filho, Head of the Doctoral School

Recommendations & Next Steps

Support the terms of reference of this committee.

Financial Impact

1. There are no financial implications.
2. The implementation of the panel intends to improve policies and processes, and reduce the number of complaints and financial claims made against the School by PGRs.

Risks

There is a risk that PGRs may confuse this panel with the formal complaints route. This will be mitigated by clear communication and face to face guidance shared with PGR representatives.

Equality Implications

1. This panel would be made up of a representative cross section of the postgraduate community to ensure equal representation.
2. The panel would make reasonable adjustments to ensure that all PGRs, including part-timers, can meet them and share feedback.

Consultations

The paper was written in consultation with the Interim Head of Governance and the Interim Student Complaints Manager.
Doctoral School Experience Panel

This panel would provide post-graduate researchers (PGRs) with the opportunity to raise concerns and issues about their supervision or other closely related issues pertaining to their Doctoral programme. This panel would not be a mechanism for submitting a formal complaint; however, it would provide PGRs with a space to raise concerns and have them resolved informally, usually through a smaller and more flexible sub-panel. PGRs would be strongly encouraged to consider or utilise this resolution route prior to submitting formal complaints or appeals.

Examples of matters that may be brought to the attention of the Panel include allegations of failure or lack of supervision; tensions between PGRs or between them and SOAS academic or professional staff, including their supervisors; disagreements over interpretations of the Regulations or the Code of Practice; allegations of process or other failures at the Doctoral School (DS); allegations of misuse of the facilities available to PGRs, and similar issues.

Anonymous feedback from the Panel meetings may be used to inform amendments in the Regulations and the Code of Practice, and to support improvements across the SOAS Doctoral programmes, including supervisory practices.

Proposed Terms of Reference:

- This is a resolution-focused Panel that intends to resolve PGR concerns informally.

- The Panel will be made up of:
  - Head of the Doctoral School.
  - Doctoral School Manager.
  - 2 Academics nominated by Senate.
  - 4 Postgraduate Researchers nominated by the RSA.
  - One member of the Doctoral School staff will act as secretary.

- If a PGR wishes to raise concerns about a member of the Panel, excluding the Chair, they should email the Head of the Doctoral School. The same confidentiality principles apply. If a PGR wishes to raise concerns about the Head of the Doctoral School, they should email the Pro-Director (Research and Enterprise).

- The full Panel will meet 4-6 times per annum. Sub-panels of 3-5 members may be constituted to look rapidly and flexibly at specific cases or concerns.

- Submissions may be made to any member of the Panel, but should in all cases be passed to the Doctoral School Manager for discussion at the next appropriate meeting.

- The Panel will not accept anonymous submissions. However, the details of cases discussed will remain confidential insofar as this is possible given their nature and the proposed resolution, and as long as confidentiality is permitted by law.
and by SOAS regulations (including formal complaints, disciplinary and appeals procedures).

- The full Panel or sub-panels may invite individuals making submissions to attend meetings in order to present their case. They may be accompanied by a support person, following the same rules as those applying in the SOAS complaints procedures.

- All Panel members would commit to the confidentiality of the proceedings. If the Chair of the Panel believes that there is evidence that details of any case have been intentionally shared by panel members, they may be excluded from the Panel. Appeals may be submitted to the Pro-Director (R&E), whose decision is final.

- All PGRs would be encouraged to try and resolve concerns directly in the first instance. They may request the support of the RSA, the relevant Research Tutor, Doctoral School staff or the Head of Doctoral School. Submissions to the Panel remain possible at any stage, as long as no formal complaint or appeal has been submitted about any aspect of the case.

- The Panel will endeavour to consider all matters brought to its attention as promptly as possible, but PGRs will be aware that some resolutions may not be immediate.

- This Panel would not supersede or replace the formal complaints or any other SOAS procedure. All PGRs retain the right to submit a formal complaint at any stage; however, in doing so their submission to the Panel is automatically withdrawn.
### Changes to Annex V (Standing Orders) – Research and Enterprise Committee membership

Minor amendments to Annex V (Standing Orders) – Research and Enterprise Committee membership

Academic Board is asked to **Approve** the proposed changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor amendments to Annex V – Research and Enterprise Committee Terms of Reference of the Standing Orders, which specifically are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of the Chief Information officer to become an ex officio member (replacing the Director of Library Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name change of Associate Dean of Research to Associate Director of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name change of PhD Student to Doctoral Researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes are highlighted in yellow for ease of reference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The REC recommends these changes. The input from the CIO will be crucial in ensuring that the terms of reference of the REC will be met and that the implementation of a new Research IT services team will support the strategic objectives of the School.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex V Research & Enterprise Committee

Research & Enterprise Committee is a sub-committee of Academic Board. It is required to report to Academic Board on a termly basis. It also has a responsibility to liaise with other committees and to keep them informed as necessary.

(i) The membership of Research & Enterprise Committee will comprise

**Chair:**
Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise)

**Ex-officio Members:**
Head of Doctoral School
Director of Library & Learning Resources
Director of Research & Enterprise
Director of Academic Services
**Chief Information Officer**

**Other Members:**
Pro-Director(s)
Associate **Directors** for Research (or equivalent)
1 academic representative from each Department nominated by that Department
2 **doctoral researchers** nominated by the Students’ Union Executive Committee

(ii) The Registrar will nominate a Secretary. The Committee will normally hold three ordinary meetings per annum.

(iii) Research & Enterprise Committee will have the following Panel and Group reporting to it:

Research Ethics Panel
Doctoral School Management Group
REF Steering Group

It may delegate activities and authorities to this Panel and Group, as appropriate, but retains overall responsibility for these.

(iv) Research & Enterprise Committee will have the following terms of reference.

(a) To consider strategic planning and policy development matters relating to research and enterprise, and to provide reports for and make recommendations to Academic Board and other committees as appropriate;

(b) To oversee the development of a Research & Enterprise Strategy in the context of the School’s Vision and Strategy and the School’s other sub-strategies;

(c) To monitor the overall delivery of the Research & Enterprise Strategy and to review it on an annual basis, recommending changes as appropriate;

(d) To ensure that the Research & Enterprise Strategy contains Performance Indicators and targets and to periodically monitor their delivery, together with metrics for ongoing research assessment exercises;
(e) To make regular reports to Academic Board regarding the delivery or otherwise of the PIs and targets set in the Research & Enterprise Strategy;

(f) To make an annual report to Academic Board regarding the overall delivery of the Research & Enterprise Strategy;

(g) To advise Academic Board and Resources & Planning Committee on business links, intellectual property and the commercial implications of research and knowledge transfer;

(h) To consider matters relating to the establishment, monitoring and closure of individual Research Centres;

(i) To advise Academic Development Committee on the development and delivery of those areas of the Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Strategy which relate to research degrees and the quality of the School's provision for research students;

(j) To oversee the development and implementation of procedures to monitor and maintain the quality and standards of research degrees in accordance with internal and external frameworks and requirements, and to consider the outcomes of such procedures;

(k) To consider, and where appropriate to advise Academic Board and other committees on strategic planning and policy development matters which directly affect provision to research students;

(ii) the implications of research student numbers and completion rates for the external assessment and funding of research in the School generally;

(l) To advise the School on ethical matters relating to the School's research in accordance with the School's ethics policy and related procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Mitigating actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>All relevant policies relating to research grant applications and authorship adjusted to place significant emphasis on need for international collaboration</td>
<td><strong>Amber</strong> Paper considered at REC Feb 18; Publications Fund launched March 18 which emphasises importance of internationally co-authored outputs</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound post award processes established; improved initiation, management and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- 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 2018 with total budget of £20,000.
- Writing up of processes and procedures for post-award currently being completed.
<p>| 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 | <strong>Amber</strong> 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. |
| Establishing innovative structures, systems and processes that increase efficiency of research support and administration to maximise research outcomes | <strong>RED</strong> 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 |
| Process / system in place to review and report on research outputs, collaborations, co-authored outputs, publication routes used (eg which journals) to inform strategies | 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&amp;Cs. |
| | February 2019 |
| | | July 2019 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to report on current, past and forecasted research &amp; enterprise income and other performance indicators (applications and awards), both at School and Departmental level, with appropriate benchmarks in place</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Work with new CIO to prioritise this work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet (MySOAS) and internet content revised/improved to meet information/training needs of SOAS researchers</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Pre-award, scholarly communications and REF information currently available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline extended to May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Enterprise work affected by vacancies. Content to be signed off by end of Oct. 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Post- Award processes and procedures clarifying responsibilities of PIs and HoDs are under development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff granted research leave to have clear objectives, outputs and outcomes set which are monitored on return by Departments</td>
<td><strong>Amber</strong> Information currently held by faculty administrators; outputs of research leave not consistently captured</td>
<td>Work needs to be done at academic department level. Discussion with MN have started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td><strong>Amber</strong> Worktribe Pre-Award module embedded. Trial of VV Impact Tracker Tool scheduled summer 2018.</td>
<td>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. Agreed to postpone decisions on new purchases due to School’s budget position. Impact repository in MySOAS continues to be maintained and is adequate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Enhanced contracts and post award systems in place | **Amber**  
Improvments 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** | | |
| 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 | **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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>Ethics and impact training offered (Epigeum). Other online training in development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Development to cover the whole research life cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated research impact training programme and materials in place leading to improved impact planning, tracking of impacts and retention of evidence</th>
<th>Green Institutional Research Impact Training Programme delivered during 2017/18.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>End of December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All researchers (staff and students) have appropriate understanding of ethics and research integrity and have undertaken online Epigeum training</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students have passed the course already.

There is a relatively low number (c.15%) of research staff who have passed the course.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Every large grant holder to have received appropriate support and training to be capable of managing their grant(s) successfully</th>
<th>Research Governance Officer</th>
<th>November 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Working Meeting with Pre-award and post-award to be held in late October 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick off meetings in place</td>
<td>Kick-off meetings format to be reviewed with the Pre Award team, as some processes have now changed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring provision for academic and research staff in all departments</th>
<th></th>
<th>December 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>This is an action for HoDs. Work started with MN to facilitate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Guidance published and circulated to Departments 2017</td>
<td>Mentoring guidance written by Andrea Cornwall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised draft mentoring guidance circulated for review. Revised SDR trialled in economics and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expanding our national and international presence by engaging with HEIs, industry and the third sector to achieve meaningful and lasting research impact</th>
<th></th>
<th>March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Plans in development for formal review between Jan-March 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Case Studies with highest potential for submission to REF formally reviewed</td>
<td>Formal review to be completed by June 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with Departments and UoAs to agree which ICS have most potential took place during April-July 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement reached on 39 impact case studies to be prioritised. ICS leads asked to write and submit drafts by 31/10/18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 full drafts received as at 30/11/18; December deadlines agreed for 14; 2 no responses (following up). Contract in place with external experts, Bulletin, to formally review impact case studies. Drafts will be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/PER Strategies and implementation plans published and implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong> Internal Impact Strategy drafted and feedback received</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>December 2018 March 2019 for implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps for the School of Finance and Management

This paper presents one of the recommendations resulting from the review of the School of Finance and Management at SOAS.

AB is asked to approve the recommendation.

Executive Summary

This paper outlines three options for the future of SFM based on the recommendations of a task force-CDR report, SFM's sustainability plan and SFM's response to the CDR report. I would strongly advocate for recommendations 1 and 3.

Sponsor: Steve Hopgood

Recommendations & Next Steps

Recommendation: Set up a small operational task force to take over the running of Cefims.

Recommendations regarding other next steps resulting from the review of the School of Finance and Management have been reviewed by Executive Board.

The School will also invest immediately in a stronger marketing presence for SFM in the 2018-19 recruitment cycle.

Next steps: Implementation of the decision EB makes by the Pro-Director International.

Financial Impact

With no change the risk is SFM continues to be a deficit department and can no longer continue.

A reinvigorated Cefims could provide significant new income for School at a time of great financial need.

Risks

Without change SFM continues as a deficit department making it very hard for the School to survive as an independent entity retaining our core historical strengths.

Equality implications
Any decisions about teaching, research and leadership will have potential equality implications that all HoDs regularly need to take into account.

**Consultations**

This set of proposals emerges out of months of consultations with countless people inside and even outside of SOAS.
Next steps for the School of Finance and Management (SFM)
Steve Hopgood (Pro-Director International), Jan 17, 2018.

SOAS’s Academic Strategy identified the School of Finance and Management as a priority area for SOAS moving forward. Its deficit position (low undergraduate and PGT recruitment and high non-retention rates) and the failure to generate a significant surplus as the most successful finance and management departments and business schools do, led to the initiation of a task force that evolved into a Comprehensive Departmental Review and report, published with recommendations, in October/November 2018. A sustainability plan was produced by the department in January 2019 and the department also produced a detailed response to the CDR on Jan 16, 2018 (‘SFM CDR response’). At a meeting of the Board’s Resources and Planning Committee on January 8, 2019, SFM’s sustainability plan was rejected on the basis that it did not present a plausible route to viability. Prior to this, Academic Board on December 12th had discussed the CDR report and concluded that SFM was in effect in ‘special measures.’

The SFM CDR response of Jan 16, 2019 is detailed and comprehensive. The department is to be commended for its serious engagement with both the recommendations of the task force/CDR and the sustainability planning process. Despite this, I retain serious doubts about the longer-term ability of SFM to turn around its on-campus recruitment figures and improve its non-retention rates (the SFM non-retention rate for UK-EU students for 2017-18 is an extraordinary 29.6%).

It is clear in all these reviews that one part of SFM has continued viability, the Centre for Financial and Management Studies (Cefims), although applications to Cefims have fallen recently. SFM’s CDR response addresses Cefims in detail and whatever changes are instituted, Cefims must be protected and nurtured. There will be differences of opinion on how best to do this.

A second key consideration is the provision of teaching in Singapore as part of our partnership with the Ngee Ann Academy. Continuity of provision of key SFM modules over the next 2-3 years must be maintained. Finally, continuity of provision for campus modules must be maintained in the short to medium term in order to comply with our CMA obligations and to reassure existing students their modules and programmes will be taught to completion. There is also some evidence of an upturn in applications for SFM’s BSc in Accounting and Finance and while we have no data on conversion, especially as the BSc as yet lacks formal accreditation, this programme needs careful oversight.

The SFM CDR response accepts that ‘Making our vision a reality will require a substantial culture change in SFM.’

I recommend to immediately insert a small operational task force of staff external to the department to work on a) reducing Cefims cost base and simplifying its delivery model, b) modernising its delivery method away from the sending out of hard copies of material towards a wholly online model except where the unavailability of e-books makes it
impossible (the SFM CDR response does accept the need for this long overdue change) and
c) working on expanding the market for Cefims.
SOAS Review of Languages

The paper presents the report of the Review of Languages and the associated Action Plan.

AB is asked to approve the Report and Action Plan

Executive Summary

The review recommends that:

The overall aim of improved language teaching at SOAS has to be to 1) increase student satisfaction, 2) increase attainment for all students, and 3) achieve broad financial sustainability. It is essential to take into account student expectations and backgrounds, and to make students the centre of all programme design and implementation. The overall success of language programmes lies in the positive outcomes for all students.

25 detailed recommendations and actions are proposed to achieve this aim.

Recommendations & Next Steps

25 detailed recommendations and actions are included in the report. The Action Plan provides details of lead responsibilities, timelines and priorities of actions.

A Steering Group should be formed to oversee progress of the actions and report regularly to AB. The Steering Group should be led by the Associate Director Languages (see Recommendation 3).

Financial Impact

Staffing costs for proposed AD Languages.
Costs for additional time of language teachers for development and innovation.
Increased revenue through reduced attrition and indirectly through higher student satisfaction and reputational gain.

Risks

Poor results of language activities, with consequent financial risks for relevant departments.
### Equality implications

None.

### Consultations

- Review panel
- EB
1. Background
In June 2018, the SOAS Academic Strategy Board, which had been formed by the School’s Executive Board, published its paper on the ‘SOAS Academic Strategy’, in which a number of proposals about the future direction of the School were made.

The paper also addressed languages and noted several areas of concern – including attainment, retention, and financial sustainability – and proposed, with reference to the SOAS Languages Strategy produced in February 2018, a review of SOAS’s provision in the major languages Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean, to involve external members, and to be completed by November 2018.

The review would consider how the learning and teaching, delivery and pedagogy of these languages might be transformed in line with the findings of the Languages Strategy report, in order to make their content and style of delivery more attractive to students and to support better student progression.

The current document is the report of the review and presents its findings and recommendations.

1.1 Remit of the review
The strategic review of languages had the following remit:

1. To undertake a full review of the pedagogical success and financial performance of SOAS’s degree-level language teaching activities and to review the School’s position and strategic approach to languages, focusing in particular on high-recruiting languages (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean)
2. To review the School’s approach to pedagogy and practices in language learning, in comparison with curricula offered at comparable departments elsewhere, and to recommend changes on the basis of stimulating student demand and increase student success, retention and progression.
3. To compare the financial performance of SOAS’s degree-level language teaching activities with comparable departments in the fields of modern languages or language-based area studies in the UK
4. To identify future trends and developments in modern languages in the wider HEI and employment contexts, and to suggest ways to address them
5. To identify impediments to the realisation of a more financially and pedagogically successful performance of SOAS’s degree-level language teaching activities
6. To review the School’s position and strategic approach to study abroad periods
7. To review the School’s position and strategic approach to the use of ICT and social media, as well as on-line and blended learning with respect of languages
1.2 Members of the review panel
The Review Panel consisted of the following members:

1. Professor Lutz Marten (Chair)
2. Professor Deborah Johnston, Pro-Director (Teaching and Learning)
3. Dr Nathan Hill, Head of Department of the School of East Asian Languages and Cultures
4. Dr Ben Murtagh, Head of Department of the School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics
5. Sir Martin Harris, Vice Chair for the Board of Trustees
6. Eva Peters/Richard Appleby/Nadja Abia, QA team
7. Dr Angela Gallagher-Brett, LTD team
8. Susan Clucas, Planning
9. David Derrick, Finance
10. Hitoshi Shiraki, member of staff involved in teaching languages (EALC)
11. Nada Elzeer, member of staff involved in teaching languages (LCL)
12. Richard Beet, project officer to act as secretary and support to the task force
13. Nadja Abia, Curriculum and Regulations Officer.
14. Professor Paul Rowlett, external member
15. Dr Clare Wright (University of Leeds), external member
16. Professor El Mustapha Lahlali (University of Leeds), external member

The Group met on 15 August 2018, 17 October 2018, and 28 November 2018. At the 17 October meeting, the panel met with a student from LCL (unfortunately no arrangements could be made for meeting a student from EALC).

2. Summary of work conducted
The panel’s work was based on extensive data supplied by Planning and Finance and by Marketing and Recruitment, on published SOAS strategies, as well as on departmental self-assessment documents, and on the feedback and contributions to panel discussion provided by SOAS members of the panel.

The panel conducted a STEEPLE analysis (taking into account Sociological, Technological, Economic, Ecological, Political, Legislative, and Environmental factors) and a word cloud exercise based on a SWOT analysis, and used these to discuss a number of issues relating to languages in the wider UK context and at SOAS. The discussion focused on the external environment, the position of SOAS within this, study abroad, pedagogy, the financial performance, the use of technology, and staffing.

2.1 The wider environment
The panel discussed a number of contextual factors and wider trends in higher education, and specifically with respect to languages.
The panel noted that language departments across the UK HE landscape are facing a number of challenges, and that discussions about change and sustainability are taking place in many HE institutions.

Student numbers in languages have declined from 2012/13 to 2016/17 (the most recent HESA data\(^1\)), from 124,190 to 107,040 across all levels of study, and from 91,330 to 81,025 for UG students only. For comparison, the number of UG students across all subjects during the same period increased slightly from 1.53m to 1.6m (see Tables 1, 2 and 3). The decline in student numbers in languages runs counter to the overall trend in student numbers, and provides one element of the current challenges faced by language departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>124,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>117,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>111,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>108,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>107,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 1: Language students: All levels of study, whole UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>91,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>88,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>84,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>82,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>81,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 2: Language students: First degree students, whole UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>1,528,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>1,597,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 3: First degree students in all subjects, whole UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The panel also noted the potentially negative effect on languages of any reduction in student fees (without any mitigating increase in HE funding). A reduction of UG home fees to, for example, £6,500 – as might be suggested by the forthcoming review of post-18 education chaired by Philip Augar – would not only increase the pressure on language programmes, but also would undermine the School’s ability to generate enough revenue to cross-subsidise strategically important and vulnerable languages (as it currently the case, cf. below).

There are also risks associated with Brexit, including a further decrease in the uptake of languages, a reduction in students from the EU (who would presumably have to pay overseas fees, and pay them up-front, without access to standard student financial support), negative effects in staff mobility and recruitment, and potentially negative effects on research collaboration and funding. More generally, the perception of a challenging environment for international students will also have an impact on SOAS finances generally, and then on the ability to cross-subsidise, as SOAS has a high proportion of international students in many departments. On the other hand, a potential increase in public and government interest in geographic areas beyond Europe may create new opportunities for SOAS.

2.2 SOAS position
The panel noted the recently adopted SOAS Languages Strategy and how the work of the Review related to it.

It noted the unique offering provided by SOAS, and the high degree of specialism. SOAS’s strengths included the brand recognition and the School’s Central London location, as well as the relevance of SOAS regions to global dynamics, trends, and challenges.

The panel also noted the institution’s commitment to supporting languages, and the on-going cross-subsidy of strategically important and vulnerable languages (SILs) (that is, all languages taught at SOAS except for Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean) of currently app. £1.6m p.a. However, it was also noted that SILs were outside of the remit of the current review.

The panel also noted the activities of the Language Centre, but confirmed that the Language Centre was outside of the scope of the review except in cases where there was a direct effect on degree language teaching.

The panel found that despite clear areas of strength and achievement, there were also areas where improvement was needed. These had been identified in the recent Languages Strategy document and a recent report on student progression in languages submitted to Academic Development Committee which had been made available to the panel. The panel also had sight of further evidence from financial, planning and comparator data, as well as from interviews and discussion with SOAS academic, teaching and professional staff as well as students.

Challenges noted by the panel – discussed in further detail below – included problems with student progression and success, a disproportionate focus on well-performing students to the detriment of the whole cohort, approaches to pedagogy for example with respect to practical, communicative competence, programme governance and oversight, and financial sustainability.

2.3 Pedagogy and programme issues
The panel noted a long tradition of very good performance of a subset of SOAS language students, but expressed concerns about performance across all students. It noted high dropout and failure rates, and an overall trend of student migration out of languages programmes.

While the panel was aware of the particular nature of language learning, and of the fact that progression and retention in language classes could not always be compared directly with non-languages classes,² the panel agreed that student success at SOAS could be better supported through changes in programme design and delivery.

The panel noted that programme and module aims and learning outcomes have to be clearly related to the learner cohorts the programme or module intends to address. This requires a good understanding of learners’ backgrounds and expectations, and of the levels of attainment different programmes and modules aim to achieve.

In terms of governance, oversight, and management, the panel felt that there was some lack of clarity in the roles of language convenors and programme convenors. Furthermore, a high number of students took a language module as an open option, and so outside of the oversight of the programme convenor of the language degree. It was noted that there was some need for providing more transparent and clearly structured programme oversight, with a clear understanding of responsibility of staff.

There was a feeling that at least in some programmes and modules, there was excessive emphasis on classical language and traditional grammar learning and insufficient attention to communicative approaches and contemporary spoken language. This was particularly important for the ‘open’ language options, where the gap between student expectations and provisions was likely to be large.

The panel also noted that textbooks and teaching materials were not always tailored to the relevant programme and module outcomes and sometimes reflected an overly conservative approach to language learning. For example, the same textbook was used for a three-unit beginners module and a one-unit beginners module, with the latter group only covering the first third of the textbook.

The panel also heard that in some language modules many students experience the pace and intensity of the class as too fast, and that some decided to work with a private tutor outside of class.

Relatively poor employability outcomes were also having an impact, both directly through the concerns that might be raised for applicants (who are often strongly focused on subsequent employment opportunities) and indirectly through the impact on league tables and on the TEF award.

2.4 Financial performance

The group considered detailed module level data of a range of sample modules, including financial models of the same module with different assumptions about contact hours and group sizes. Based on data and modelling provided by Finance and the Pro-Director Learning and Teaching, the panel noted a number of key points of analysis of the financial performance of the four languages under review. These included the following points.

- All first-year programme provision has low student numbers per teaching hour. There is some variation across languages, and the analysis raises questions about the difference in intensity of teaching and teaching credit across different languages – with a clear differentiation between, for example, Korean and Chinese.
- Open option modules are more cost-effective forms of provision than other forms of language acquisition. Interestingly Japanese is the most cost-effective provision (compared to its other language provision).
- The cost of first year language acquisition to that of later years differs between different languages, and there is not a clear pattern. While in some languages, the returns from teaching are similar across each year, for other languages returns decline or improve. This raises questions about the different approaches that each language uses as language capability rises, and the possibility to learn lessons and share models.
- Non-language acquisition (i.e. thematic, discipline) modules tend to have a higher students/per timetabled hours ratio, and this can be seen to have a positive impact on the outcomes for department. However, the relative figures are low compared to other parts of the School.

Overall, the financial model showed that there is considerable variation in terms of student numbers per teaching hour, and consequent financial performance, both within and across the four different languages.

The fanning out of levels of provision was a cross-cutting issue that emerged, and one that appeared to drive financial sustainability outcomes. For example, there were several kinds of divergence in SOAS language provision that meant that students were often taught in small groups. First, some learners come with relatively strong knowledge of a language while others will be ab initio. Second, some students naturally make faster progress than others through a language. Third, the experience of diverse year abroad offerings can also lead to heterogeneity in student ability.

In the comparator institutions, there were conscious attempts to keep cohort sizes large and to manage language attainment so that cohorts were less likely to be split into small groupings. The panel heard of examples of strong management of year abroad settings to ensure homogenous experiences across a language, decisions to provide strongly learner-based, independent final year language acquisition, and the slowing of pace in early year language provision to ensure that provision met the needs of most students (rather than splitting students into skill-related cohorts).
The panel noted that high drop-out and failure rates also have negative financial consequences—e.g. high drop-out rates entail loss of fee income of students who are leaving, and high failure rates (which are now published School-wide) deter students who are considering taking a language as an open option.

While the data show that the situation is often complex, the panel noted that there are four main parameters driving the financial character of modules—class sizes, teaching/contact hours, staff costs, and credit value—and that these provide some basis for planning. However, despite having access to some financial data, the panel noted the absence of a transparent financial planning tool which would help departments making strategic decisions about their financial performance.

The panel noted the opportunity for exchange and spread of best practice across different languages, and the lack of clear and wide-spread understanding among staff of financial aspects of teaching provision. There was some discussion of the potential pedagogic advantages of larger tutorial groups (e.g. in terms of group work and engendering discussion), as well as of the opportunity for more innovative group teaching provided by the new Languages Room on the Brunei Gallery ground floor. The panel also noted opportunities provided by blended and on-line learning.

2.5 Study abroad

The panel discussed in some detail arrangements for study abroad. There was agreement that study abroad constitutes an extremely valuable aspect of language learning, and had a key role to play not only for students’ progression in terms of language competence, but also for wider life-readiness skills.

The panel noted that currently only UG students on 4-year degrees (as well as students on 2-year MA degrees) have the opportunity to study abroad. However, the panel also noted recent plans to introduce shorter periods of study abroad which could also be made available in 3-year UG degrees.

The panel heard that in most 4-year UG programmes the year abroad takes place in year 3, although in Chinese and Korean, the year abroad takes place in year 2. It was noted that the choice of different years is influenced by and related to a range of factors. An earlier year abroad allows students to use their language skills earlier and so might add to their motivation and sense of achievement. It also means that language courses in subsequent years can be less intensive and can focus more on language use as students already have a high level of competence. On the other hand, having the year abroad in year 3 means that there are larger cohorts in years 1 and 2, before students in 3-year programmes and 4-year programmes are split.

There was also some difference between the year abroad arrangements for different languages, e.g. in terms of whether students were placed at a university or at a language school, the number of year abroad locations and partners, and the extent to which curriculum
and delivery during the year abroad was developed in conjunction between SOAS and the year abroad partners.

Another area of discussion was the costs of the study abroad period, where the panel noted that there were differences between different language programmes, and that the question had recently been discussed in the School, although the problem had not been resolved.

It was felt that ultimately the timing and organisation of the year abroad need to flow from the programme aims, but that it was unlikely that there was one ideal solution which fitted all programmes equally well.

2.6 Use of technology
The panel also noted advances in technology, both in HE activities in general, and specifically related to languages – including blended and on-line learning, virtual and skype language learning, and automatic translation. These developments contribute to a significant change in the operation of universities. They present both opportunities and challenges which need to be understood and addressed at strategic institutional level as well as with respect to practices in learning and teaching and student experience.

The panel noted that technological innovation provided many opportunities for language learning and teaching and that there was scope for increased use of online and blended learning.

The panel noted that materials for online and blended learning of Arabic had recently been developed, and that there were plans to extend the material to cover other languages.

However, the panel also noted reluctance among some teaching staff to engage with technology for language learning.

2.7 People and staffing
The panel noted that a high number of language teaching staff were employed on part-time contracts, and that it was particularly important to ensure that this staff group was included in any strategic planning, and in any activities aimed at building a community of language teachers at SOAS.

The panel also noted that language teaching staff often had a high number of contact hours, and made a strong contribution to administration of language programmes and to pastoral care. This sometimes led to a lack of opportunity for professional development and curriculum innovation.

3. Recommendations
Based on the investigation and discussion of different aspects of SOAS’s language provision in Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean, the panel made a number of recommendations. The panel proposed that the overall aim of language teaching at SOAS should be the following.

The overall aim of improved language teaching at SOAS has to be to 1) increase student satisfaction, 2) increase attainment for all students, and 3) achieve broad financial sustainability. It is essential to take into account student expectations and backgrounds, and to make students the centre of all programme design and implementation. The overall success of language programmes lies in the positive outcomes for all students.

Against this background of the overall aim, the panel made a number of more specific recommendations. These are loosely grouped into the following areas: Financial Sustainability, Oversight, Student Experience, Learning and Assessment, Academic Development, and Communication, Collaboration, and Connectedness, as well as recommendations referring specifically to one of the four languages under review.

The recommendations are related to relevant actions to implement the recommendations. Some of these actions can be taken immediately, and can lead to changes in the short term, while others require more careful planning and can only be implemented in the intermediate future. A separate Action Plan will be developed identifying main responsibilities and timelines.

**Financial sustainability**

**R1** All activities need to relate to the financial sustainability of the academic units in which they take place. While it is acknowledged that some modules do not cover their costs, financial sustainability needs to be achieved across all modules of a given language and ultimately by each of the two departments teaching languages.

**R2** Financial sustainability needs to be accepted and understood by all staff as the central overriding strategic aim, and essential precondition, of our work in language provision and scholarship.

**Action** The costs of different language modules need to be carefully considered individually and for each language. This includes the fanning out of levels, contact hours, class sizes in lectures and tutorials, consolidation of small modules, review of year abroad, etc.

**Action** Best practice should be shared between the four languages and successful models (e.g. in terms of student per teaching hour, assessment, use of ICT) should be adopted more widely.
Action Departments need to be provided with transparent planning tools which allow them to make informed strategic decisions about their financial performance.

Action Relevant office holders, including programme leaders, need to share responsibility for financial sustainability.

Action Programmes should be built around fewer modules with larger student numbers. Academically important smaller modules could be run in alternate years to increase student uptake.

**Oversight**

R3 The School should appoint an Assistant Director for Languages (ADL), with overall responsibility for, among others, overseeing the implementation of the recommendations of this review, bringing about cultural change, improving financial performance, working with academic and professional service departments across the School, contributing to the improvement of the School’s TEF ranking and league table position, and representing the School at outside bodies and subject organisations.

Action Appointment of an ADL

R4 The ownership of language modules and degree programmes in which they are embedded needs to be clarified, especially beyond single honours language degrees, to develop a clear line of accountability and responsibility for quality. There needs to be specifically clear oversight of the ‘open’ modules that are not nested within programmes.

Action Responsibility for and clear points of contact for students to be developed especially for the many students who take language modules as open options.

Action Clarification of the relation between the programme convenor and the language convenor, and development of relevant role descriptions.

R5 Programme convenors (or ‘leaders’) need to take an active role in strategic oversight, quality assurance, and financial sustainability.

Action Replacement of the title ‘programme convenor’ by ‘programme leader’ and development and provision of appropriate training.

**Student Experience**

R6 School-wide marking guidelines for languages should be developed, based on or with reference to the CEFR model, with each language relating to it as
appropriate. These should make learning outcomes and attainment more transparent and provide students with better information for module and programme choices. They will also help to address any disparity in the approach to marking between languages and other parts of the school.

**Action**  Development of marking guidelines.

**R7** Employability and skills development should be emphasised more clearly.

**Action** Ensuring that our core teaching meets our students’ long-term needs, that they benefit from learning the most appropriate register/vocabulary etc. with the strongest employment prospects, and that they are encouraged to develop skills that help them in their career (such as report writing, group work, presentations, etc.)

**Action** SOAS Careers Service should develop a programme of workshops/support for those seeking employment using language degrees.

*Learning and assessment*

**R8** Learning outcomes of language modules and the programmes in which they are embedded need to ensure they are student-centred and support students’ different needs.

**Action** The pace and intensity of language modules should be reduced, especially in the first two weeks of term, to ensure that all students can build a strong foundation for their progression on the module.

**R9** All language modules should contain a strong communicative element. Achievement in all four aspects of language learning – speaking, listening, reading, and writing (in an appropriate variety such as Modern Standard Arabic) – is a reasonable student expectation and should be addressed at all levels.

**Action** Module and programme specifications to be revisited to ensure that there is sufficient recognition of communicative competence.

**Action** Documentation to be revisited to ensure that there is sufficient information about the level of competence achieved. This should ideally be done with reference to the descriptors and/or levels as appropriate of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), or with reference to module or programme learning outcomes.

**R10** More attention should be given to language modules serving in ‘Studies’ programmes and as open options. They should not be seen as a ‘lighter version’ or ‘poor relation’ of language-degree modules. Rather they need to
be designed and taught independently, taking into account the specific aims and backgrounds of the learners. It should be kept in mind that some students only take one or two language modules, and that each module has to provide students with meaningful, coherent learning outcomes on its own.

**Action** Revision of ‘Studies’ and open option modules.

**Action** Study Abroad periods (not necessarily for a whole year) should be made available also in ‘Studies’ programmes.

**R11** More room should be given to pedagogic innovation, student centred learning, peer-group and student mentoring schemes, and the use of ICT in language learning, as well as to innovative forms of assessment.

**Action** Innovative teaching models of large group teaching with teaching teams of module leaders and assistants should be trialled, allowing for the maximum size of tutorials should be increased. Use of ICT should be increased. More diverse assessment methods should be developed.

**Academic Development**

**R12** The School should strive to develop more visible leadership in the pedagogy of African and Asian languages and identify strategic ways to make a much stronger impact in this field.

**Action** Development and enhancement of SOAS’s academic visibility and innovation through e.g. teacher training, material development and international collaboration. For Chinese, this development can draw on the support provided by the London Confucius Institute.

**Action** Online and blended learning for African and Asian languages should be developed further. Activity in this area could be focused and coordinated at a strategic level to make a much wider impact within and beyond SOAS.

**Action** Development of translation and translation studies of African and Asian languages, building in the current MA in Translation and the work of the Centre for Translation Studies.

**R13** Language teachers should be given more opportunity to actively contribute to module and programme enhancement and update, and to develop new pedagogical initiatives. This might entail fewer contact hours and a scholarship-route career path.
Action Develop role description and workloads for language teacher to allow room for contribution to innovation and development.

Action Provide more professional development and training opportunities for language teachers.

*Communication, collaboration, and connectedness*

R14 SOAS’s expertise and experience in language learning should be shared more widely nationally and internationally

Action Higher participation in relevant professional and subject organisations such as the University Council for Modern Languages (UCML), Advance HE or the Routes into Languages (RiL) partnership.

R15 More and better information should be made available to prospective students about SOAS’s language offers

Action: The two departments to work with Careers to identify and articulate employment skills - both generic and specific to languages - developed by students taking language programmes. This could be made with reference to relevant QAA benchmark statements, and maybe involve an advisory group of alumni.

Action: Communicating these skills via programme objectives / outcomes in the programme specifications and working with Marketing to increase the attractiveness of the programme to prospective students, in addition to communicating this with employers.

R16 The School should develop a more integrative and cohesive community of scholars concerned with language study and language pedagogy. Exchange between different languages, and between pedagogical theory and pedagogical practice, would enrich the language learning environment and staff access to critical reflection and professional development.

Action Development of activities and incentives for exchange and collaboration between language teachers.

Action Organisation of a workshop about language assessment and marking criteria, addressing questions such as what types of assessment there are, models of in-class, continuous, course work assessment (cf. the recently run Assessment Labs series), and drawing on experience in other universities.
Arabic

R17 More attention should be paid to heritage speakers and their specific background and aspirations.

R18 The links between Standard Arabic and employability should be considered, and the employability prospects of the students should be enhanced.

R19 The divergence of experience between different year abroad options needs to be reduced.

Action Ensure that our core teaching meets our students’ long-term needs, that they benefit from learning dialect(s) during their year abroad. Further, that students are encouraged to develop skills that help them in their career (such as report writing, group work, presentations etc).

Action The possibility to offer different learning activities or module offerings with specific learning outcomes (e.g. different open option modules) for heritage speakers should be explored.

Chinese

R20 Classical Chinese should remain a key element of studying Chinese at SOAS. However, the Department should acknowledge a variety of legitimate student profiles wanting to intensively study Chinese, without necessarily wishing to study Classical Chinese.

Action Classical Chinese should thus be optional in the BA Chinese programme (which then might have to change its name), and one introductory module should be developed, requiring knowledge of 500 characters.

Action Also scope should be explored to reduce contact hours and options available in Classical Chinese to provide a more focussed offering.

R21 The EALC department should explore the possibility to offer more Year Abroad locations to increase student choice and student experience. These might include locations such as Shanghai, Kunming, or Taiwan.

R22 A Chinese strand of the 2-year MA Intensive Language programme should be developed, irrespective of other PG offers in Chinese.

Action Explore extension of YA location and development of 2-year MA

Japanese
R23 The year abroad arrangements for Japanese should be revisited to ensure that they are pedagogically, administratively and financially fit for purpose. This might include moving the year abroad to Year 2.

R24 Small group teaching and the fanning out of levels should be reconsidered.

Action Explore YA arrangements and small group teaching

Language Centre

R25 The Language Centre needs to focus on the core elements of its mission statement: It is outwards facing and will make a contribution to the School's sustainability. This means that the LC will not cater for degree students and so will not be part of Open Days and other events aimed at degree students. There needs to be a clear and well communicated division between the work of academic departments (academic and communicative language learning for a wide range of degree students) and the LC (communicative and bespoke language learning for a wide range of learners from the public, communities, government and business).

Action Ensure that Language Centre is aligned with SOAS strategies
### Financial Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec’ion</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>How important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>All activities need to relate to the financial sustainability of the academic units in which they take place. While it is acknowledged that some modules do not cover their costs, financial sustainability needs to be achieved across all modules of a given language and ultimately by each of the two departments teaching languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Financial sustainability needs to be accepted and understood by all staff as the central overriding strategic aim, and essential precondition, of our work in language provision and scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2A1</td>
<td>The costs of different language modules need to be carefully considered individually and for each language. This includes the fanning out of levels, contact hours, class sizes in lectures and tutorials, consolidation of small modules, review of year abroad, etc.</td>
<td>ADL, HoDs, Finance, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2A2</td>
<td>Best practice should be shared between the four languages and successful models (e.g. in terms of student per teaching hour, assessment, use of ICT) should be adopted more widely.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2A3</td>
<td>Departments need to be provided with transparent planning tools which allow them to make informed strategic decisions about their financial performance.</td>
<td>HoDs, Finance</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2A4</td>
<td>Relevant office holders, including programme leaders, need to share responsibility for financial sustainability.</td>
<td>Programme Leaders</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2A5</td>
<td>Programmes should be built around fewer modules with larger student numbers. Academically important smaller modules could be run in alternate years to increase student uptake.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders, LTD</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oversight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec’ion</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>How important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>The School should appoint an Assistant Director for Languages (ADL), with overall responsibility for, among others, overseeing the implementation of the recommendations of this review, bringing about cultural change, improving financial performance, working with academic and professional service departments across the School, contributing to the improvement of the School’s TEF ranking and league table position, and representing the School at outside bodies and subject organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3A1</td>
<td>Appointment of AD Languages</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learning and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec’ion</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>How important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>The ownership of language modules and degree programmes in which they are embedded needs to be clarified, especially beyond single honours language degrees, to develop a clear line of accountability and responsibility for quality. There needs to be specifically clear oversight of the ‘open’ modules that are not nested within programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4A1</td>
<td>Responsibility for and clear points of contact for students to be developed especially for the many students who take language modules as open options.</td>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4A2</td>
<td>Clarification of the relation between the programme convenor and the language convenor, and development of relevant role descriptions.</td>
<td>ADL, HR</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Programme convenors (or ‘leaders’) need to take an active role in strategic oversight, quality assurance, and financial sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5A1</td>
<td>Replacement of the title ‘programme convenor’ by ‘programme leader’ and development and provision of appropriate training.</td>
<td>ADL, HR, Staff Development</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec’ion</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
<th>How important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>School-wide marking guidelines for languages should be developed, based on or with reference to the CEFR model, with each language relating to it as appropriate. These should make learning outcomes and attainment more transparent and provide students with better information for module and programme choices. They will also help to address any disparity in the approach to marking between languages and other parts of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6A1</td>
<td>Development of marking guidelines</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Employability and skills development should be emphasised more clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7A1</td>
<td>Ensuring that our core teaching meets our students’ long-term needs, that they benefit from learning the most appropriate dialect/register/vocabulary etc. with the strongest employment prospects, and that they are encouraged to develop skills that help them in their career (such as report writing, group work, presentations, etc.).</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders, Careers</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7A2</td>
<td>SOAS Careers Service should develop a programme of workshops/support for those seeking employment using language degrees.</td>
<td>ADL, Careers</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8A1</td>
<td>The pace and intensity of language modules should be reduced, especially in the first two weeks of term, to ensure that all students can build a strong foundation for their progression on the module</td>
<td>Programme leaders, HoDs</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>All language modules should contain a strong communicative element. Achievement in all four aspects of language learning – speaking, listening, reading, and writing – is a reasonable student expectation and should be addressed at all levels</td>
<td>Programme leaders, HoDs</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9A1</td>
<td>Module and programme specifications to be revisited to ensure that there is sufficient recognition of communicative competence</td>
<td>Programme leaders, HoDs</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9A2</td>
<td>Documentation to be revisited to ensure that there is sufficient information about the level of competence achieved. This should ideally be done with reference to the descriptors and/or levels as appropriate of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), or with reference to module or programme learning outcomes.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>More attention should be given to language modules serving in ‘Studies’ programmes and as open options. They should not be seen as a ‘lighter version’ or ‘poor relation’ of language-degree modules. Rather they need to be designed and taught independently, taking into account the specific aims and backgrounds of the learners. It should be kept in mind that some students only take one or two language modules, and that each module has to provide students with meaningful, coherent learning outcomes on its own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10A1</td>
<td>Revision of ‘Studies’ and open option modules</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10A2</td>
<td>Study Abroad periods (not necessarily for a whole year) should be made available also in ‘Studies’ programmes</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>More room should be given to pedagogic innovation, student centred learning, peer-group and student mentoring schemes, and the use of ICT in language learning, as well as to innovative forms of assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11A1</td>
<td>Innovative teaching models of large group teaching with teaching teams of module leaders and assistants should be trialled, allowing for the maximum size of tutorials should be increased. Use of ICT should be increased. More diverse assessment methods should be developed.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>The School should strive to develop more visible leadership in the pedagogy of African and Asian languages and identify strategic ways to make a much stronger impact in this field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12A1</td>
<td>Development and enhancement of SOAS’s academic visibility and innovation through e.g. teacher training, material development and international collaboration. For Chinese, this development can draw on the support provided by the London Confucius Institute. Re-launch of the MA Applied Linguistics.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12A2</td>
<td>Online and blended learning for African and Asian languages should be developed further. Activity in this area could be focused and coordinated at a strategic level to make a much wider impact within and beyond SOAS.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders, Academic Lead On-line Learning</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12A3</td>
<td>Development of translation and translation studies of African and Asian languages, building in the current MA in Translation and the work of the Centre for Translation Studies.</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders, Chair CTS</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>Language teachers should be given more opportunity to actively contribute to module and programme enhancement and update, and to develop new pedagogical initiatives. This might entail fewer contact hours and a scholarship-route career path.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13A1</td>
<td>Develop role description and workloads for language teacher to allow room for contribution to innovation and development</td>
<td>ADL, HoDs, HR</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13A2</td>
<td>Advance more professional development and training opportunities for language teachers.</td>
<td>ADL, Staff Development</td>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication, collaboration, and connectedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>SOAS’s expertise and experience in language learning should be shared more widely nationally and internationally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14A1</td>
<td>Higher participation in relevant professional and subject organisations such as the University Council for Modern Languages (UCML), Advance HE or the Routes into Languages (RIL) partnership.</td>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>More and better information should be made available to prospective students about SOAS’s language offers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15A1</td>
<td>The two departments to work with Careers to identify and articulate employment skills - both generic and specific to languages - developed by students taking language programmes. This could be made with reference to relevant QAA benchmark statements, and maybe involve an advisory group of alumni.</td>
<td>ADL, Student Recruitment, DAEE</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15A2</td>
<td>Communicating these skills via programme objectives / outcomes in the programme specifications and working with Marketing to increase the attractiveness of the programme to prospective students, in addition to communicating this with employers.</td>
<td>ADL, Student Recruitment, DAEE</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>The School should develop a more integrative and cohesive community of scholars concerned with language study and language pedagogy. Exchange between different languages, and between pedagogical theory and pedagogical practice, would enrich the language learning environment and staff access to critical reflection and professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16A1</td>
<td>Development of activities and incentives for exchange and collaboration between language teachers.</td>
<td>ADL, HoDs, Staff Development</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16A2</td>
<td>Organisation of a workshop about language assessment and marking criteria, addressing questions such as what types of assessment there are, models of in-class, continuous, course work assessment (cf. the recently run Assessment Labs series), and drawing on experience in other universities.</td>
<td>ADL, Staff Development</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>More attention should be paid to heritage speakers and their specific background and aspirations.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>The links between Standard Arabic and employability should be considered, and the employability prospects of the students should be enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>The divergence of experience between different year abroad options needs to be reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19A2</td>
<td>Action Ensure that our core teaching meets our students' long-term needs, that they benefit from learning dialect(s) during their year abroad. Further, that students are encouraged to develop skills that help them in their career (such as report writing, group work, presentations etc).</td>
<td>ADL, Programme Leaders</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19A1</td>
<td>The possibility to offer different learning activities or module offerings with specific learning outcomes (e.g. different open option modules) for heritage speakers should be explored.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Classical Chinese should remain a key element of studying Chinese at SOAS. However, the Department should acknowledge a variety of legitimate student profiles wanting to intensively study Chinese, without necessarily wishing to study Classical Chinese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20A1</td>
<td>Classical Chinese should thus be optional in the BA Chinese programme (which then might have to change its name), and one introductory module should be developed, requiring knowledge of 500 characters.</td>
<td>ADL, EALC Department</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20A2</td>
<td>Also scope should be explored to reduce contact hours and options available in Classical Chinese to provide a more focussed offering.</td>
<td>ADL, EALC Department</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>The EALC department should explore the possibility to offer more Year Abroad locations to increase student choice and student experience. These might include locations such as Shanghai, Kunming, or Taiwan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22</td>
<td>A Chinese strand of the 2-year MA Intensive Language programme should be developed, irrespective of other PG offers in Chinese.</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22A1</td>
<td>Explore extension of YA location and development of 2-year MA</td>
<td>ADL, EALC Department</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23</td>
<td>The year abroad arrangements for Japanese should be revisited to ensure that they are pedagogically, administratively and financially fit for purpose. This might include moving the year abroad to Year 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24</td>
<td>Small group teaching and the fanning out of levels should be reconsidered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24A1</td>
<td>Explore YA arrangements and small group teaching</td>
<td>ADL, EALC Department</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>The Language Centre needs to focus on the core elements of its mission statement: It is outwards facing and will make a contribution to the School’s sustainability. This means that the LC will not cater for degree students and so will not be part of Open Days and other events aimed at degree students. There needs to be a clear and well communicated division between the work of academic departments (academic and communicative language learning for a wide range of degree students) and the LC (communicative and bespoke language learning for a wide range of learners from the public, communities, government and business).</td>
<td>Language Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25A1</td>
<td>Ensure that Language Centre is aligned with SOAS strategies</td>
<td>ADL, Head of Language Centre</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The options for Hebrew Year Abroad provision

AB is asked to consider the following Report

Executive Summary
ADC requested that the matter of Hebrew Year Abroad be referred to Academic Board for discussion. The Hebrew programme was asked to examine alternatives to the current arrangements with the Hebrew University. This document surveys the options for Year Abroad providers in Israel for the BA degrees in Hebrew and NME Studies. SOAS sends a small number of students each year to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Potential Hebrew schools were contacted by email and phone to ascertain the level of language provision and assistance they provide for students.

Sponsored by Ben Murtagh

Recommendations & Next Steps
The paper outlines a number of options based on teaching suitability, pastoral care and cost while noting political concerns. The Hebrew section recommends that we continue with the Hebrew University programme based on the suitability of the programme for our students and the degree of pastoral care offered. The best alternative to this is this Kibbutz Ulpan, there will be challenges in agreeing a programme that fits our students needs but there will be cost benefits. We have not yet visited Kibbutz Ulpan and if advised to seek an agreement with this provider a site visit would be necessary. The other non-university providers are seen as unsuitable for reasons explained in the paper. Academic Board should make a recommendation as to which provider the Hebrew programme should work with for future Hebrew Year Abroad provision.

Financial Impact
The Hebrew University Programme costs $12,235 for a full year and $8,275 for half a year. Other university providers have a similar cost.

Kibbutz Ulpan costs $1500 for half a year and $3000 for a full year.

£750 has been budgeted (from SLCL) for any necessary visits to sites if directed to establish a relationship with a new provider.

Risks
As with any Year Abroad programme the provision of pastoral care by the local provider is
key in minimising a variety of risks that might affect student outcomes. The quality of the provision is essential in ensuring a good student learning experience. For these reasons we have focussed on these factors in assessing the suitability of potential providers. To choose a non-university provider other than Kibbutz Ulpan would increase risks in these two respects. In addition students there would be significant issues for students as they would be unable to apply for student visas with these providers.

**Equality implications**

*Suitable pastoral care is only offered by the Universities and the Kibbutz Ulpan. To partner with a non-university partner which does not offer pastoral care would have implications for some students with specific learning, wellbeing and support needs.*

**Consultations**

*Providers listed in the paper have been consulted.*
Survey of Year Abroad providers for the BA in Hebrew and Israeli Studies

This document surveys the options for Year Abroad providers in Israel for the BA in Hebrew and Israeli Studies. SOAS sends a small number of students each year to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. The Hebrew programme was asked to examine alternatives to the current arrangements with the Hebrew University. Potential Hebrew schools were contacted by email and phone to ascertain the level of language provision and assistance they provide for students.

The main requirements from Year Abroad providers are on aspects of tuition, quality and pastoral care. At a minimum, providers should offer intensive courses of Hebrew instruction (Ulpan) of 4-6 weeks, followed by an academic term (or two) in levels suitable for our students. Some providers offer additional classes in English on non-language topics and themes, which is an advantage. Providers should provide adequate pastoral care for SOAS students, in welcoming the students and providing support and advice on a variety of issues, such as housing, mental health etc. Providers should offer assistance in obtaining student visas which would allow students one-year visa that would cover the period of study. Providers should have track record in teaching and looking after international students.

Current provider
The Rothberg International School, The Hebrew University Jerusalem

Part of the Hebrew University, The Rothberg International School offers courses for overseas students since 1956. Currently has a student body of over 2000 students a year, from 90 countries.

Students who go to Israel for the full-year take a summer intensive Hebrew course, followed by two academic semesters, in which they have between 8-12 hours of Hebrew instruction a week alongside other courses taught in English for them to choose.

Students who do a Year Abroad between two countries come to Israel in January and do a four-week intensive Hebrew course before joining the other students for the spring semester. Students can apply for accommodation at university dorms, and receive pastoral care assistance 24/7. An emergency number is available for students at all hours.

Registration for the programme entitles students to apply for a student visa.

Cost:
Full year: $12,235
Half year: $8,275

(discounted fees to SOAS students by agreement with the Rothberg International School)

Alternative University providers offering a similar programme –
1. Ben Gurion University of the Negev
Full year tuition $12,700
Half year: $8,700

Tuition Fees for all Semester or Year-Long Programs include weekly social activities, academic field trips, trips around Israel, access to the university sports center & health insurance.
2. Tel Aviv university
Full year tuition: $12,950
Half year: $8,700

Program Trips, student activities, facility fees and health insurance are all included in the tuition fees quoted above.

3. Haifa University:
Full year tuition: $12,300
Half year: $8,400

Foreign students registered for full time education in Israeli universities can get a student visa, valid for one year.

Non university providers – different programme
The only non-University provider to meet SOAS minimum requirements, in terms of student support and pastoral care, is Kibbutz Ulpan – Ulpan Eztion Kibbutz Tzuba. This programme differs from university ones and does not easily correspond to UK academic year, and so would require special tailoring.

This programme runs for 5 months, twice a year (starting in May or October).
Students study Hebrew for 25 hours a week and work 24 hours a week, either in the kibbutz, or as interns in Jerusalem. They are not paid for their work, but are provided with free accommodation on the kibbutz, three meals a day, and there is pastoral care 24/7.
The programme is aimed at university graduates, and the same language school also trains the British diplomatic staff in Israel.
Students registered on this programme are eligible to apply for a student visa and the kibbutz movement hosting the programme can facilitate this procedure.

Cost, for a five months programme
5500 NIS (approx. $1500)

The dates for this programme do not correspond easily with our academic year. Based on a conversation with the manager, there is a possibility of making adjustments/chances, and requires further discussion. If this option is to be considered, a site visit would be required to confirm the conditions and teaching arrangement.

Other language schools in Israel - unsuitable alternatives
There are other potential Hebrew language schools in Israel, but they do not meet the requirements in terms of tuition and pastoral care.

Most Hebrew Language teaching institutions are run by the Ministry of Education/Ministry of Absorption [of immigrants] and are mainly designated for new immigrants, not foreign students.
There are some private Hebrew language teaching providers (ulpans), such as Ulpan Milah (Jerusalem), Gordon (Tel Aviv) Etzion (Raanana). These schools provide language tuition only, are not geared to provide assistance for students, and are not interested in taking such role in an arrangement with SOAS.

They normally offer between 4-5 hours of language tuition a day, 4-5 days a week (20-25 hours). Students registered for a full-time Hebrew language programme in a private ulpan cannot apply for a student visa and will need to enter Israel as tourist, with a three-months visa only.

Ulpan Milah, Jerusalem:
Three months term – four mornings a week, four hours a day
Cost: NIS3480  (about $950).

There are no facilities to offer dorms, no social activities, no health insurance nor pastoral care/support 24/7.

Similar provisions at Gordon Ulpan, Tel Aviv and Ulpan Etzion, Raanana

Political objections

The main objection raised in the case of the Hebrew University is that the campus is on occupied territory. As explained in previous document, the campus’s periphery extends into occupied territory (part of the dormitory as well as the sports centre). The main campus is not on occupied land (neither the Rothberg institute nor any other Hebrew University teaching facility). EU policy, according to the EU embassy in Israel, is to consider Mt. Scopus Campus as within the 1967 lines, that is, within “Israel proper”, and not to see the campus as located on occupied territory.

All other universities and schools referred to here are within Israel proper, the 1967 lines.

Summary

University schools for international students are the most suitable providers for Hebrew Year Abroad in Israel. Of these, the Hebrew University is in our view the best option in pedagogic terms, and its fees are comparable to other universities in Israel (similar or slightly cheaper).

Private Hebrew schools do not meet the requirements for Study Abroad providers. They do not provide any pastoral care for students, are not set up to provide such assistance, whether in terms of housing and dormitories, mental health, or any other assistance.

The most obvious problem is the issue of visa. These private schools cannot offer assistance in obtaining one year student visas, which means that students would enter the country on a three months tourist visas – shorter than their programme. This is not a viable option.

The only non-University provider which meets the requirements in terms of pastoral care is the Kibbutz Ulpan. However their programme would have to be tailored, particularly for students who do a shared year abroad to ensure they can spend sufficient time in Israel for their half Year Abroad.
This report was prepared by Dr. Tamar Drukker, Senior Lector in Hebrew, and Dr. Yair Wallach, Senior Lecturer in Israeli Studies.
SIS Review

AB is asked to note the following draft Review

Executive Summary

This review is one of the reviews commissioned by the Academic Strategy group. Its findings will contribute to the development of an academic strategy for SOAS once all the reviews are completed.

Recommendations & Next Steps

The report makes a number of administrative recommendations. Next steps include: i) a proposal to be brought together by the head of SIS that represents a response by SIS to the review and that outlines next steps; ii) circulation of the proposal from SIS to EB and AB for discussion and approval.

Financial Impact

These will depend on which, if any, recommendations are taken up. To be reviewed with the response from SIS.

Risks

The principal institutional risk identified in the report is that insufficient administrative resource is allocated to CISD for existing and new programmes to be run effectively. This is a matter of urgency, as new programmes are set to go live in the next few months.

Equality implications

None

Consultations

Survey (98 respondents, 20 from SIS); meetings with SIS staff; individual interviews; informal discussions with members of SIS; feedback on initial draft of the review from the Head of SIS and of CISD.
SIS Review

Draft v2

Preliminary Findings for Discussion

Introduction

SIS was established as an interdisciplinary hub for SOAS, bringing together four units: the Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy (CISD), the Centre for Gender Studies (CGS), the Centre for Environment, Development and Policy (CEDEP) and the Centre for Global Media and Communications.

This review was tasked with looking broadly at how SIS is serving this original purpose of fostering interdisciplinarity, and on what might be done to fulfil that purpose. A survey was designed that would provide an opportunity to gather as wide and diverse a selection of views from across the institution as possible, using a tool that would provide a filter so results could be differentiated so as to understand the perspectives of those who are members of SIS and perspectives from those from outside SIS in other parts of the School. Degrees of collaboration and proximity to SIS formed one of the questions and provided an additional filter in analysing the outcomes of the survey.

This report builds on three sources of information: the results of the survey (based on responses from 98 participants, including 20 members of SIS), a group discussion at an initial SIS departmental meeting and a further meeting to set out the findings of the review and solicit feedback, and a series of individual and small group discussions with members of units in SIS.

The review addressed questions of purpose (how do people currently conceive of SIS’ purpose, within and outside SIS? Is the purpose of SIS best expressed as facilitating interdisciplinarity in SOAS? What other purposes does and might it serve?); function (what does SIS do that’s distinctive? What else could it do?); and membership (who should be part of SIS? How are they and SIS connected with other parts of SOAS?). It sought to come up with a series of possible scenarios for discussion, with the ultimate objective of determining both how we might do more to foster interdisciplinarity at SOAS and how best to support the evolution of SIS.

SIS: Current Status and Strengths

The economic base of SIS is very strong. In the last financial year, CISD made a 27% and Media a 10% surplus: SIS as a whole made a surplus of 12%, absorbing the losses sustained by CEDEP and to some smaller extent CGS. CEDEP has achieved great success in research income generation, but makes a significant net loss of over £400k. It now has a recovery plan that includes switching to the more economically efficient distance learning model developed by CISD and teaching out the old courses, and is now on track, after sustaining a number of staff losses to VS. Global Media is doing well, with strong recruitment and a great deal of growth potential and entrepreneurship. CGS has continued to recruit quite well and sustains a modest deficit, but is financially viable and could take advantage of
current interests in gender to expand into new areas. It seems clear from an analysis of SOAS' finances that SIS in general – and CISD in particular - is one of SOAS’ most promising area for investment in order to generate the kind of surpluses that can lift SOAS’ current financial position.

SIS is a site of pedagogical innovation. CGS pioneered Reaction Papers, which enable students to develop and practice critical synthesis and review skills. CISD uses a practice-based, learner-focused pedagogy that is regarded as highly effective. There is some degree of snobbery in SOAS about the teaching methods used in SIS. I was told by one critic that students in SIS receive feedback prior to submitting their assignments so they can improve them (isn’t this good practice?), that they are taught using peer groups rather than conventional lecture-seminar methods (and that’s not a positive?) and that the students are not assessed by exams but by papers student develop on topics they choose themselves (what’s not to love?). The University of London uses CISD assessment method as a model for programmes with 50,000 students. It would have been useful if there had been more time to do some more in-depth study of SIS’ ways of working, in order to explore their pedagogic innovations and how they might be shared more widely within SOAS.

By virtue of sitting outside the disciplines and its focus on engagement and practice, SIS offers SOAS a number of advantages, according to respondents:

- It can be more academically flexible than discipline-based Schools.
- It can help to connect the different silos in which people often work at SOAS.
- The opportunities for SIS are plentiful. It can be a hub for interdisciplinary thinking in ways that the School has not yet engaged in, enterprise activities – with a view to revenue generation through CPD.
- SIS… charged with bringing innovation and excellence in interdisciplinary studies to the whole School.
- SIS may find less internal resistance in playing this coordination role than individual departments or Schools.

Any change to SIS would need to be considered very carefully and managed very well so as not to disturb the ecology of a very successful unit. SOAS should pay closer attention to what works in SIS and give this every opportunity to grow, develop and influence out into the rest of SOAS. This is especially the case in the innovative and highly financially successful online learning programmes that CISD has piloted and delivered. Hearing the frustrations of those seeking to make the most of these opportunities, hampered by a lack of resource for administrative needs and other institutional obstacles, it is important that SOAS is able to support this work in a much more meaningful way than it has to date. Specifically, it is critical that SOAS recognise the need for adequate administrative support to CISD in particular, and SIS more broadly.

With this in mind, the review raised a number of challenges. In what follows, I draw on quotes from respondents to outline some of the main issues, which include:

**Findings**
What is SIS? Identity & Purpose

The survey revealed amongst those who are *not* members of SIS a considerable level of ignorance across the institution about what SIS is and does. None of them thought SIS was working very well, and the majority held the view that it was not, with 78% responding that it was working ‘not so well’ or ‘not at all well’. Amongst these respondents from outside SIS were a number who thought the best possible future for SIS was to dissolve it and allocate its units to relevant departments.

Absorbing its members into the existing departmental structures and prevent any further fragmentation of the School as a whole, with one department cost-centre competing against another in the battle for survival.

By being dissolved or reorganised so it does not look like a bag of offcuts.

A unit without a logic to it… there is no real point to the department in my opinion other than a place to put people who did not fit in elsewhere with restructuring.

SIS does not look like a school or department at present. As an entity, it brings together very different disciplines and subject areas, some of which seem to have relatively modest connections with each other. It is not clear whether there are synergies there in terms of marketing and recruitment. Probably there is no advantage to pool together the financial performance of the four schools/centres.

Non-members highlighted their concerns about the lack of an overall narrative or clear sense of mission for SIS in its current form as a container for entirely separate units. Several respondents called for a clear vision to be articulated gave an account of why these different units were together.

Developing a narrative… that makes sense of the SIS structure

A clear vision that accounts for all activities or the transfer of activities into other areas

Students should not be given the signal that this is the School of leftovers.

Opinions were divided – including amongst members of SIS – on whether it was necessary or desirable to develop a stronger rationale and sense of common identity and purpose:

Either move towards a sense of coherence or disband. There is not much point in having a group the members of which do not want to establish a common identity.

SIS should either be totally reconfigured to make more sense academically or continue as an administrative shell with autonomous units.

If SIS was set up as an administrative fix to pool together administrative arrangements for a set of miscellaneous units, I would strongly encourage abandoning the attempt to concoct an intellectual rationale for this grouping that convinces almost nobody, and instead acknowledge it for what it is. Continue the pooling of administrative resources but stop presenting this set of units as a ‘School’. In a de facto sense, the units would operate independently of one another without a
false coherence being foisted on them from above, while still sharing admin personnel.

For others, including members of SIS, the idea of SIS as a container for separate units who were able to pursue their own agenda was less of a problem than a strength:

Autonomous centres that thrive, no waste of time with intra-SIS cooperations, joint programmes or even staff meetings.

It could provide an institutional space in which centres that are too small to be departments can function autonomously.

Ultimately, it would benefit SIS to take a more proactive approach to defining the identity, vision and purpose of SIS – either deciding to remain a container, in which case it might be expanded to contain other units, or to have a more explicit focus such as on engagement. One respondent summed it up:

Its role needs to be decided. If it’s a holding place, then why not move institutes and centres into it. So it becomes a way of providing admin and financial support and monitoring for non-disciplinary departments. As a site for ‘interdisciplinary’ study and research, I don’t really see the rationale: what about other departments which are also interdisciplinary and perhaps more so in a meaningful way? If it is trying to do something different, have a global face to raise profile, I wonder if something along the lines of UCL’s Global Prosperity Institute would work: much smaller, but a global reputation. This could also be the site for a more explicit policy engagement focus, and draw on membership from across other departments.

**An Interdisciplinary Hub for SOAS?**

There was little unanimity amongst respondents about whether SIS is currently serving or has the potential to serve in future as an interdisciplinary hub for SOAS. Some questioned the very premise:

Why are these centres in particular considered interdisciplinary? Much work in literature, history, religion, music etc is interdisciplinary and I am unclear as to why that is not explicitly recognised/nurtured, while these 4 centres are grouped under such an anomalous heading.

There were those who were all for “proactively drawing in members of SOAS from outside the core groups involved, and making significant strides in constituting a hub for interdisciplinarity.” There were those who urged us to be “cautious labelling it IS given that interdisciplinary work done all over the School”. There were those who were frankly sceptical: “No inherent link between the 4 units. None are particularly working on inter/transdisciplinarity as a phenomenon, in a reflective way. That function/focus, which would be very valuable for SOAS, is unlikely to be taken up by the present members.” And there were those who were against SIS serving SOAS in this way:

Interdisciplinar[ity cannot be fostered by creating a separate silo, which is what the current structure does. Rather, it requires making relations and collaboration between
the existing Schools smoother. If the creation of SIS was about the units who didn't fit anywhere else, then we need to ask whether these units fit better elsewhere.

It is a frequently articulated perception that SIS has yet to develop a compelling rationale for a visible, articulated, institutional mechanism for promoting interdisciplinarity, captured in statements like this:

*Presently, it seems to be the area where the bits that don't fit anywhere else sit. There is no coherence at all outwardly in the rationale of the conglomeration. Yet interdisciplinarity should be at the heart of SOAS.*

This raises the question: is acting as an interdisciplinary hub the best way for us to deploy what we currently have in SIS? Or, as one respondent put it:

*Do we need SIS? If yes, then why? As a holding place for some essential centres and their activities is not a sufficient response. If we did not have SIS, where would the activities go?*

One question the review asked was how many respondents identified with the following keywords, which capture the current convening strengths of SIS: conflict, security, diplomacy, gender, sexuality, environment, media & communications. The results confirm the scope of the transversal convening power of working with these keywords, with almost 60% of all respondents (44 people) responding that they work on conflict, 58% (40) on gender, 42% on security and media & communications, 40% (23) on sexuality, 33% on diplomacy (21) and environment (21). Within SIS itself, these synergies were also evident beyond the boundaries of the existing units with 73% (11) answering yes to conflict and security, 70% (9) to gender, 62% (8) to diplomacy, 50% (6) to environment, and 42% (5) each to sexuality and media & communications.

Asking the broader question, “If you were to teach as part of a School-wide interdisciplinary programme, in what broad thematic areas would your expertise most appropriately fit”, generated a further list of themes, including sustainability, infrastructure, human rights, food systems, public policy, global governance, decolonial, post-colonial, climate change, technology, internet governance, labour, poverty, negotiation, translation, activism and public culture.

**Building on SIS Strengths in Fostering Collaboration and Innovation**

SOAS is getting more collaborative, but there’s still a sense that opportunities are missed because at SOAS we continue to be rather atomised and siloed in the way we work, and not nimble and creative enough in finding ways to work together across disciplinary or thematic or regional borders. Respondents suggested that SIS could play more of a role in addressing this:

*Staging more open discussion around research bids to foster collaborative interdisciplinary work*

*Interdisciplinarity is the future! SIS could build a model of collaborative teaching and research that might be picked up in other parts of the School. It could adopt a focus on a different theme each year, and coordinate some part of each unit’s teaching to*
exploring that issue. Such an approach would strengthen both our theoretical understanding but also our use of a diversity of research methods to understand phenomena. A future reorganisation of SOAS along thematic – not disciplinary or regional lines – would be a highly original contribution to British academe. Imagine organising teaching and research around such topics such as inequality, the environment, ‘cross-cultural meaning’ etc. Wow!

The point was made that where the units in SIS add value is in their convening outside rather than within SIS itself, facilitating connections between people across and beyond SOAS. One member of SIS suggested the potential of doing this convening around a problem-based approach to teaching, especially for people going into careers that would require them to quickly grasp and work to solve complex real-world problems; such a course, they said, could have interchangeable modules, “SIS Studies”. A strength of units within SIS, and especially CEDEP which has a hugely successful track record of convening complex multi-partner research projects that generate significant income, is their convening power with institutions and partners outside the institution, which make a major contribution to SOAS’ global reach, especially in relation to engagement in international policy arenas. CEDEP offers SOAS convening across the social and natural sciences that is especially important in relation to current and future policy research priorities.

“Innovative” is a term used by several respondents in thinking about what SIS is and does – and can do - that is different, invoking SIS’ potential as a catalyst of new ways of working, connecting and thinking:

We need to push new and innovative approaches, more professional training, more online income streams.

The review needs to embrace innovative pedagogies and approaches. These may just be innovative for SOAS, but we need to do it. Standing still is going backwards.

It can function as an outward facing School with innovative degrees, professional training, adjuncts that bring in reputation and attention, that houses a number of new and innovative ventures both from an academic and professional perspective, that leads the way with impact. As far as research specifically is concerned, a good future for SIS would be to act as a platform for innovative, interdisciplinary and collaborative research projects – ideally with outside funding which will have to come from private sources too.

The idea of SIS serving as a convenor raises the question of whether SIS could and should serve as more of a bridge with interdisciplinary work being done elsewhere in the institution, especially in terms of engaging the arts and humanities and working more with our Area Studies degrees and interests:

How does SIS relate to area studies degrees? Students routinely take modules in other parts of SOAS. Seeing less cooperation from colleagues elsewhere in the school in supervising – wouldn’t like to see those degrees moving to SIS as they recruit well for LCL but would appreciate some more appreciation and official encouragement and guidelines for those interdisciplinary activities that take place outside SIS.
Why is there so little collaboration with and outreach to area departments/sections? These departments embody inter- and transdisciplinarity and have a lot to contribute to SIS. Strangely, SIS seems to go its separate ways, wasting the potential to create synergies that would make SIS, the area departments and SOAS as a whole stronger.

Further to this, one respondent suggested that SIS could:

Serve as a platform for area institutes – with all area faculty affiliated via other departments – but perhaps with a stronger programmatic bridge to language-learning (e.g. policy with language) and two core streams of activity a) hosting both ‘area’ and ‘public-policy’ events, occasionally overlapping and occasionally in conjunction with other departments, centres and programmes across the School as well as b) running ‘public-policy’ degrees, with various streams, one of which could stress the current ‘diplomacy’ theme.

This could be an interesting future direction for SIS, although it is not one towards which the current members of SIS appear particularly positively disposed. Alternative ideas articulated by survey respondents include: i) investing in and turning CISD into an independent Institute, strengthening existing CISD connections across the School; ii) setting up a Gender/Gender and Sexuality Institute, drawing together the critical mass of people working on gender and sexuality from across the School. The structural anomalies of the lack of embeddedness in the School’s academic administrative units of the current (regional) institutes deserve more thought in this regard: these are issues taken up in the Review of Centres and Institutes.

Naming and Framing

One question that arises from this discussion is whether “School of Interdisciplinary Studies” the right name for SIS. An alternative, originally mooted but subsequently rejected, is School of Global Affairs or School of Global Studies. This raises a similar set of issues: just as interdisciplinarity runs through much of the institution already and is not just found in SIS, many departments within SOAS consider themselves to be working on “global issues”. As one respondent contended:

Does SIS have to address ‘global’ issues… since almost all departments already address links with international/’global’ issues in one way or another?

Contestations around the status of the term “global” are not new to SOAS, nor is SOAS unique in having divergent views amongst our intellectual community on the utility, significance and reach of this term. However, as one respondent noted, it is in relation to SOAS’ visibility on global issues that SIS could make a distinctive contribution, as coordinator and convenor of high-profile events and outputs that engage people from across the School:

SOAS needs to improve its outreach on issues of global significance, in areas such as global conflicts, development, security, diplomacy and governance… SOAS fails to convert this into more than a sum of its parts. SIS could potentially play the role of coordinator in high profile global initiatives and policy publications, drawing on other parts of the School. They could also extend to organising professional qualifications
in short courses for senior professionals, again drawing on expertise across the School.

What SIS offers SOAS is a challenge to a conventional approach to knowledge acquisition, production and exchange. As one SIS member put it, ‘we’re thinking very differently about knowledge production and transfer, about how we understand the world.’ This is more than interdisciplinarity, it’s about a way of working that’s about engagement – and with that, about engaging wider constituencies of people and organisations, nationally, regionally and globally. As one respondent put it:

*If we want a more policy engaged unit which represents SOAS voice on global issues, is a traditional department the best way to do this? What kind of structure would better enable that SOAS voice? How can we ensure that SOAS as an institution (rather than individual academics) is the first choice for policy-makers to consult in relevant areas (invited to parliamentary committees, to prepare reports etc.)?*

To do this kind of policy engagement well, SIS needs to be more agile, more diverse and more plural in terms of its membership than a conventional department – more able to deploy its resources to hire in non-academics with experience in think-tanks, policy and advocacy skills, communications and social media expertise. Most of all, this work and those who do it need to be valued, given that, as one SIS respondent put it, “feeling like the unwelcome stepchild is not conducive to a good working environment.”

**Scenarios for SIS**

Three potential scenarios emerge from these discussions:

1. Retain the current structure with the units that currently make up SIS and work on vision, mission, purpose, structural arrangements etc. so as to give it a clearer focus on innovation and external influence and engagement. The emphasis would be less on finding a narrative that could capture what people in SIS work on, or on articulating SIS’ interdisciplinarity per se, but on the flexibility and forms of practice that SIS has been evolving. With this SIS becomes an exemplar rather than a driver of interdisciplinary working and innovation.

2. Realign the membership of SIS with the purpose of revisioning it as more of an incubator and engine for interdisciplinarity in SOAS, as a smaller and more focused innovations unit that might contain within it, for example, a social enterprise hub. Within this, consider building on and investing in CISD’s brand and strengths to grow CISD as a separate entity. Work towards creating a separate Gender/Gender and Sexuality Institute to evolve out of CGS, in line with the desire for autonomy expressed by members of CGS. Consider working towards integrating CEDEP staff into CISD or into Development Studies, Politics or Economics. Consider finding closer integration of Global Media and Communications and Anthropology.

3. Retain the current membership and composition of SIS, expanding it to include the Regional Institutes and Centres alongside the existing units and closer connections with Area Studies, with attachments into all the departments.
SIS might consider some of the following suggestions to address opportunities and some of the structural issues that became evident in the review, from duplication to competition to incentives:

- **As one member of SIS suggested, “SIS could trial ways of making it more effective to work across departments.”** With our comprehensive cross-SOAS workload model, those contributing to SIS could easily do so on a fractional basis. Members of SIS could be “full citizens” (100% in SIS) or “flexible citizens” with another department on whatever fractional basis best describes their engagement in teaching and administrative activities, which could change with new ventures and shifting interests. People would have a “home” department to which they allocate more than half of their time, for administrative simplicity.

- **SIS could play more of a role in convening interdisciplinary degrees, drawing together people and modules from across SOAS.** Resource allocation could be organised in several ways. One option is to use a fractional split, with a person being “bought out” from their home department for a proportion of time to work for SIS. For example, someone could have Anthropology as their home department and be bought out by SIS for 40% of their workload, which would be represented in terms of a flow of resource to Anthropology to pay for the 0.4FTE being used in SIS. It would be effectively a form of secondment. Another option is for returns from modules, convening, marking etc. to be coded against people’s home departments proportion to their contribution to SIS modules. And there are no doubt other options. Getting these arrangements clear and working out incentives could enable departments to see greater benefit from engaging in SIS and help stimulate collaboration in the design and delivery of teaching.

- **Earmarking a proportion of SIS’ surplus as a convening fund would allow SIS to convene and communicate multi, inter and transdisciplinary events that engage different departments/Schools across SOAS.** The fund would be used to incentivise building trans-institutional intellectual connections.

- **As one respondent put it, SIS needs to ‘make itself more heard and more visible internally at SOAS but also externally… SIS would benefit from its own webpage, blog, youtube videos of members describing their experience within it, twitter account… a communications officer for the first two or three years might be a great investment’.** Given the significance of the work that is done in SIS and the value for SOAS of making our interdisciplinarity visible, remediying this with investment in some good promotional and communications material is key.

- **To project an identity that can speak to both internal and external constituencies, to echo the point made by one respondent, SIS might consider “changing its name – it suggests the rest of SOAS is not interdisciplinary, which undermines the mission”**.

- **Expand SIS’ networks in policy and practice communities through short term or partial secondments, Global Fellows and Research Associates, and drawing on these individuals to mentor, support and inspire colleagues and students.** Appoint Professors of Practice to SIS who would teach engaged policy-practice and applied creative media workshops and teach into courses across the institution, perhaps especially at undergraduate level offering a practice-based component in otherwise practice-less degrees. Use this to offer practice-based researchers in SIS career and promotion opportunities tracks that would give recognition and value to their work, rather than judging them according to narrow academic criteria.
● Locate an enterprise hub in SIS, with a social enterprise incubator at its heart. Focusing the enterprise hub on creative exchange and engagement, particularly in the creative industries and global media. Use the links with Chouette Films, Positive Negatives and the Global Academy as models for ‘nested’ partnerships, in collaboration with Anthropology and the School of Arts.

● Do more to bring together and develop media and digital literacy across the School, especially with the School of Arts and Anthropology. Explore expanding media practice training opportunities through partnerships with nearby institutions, such as with UCL’s new media lab in ULU.

● Engage CISD in creating innovative learning opportunities from otherwise endangered ancient languages and marginalised religions as well as a selection from otherwise low-recruiting modules in the Schools of Arts, LCL, EAL and HRP that could be preserved by being curated online.

● Host a programme in an area core to SOAS – taking our decolonisation agenda as an articulating principle, for example, or a focus on digital transformations or global futures, including, for example, AI and other new technologies – with the people in SIS being as much involved as other people across the School who already work on the topic and lead the discussion.

● Mainstream gender, global media, climate and peace/conflict resolution in as many SOAS degrees as possible by offering blended learning options in SIS in all PGT degrees.

Next steps:

1. Meeting of SIS, led by SIS HoS Dina Matar, to reflect on and respond to this report and generate a proposal for action.

2. Proposal to be circulated for consultation, then pursued through EB and AB, so that changes can be implemented within this academic year.

Andrea Cornwall, 15 January 2018

Response to the Review from the School of Interdisciplinary Studies

The review was generally seen as balanced and as providing a good overview of SIS functions as well as some insights into possibilities for growth and intellectual entrepreneurship.

Taking account of its recommendations, SIS will put forward a vision and a plan of action that will provide responses to the points raised in the review and strategies moving forward.

Our first opportunity to do so will be the SIS away day on Feb 8.

Dina Matar

Head, School of Interdisciplinary Studies
### Workload Model

AB is asked to **note** this update on the Workload Allocation Model group’s work

#### Executive Summary

The Workload Allocation Model working group has drawn together the work done to date, revised tasks and tariffs, and produced a policy document that updates the earlier WAMS policy document. AB is asked to note this update and await a final policy, tasks and tariffs document and associated implementation framework at the next AB in March.

Sponsor: Andrea Cornwall

#### Recommendations & Next Steps

AB note the progress towards the revised workload allocation model and contribute to refining the model.

#### Financial Impact

Positive impact on efficiency and effectiveness.

#### Risks

Brief summary of any of the risks.

None. Colleagues are anticipating a new WAMS and the proposed model has been developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders, and will be consulted on further and tested before implementation.

#### Equality implications

Will enable us to distribute workload more fairly, with positive equality implications.

#### Consultations

WAMS working group includes UCU representatives, and there will be consultation with UCU executive once we have an agreed draft.
SOAS - WAMS PROJECT UPDATE ON WORKING GROUP PROGRESS

AB 31st January 2019
AIMS OF WORKING GROUP

- To constitute a group drawn from across the institution with membership of academic research, teaching (on campus and online) and administrative staff and representatives from UCU
- To review the WAMS policy statement, ensuring buy-in from all staff
- To revise tasks and tariffs to maximise accuracy, efficiency and remove overlaps
- To evaluate effectiveness of departmental administrative structures for allocating workload, and make proposals for change where desirable
- To establish an effective implementation platform and process
- To ensure a full WMS implementation across all departments for the start of the 2019/20 academic year.
OPERATION OF WORKING GROUP

• Completed Sessions
  • Day 1 – Policy evaluation
  • Day 2 – Process formulation, with task and tariff refinement
  • Day 3 – Implementation and communications planning

• Planned additional work
  • HoDs WAMS session – to examine implications of new proposals for departments
  • Dept managers and centre administrators session – to fine-tune roll-out details and timing.
PROGRESS TO DATE: POLICY

• Key changes include:
  • Refinement of purpose/aims statement (e.g., re-evaluation of WAMS in terms of total available workload per department as a planning and management approach)
  • Clarification of expected weightings of each workload activity for different staff types (e.g., T&R vs. T&S; HoDs and coordinators)
  • Specification of changes to expected weightings of each workload activity for special circumstances (e.g., maternity/paternity, return from sickness absence, probationary staff; junior vs. senior staff administrative responsibilities)
  • Introduction of a fourth category of workload activity – ‘Service’, to capture ad-hoc roles plus PhD supervision (allows some flexibility around individual workload assignments), giving (for a T&R staff):
    Research 40%; Teaching 30%; Administration 20%; Service 10%
  • Proposal for expansion of the School-level coordinator roles, to redefine and strengthen existing department roles, improve comms with centre, spread management responsibility across department, and avoid overload of specific coordinator roles:
    I. Teaching & Learning; II. Research; III. Doctoral Studies; IV. Recruitment and Marketing; V. Student experience
PROGRESS TO DATE: BUYOUTS

• Key changes include:
  • Buyouts are distinguished from secondments – the latter are considered complete external transfers of workload (e.g., a 50% secondment is equivalent to a 50% remaining fractional contract)
  • Buyout model – notes 10% of external work is already held with research load allocation (on assumption research = output generation/seeking and managing external funding/scholarship/research service)
  • External funding that does not cover salary plus on-costs is not a buyout – it counts fully within research time (if research commitment is made to an external funder that is not funded by salary plus on-costs, it is the equivalent of an individual taking on additional work independently rather than being assigned to it).
  • External funding that covers salary plus on costs beyond 10% factored into workloads by reduction across all four headings:
PROGRESS TO DATE: TASKS AND TARIFFS

- Key changes include:
  - Emphasis on using tariff refinement process to seek efficiencies in SOAS activity
  - Task analysis reveals some task tariffs inflated (e.g., exam board chair 150 hours → 30 hours)
  - All admin tasks grouped under five coordinator headings – allows line management, efficiency and removal of duplications
  - PhD supervision placed under ‘service’ category (essentially an opt-in task assignment)
  - ‘Meetings’ removed as task category – avoids double-counting under other admin roles, also captured within ‘general admin hours’ category (avoiding too much ‘bean counting’).
PROGRESS TO DATE: IMPLEMENTATION

• Key changes include:
  • Decision to proceed initially with a spreadsheet-based WAMS model
    • It is more developed than Simitive to capture different role weightings
    • It is more flexible as a planning tool
    • It can be adapted to fit individual department needs
    • It avoids some of the data transfer problems found with Simitive
  
• Timescale
  • Jan 2019 – Revised policy and process documentation
  • February 2019 – Tasks and tariffs document finalised
  • March 2019 – Platform established
  • April-June 2019 – Dept models populated with current data
  • July 2019 – Use by HoDs for planning and workload allocation for 2019/2020
Enough is Enough: Amendment to Student Code of Conduct

Academic Board is asked to consider the following Report and approve an amendment to the Student Code of Conduct for implementation from September 2019.

Executive Summary

The Students' Union and the School have collaborated over recent years to address sexual harassment and violence. This has included the Students' Union Enough is Enough campaign to support cultural change. In 2018, the consent training was embedded in the enrolment process and clearly identified as a required part of Welcome Week for all taught students. 1641 students attended sessions with 235 opting out. This represents a significant success on the part of the Students' Union; there are nevertheless further actions that can be taken to strengthen the School's position further.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees on 27 November, Students' Union sabbatical officers raised concerns about the absence of sanctions for those without legitimate reasons for not engaging in the programme. The Board of Trustees strongly supports the School's position on addressing sexual harassment and violence and wishes to see further progress to embed Enough is Enough, subject to compliance with requirements of the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) regarding the provision of information to applications and students.

Following a meeting between the Interim Head of Legal and Governance, the Academic Registrar and the Students' Union sabbatical officers for Activities and Events and Equality and Liberation, it is proposed that:

- The Student Code of Conduct (appended here) is amended for 2019 to clarify that failure to engage with the Enough is Enough training is a breach of the Code of Conduct which can result in disciplinary action;
- Work continues, as part of the wider work on the SOAS culture, on plans to further embed the training into the curriculum in 2020. An indication of this will be provided in the 2020 prospectus.

Once approved, the revised Code of Conduct will be added to the list of regulatory documents that are drawn to students' attention at enrolment.

Recommendations

1. Consider and approve the proposed minor amendment to clarify expectations of student conduct.
2. Note that a wider review of the Code of Conduct is taking place and proposals will be brought back to Academic Board in due course.

Financial Impact

There is no direct financial impact arising from the proposed amendment. However, there will be a resource implication from following through actions under the Disciplinary Procedure for non-engagement in the Enough is Enough training.
### Risks

At present, there is a risk that the School’s commitment to the consent training may be undermined by a lack of a clear indication of the consequence of non-completion.

### Equality implications

The proposal supports the School’s stance on gender-based violence.

### Consultation

The proposal is the outcome of dialogue between School management, the Board of Trustees and the Students’ Union.
SOAS Code of Conduct: Unacceptable Behaviour

This code of conduct forms part of the terms of the contract between the School and its students. It sets out the types of behaviour that is unacceptable and will amount to misconduct under the Student Disciplinary Procedure. This code indicates the type of sanctions that may be imposed if such behaviour is found to have occurred. The unacceptable behaviour listed is not exhaustive and the indication of the sanctions which may be applied is illustrative only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary offence</th>
<th>Examples of unacceptable behaviour</th>
<th>Examples Of sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical misconduct</strong></td>
<td>• Punching</td>
<td><strong>For less serious offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kicking</td>
<td>• Formal warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slapping</td>
<td>• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/ coaching session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pulling hair</td>
<td>• Written apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Biting</td>
<td><strong>For more serious offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pushing</td>
<td>• Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shoving</td>
<td>• Suspension/exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spitting</td>
<td>• Restrictions/conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Holding/restraining</td>
<td><strong>For less serious offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sexual intercourse or engaging in a sexual act without consent</td>
<td>• Formal warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual misconduct</strong></td>
<td>• Attempting to engage in sexual intercourse or engaging in a sexual act without consent</td>
<td>• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/ coaching session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sharing private sexual materials of another person without consent</td>
<td>• Written apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kissing without consent</td>
<td><strong>For more serious offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Touching inappropriately without consent</td>
<td>• Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inappropriately showing sexual organs to another person</td>
<td>• Suspension/exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions/conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abusive behaviour</strong></td>
<td>In any format (including phone, email, online)</td>
<td><strong>For less serious offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Threats to hurt another person</td>
<td>• Formal warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abusive comments relating to an individual’s protected characteristics, as defined under the Equality Act 2010</td>
<td>• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/ coaching session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slander/libel</td>
<td>• Written apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acting in an intimidating and hostile manner</td>
<td><strong>For more serious offences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of inappropriatelanguage</td>
<td>• Expulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repeatedly contacting another person against the wishes of the other person</td>
<td>• Suspension/exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repeatedly following another person without good reason</td>
<td>• Restrictions/conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary offence</td>
<td>Examples of unacceptable behaviour</td>
<td>Examples of sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Damage to property** | • Causing significant damage to School property or the property of students or employees of the School or visitor to the School  
• Causing minor damage to School property or the property of students or employees of the School or visitor to the School | **For less serious offences**  
• Formal warning  
• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/ coaching session  
• Written apology |
| **Theft or unauthorised use of property** | • Unauthorised entry onto School premises or unauthorised use of School premises  
• Taking property belonging to another without permission  
• Misuse of School property (for example computers and multifunctional printers)  
• Misuse of SOAS ID cards (for example lending it to other people) | **For less serious offences**  
• Formal warning  
• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/ coaching session  
• Written apology |
| **Causing a health or safety concern** | • Act/omission that did cause or could have caused serious harm on School premises or during School activities (for example, letting off fireworks inside or possessing/supplying controlled drugs)  
• Act/omission that did cause or could have caused a health and safety concern on School premises (for example, setting off fire alarms for reasons other than suspected fire or smoking in non-designated areas) | **For less serious offences**  
• Formal warning  
• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/ coaching session  
• Written apology |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary offence</th>
<th>Examples of unacceptable behaviour</th>
<th>Examples of sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Operational obstruction** | • Acts/omissions/statements intended to deceive the School  
• Disruption of the activities of the School (including academic, administrative, sporting and social) on School premises or elsewhere  
• Disruption of the functions, duties or activities of any student or employee of the School or any authorised visitor to the School  
• Improper interference with the activities of the School (including academic, administrative, sporting and social) on School premises or elsewhere  
• Improper interference with the functions, duties or activities of any student or employee of the School or any authorised visitor to the School | For less serious offences  
• Formal warning  
• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/coaching session  
• Written apology  

For more serious offences  
• Expulsion  
• Suspension/exclusion  
• Restrictions/conditions |
| **Reputational damage** | In any format (including print, email, online)  
• Behaviour which has caused serious damage or could have caused serious damage to the reputation of the School  
• Behaviour which has damaged or could have damaged the reputation of the School | For less serious offences  
• Formal warning  
• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/coaching session  
• Written apology  

For more serious offences  
• Expulsion  
• Suspension/exclusion  
• Restrictions/conditions |
| **Breach of School policies and procedures** | • Failure to comply with a previous penalty under the Student Disciplinary Procedure  
• Breach of the School’s Data Protection Policy | For less serious offences  
• Formal warning  
• Compulsory attendance at a workshop/coaching session  
• Written apology  

For more serious offences  
• Expulsion  
• Suspension/exclusion  
• Restrictions/conditions |
**Dignity@SOAS Policy**

Academic Board is asked to approve the Dignity@ SOAS Policy.

**Executive Summary**

The adoption of a Dignity@SOAS policy will strengthen and clarify the School’s response and approach to managing issues of discrimination including bullying, harassment, victimisation and bullying.

The policy provides the legal definitions of discrimination, harassment and victimisation and bullying. The policy is based on best practice, both in terms of policy and procedural application.

The policy seeks to further clarify the different stages of case management for students and staff.

The Executive sponsor is Andrea Cornwall Pro – Director (Research and Enterprise)

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that Academic Board approve this policy

**Financial Impact**

None

**Risks**

The School is currently at risk of being perceived as not having clear processes in place to deal with cases of discrimination, harassment, victimisation and bullying.

This policy states a clear commitment to the non-toleration of unacceptable behaviour. This policy also defines those unacceptable behaviours, and provides a framework to support students and staff.

**Equality implications**

This policy meets both the general and specific requirements of the Equality Act 2010, and there is no adverse impact.

**Consultation**

Consultation was carried out with staff, students and the relevant Unions
Dignity and Respect Policy

Bullying and harassment will not be tolerated at SOAS.

1. **Policy Statement**

1.1 Bullying and harassment of any kind will not be tolerated at the School SOAS is committed to creating and sustaining a working and learning environment where people can achieve their full potential free from any form of harassment, bullying, sexual abuse and coercion, discrimination and victimisation. The School is committed to creating an environment which is free from such behaviour and promotes a culture of accountability, dignity and respect for all.

1.2 For the purposes of this Policy, references to ‘the SOAS community’ includes all students’ staff and lay governors of the School. The School will try to ensure relevant parties (such as third party contractors) comply with the required standards of behaviour in this Policy by way of contract.

2. **Aims of this Policy**

2.1 The aims of this policy are to:

- Promote the principles of dignity and respect towards one another;

- Assist in maintaining a healthy learning and working environment where unacceptable behaviour is identified;

- Proactively work towards the elimination of bullying, harassment and victimisation by building an inclusive culture, raising awareness and ensuring transparent, effective mechanisms by which complaints can be addressed,

- Encourage everyone to play a role in creating and maintaining an environment in which harassment, bullying and victimisation are understood to be unacceptable and people feel able to raise complaints, be heard and know that appropriate action will be taken.

3. **Action Against Bullying and Harassment**

3.1 It should be noted that a member of the SOAS community is personally liable for their actions, which in some instances could lead to criminal or civil action in the Courts under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997, Equality Act 2010 or other relevant legislation, such as the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 The School and the SOAS Students’ Union will use their own separate procedures to investigate and take appropriate action to resolve the same allegation of bullying or harassment (i.e. the School in considering a student’s
status at SOAS, the Union considering a student’s membership of its organisation). (See Appendices XX for student and staff procedure)

3.3 The School will take appropriate steps to deal with behaviour, intentional or unintentional, that result in a breach of this Policy. The School will conduct confidential and impartial investigations into allegations of bullying and/or harassment. It will at all times comply with the General Data Protection Requirement framework.

4. **Scope of Policy**

4.1 The School will not tolerate any form of bullying or harassment within its community or against its members, which may go beyond the physical premises and normal business hours of the School, such as conduct at events and trips abroad or on social media.

4.2 This Policy applies to the SOAS community and relates to bullying or harassment perpetrated by:

- a student against a student, member of staff or lay governor;
- a member of staff against a student, member of staff or lay governor, and
- a lay governor against a student, member of staff or lay governor.

The above examples also include bullying and harassment by or against any other party who is contracted to abide by this policy including visitors and third party contractors.

4.3 Discriminatory behaviour can occur on the basis of perceived group membership, affiliation or association. The Equality Act 2010 legally prevents those who share protected characteristics from discrimination on the basis of their shared characteristic.

These are: Age, disability, gender reassignment marriage and civil partnership pregnancy and maternity, race (including ethnic origin, nationality and colour), religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Transgender includes those who have undergone, are undergoing or intend to undergo gender reassignment.

4.4 Unacceptable behaviour can take many forms and can range from physical attack to more subtle conduct such as remarks or jokes.

It can also include behaviour which deliberately or inadvertently excludes individuals from normal activities.

4.5 Unacceptable behaviour includes, but is not limited to, bullying, harassment and victimisation

5. **Definition of Bullying and Harassment**
Bullying and harassment are not necessarily confined to the behaviour of senior staff towards more junior staff, or indeed staff towards students; it can take place between persons at the same level or involve staff or students behaving inappropriately towards more senior members of the School.

5.1 For the purpose of this Policy: the following terms are defined as:

5.1.1 **Bullying** is defined as offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, which may include an abuse or misuse of power, through means that threaten, undermine, humiliate, denigrate, take advantage of, or injure the recipient. Power does not always mean being in a position of authority, but can include both personal strength and the power to coerce through fear or intimidation.

5.1.2 **Harassment** is defined as unwanted conduct that has the purpose or effect of:

- violating a person’s dignity; and/or
- creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment which relates to one of their protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation.

5.1.3. **Sexual harassment** is defined as unwanted conduct of a sexual nature that has the purpose or effect of:

- violating a person’s dignity; and/or
- creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment

‘Of a sexual nature’ can cover verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct including unwelcome sexual advances, inappropriate touching, forms of sexual assault, sexual jokes, displaying pornographic photographs, drawings or videos, or sending emails with material of a sexual nature.

5.1.4 **Victimisation** is defined in the Act as:

Treating someone badly because they have done a ‘protected act’ (or because you believe that a person has done or is going to do a protected act).

A ‘protected act’ is:

- Making a claim or complaint of discrimination (under the Equality Act).
- Helping someone else to make a claim by giving evidence or information.
● Making an allegation that you or someone else has breached the Act.
● Doing anything else in connection with the Act.

If you do treat a student less favourably because they have taken such action then this will be unlawful victimisation. There must be a link between what the student did and your treatment of them.

The less favourable treatment does not need to be linked to a protected characteristic.

For example:
A tutor shouts at a student because he thinks she intends to support another student’s sexual harassment claim. This would amount to victimisation.

Who is not protected?

A student who in bad faith gives false information or evidence (that is, they knew that it was false) or makes an allegation that was false and given in bad faith would not be protected against victimisation.

For example:
A student with a grudge against his tutor knowingly gives false evidence in another student’s discrimination claim against the university. He is subsequently excluded from the course for supporting the claim. This treatment could not amount to victimisation because his evidence was untrue and given in bad faith.

It doesn't matter whether the original complaint/claim is upheld as long as it was not made in bad faith.

5.2 In deciding whether conduct is bullying or harassment, the School will take account of the following factors:
• the alleged victim’s (or victims’) perception of the conduct;
• the other circumstances of the case;
• whether it is reasonable for the conduct to have had the effect of bullying or harassment.

5.3. Examples of the different types of bullying and harassment are included in Appendix xxxxx (To be inserted at the end).

6. Responsibility of the SOAS Community

6.1 All members of the SOAS community can help to:
• prevent bullying and harassment by being sensitive to the reactions and needs of others, and ensuring that their conduct does not cause offence;

• discourage bullying and harassment by others by making it clear that such conduct is unacceptable, and supporting colleagues and peers who are taking steps to stop the harassment;

• understand bullying and harassment by attending training sessions and/or seeking advice from the School’s Anti Harassment Contact Officers or Students’ Union.

6.2 The School is responsible for:

• taking steps to eliminate bullying and harassment and other unlawful discrimination, as well as to actively promote equality to provide a collegiate, lawful and harmonious working environment;

• taking appropriate action when it is aware that bullying or harassment may be or is taking place;

• raising awareness to help members of the SOAS Community identify and deal with bullying and harassment.

7. Monitoring of Bullying and Harassment Cases

7.1 The School will compile anonymous information about the number, nature and outcome of bullying and harassment cases each academic year, including from formal grievance procedures, as well as from the anonymous report and support recording tool, with a view to keeping the XXXXXX Committee updated.

The Report and Support in an online educational and reporting tool that enables staff and students to anonymously report unacceptable behaviour. Further information can be found on the following link:

Insert link here:

8 Equality and Diversity

8.1 SOAS is committed to ensuring that protected characteristics are taken into consideration in the development and implementation of any policy, process or procedure, including decision making

8.2 This policy has been developed in accordance with the terms of the SOAS Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy and the Equality Impact Assessment procedure. This will help ensure that the School meets the Public Sector Equality to:

• Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other behaviour prohibited by the Equality Act (2010)
• Advance equality of opportunity
• Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who don’t.

8.3 If you have any queries regarding this policy, or its application, and you are a student, please contact either The Student Advice and Welfare Team, or the SU, or the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager.

If you are a member of staff, please contact your Employee Relations Consultant or the Human resources Equality Adviser.

8.3 The procedures outlined here should be carried out with due regard to any diversity issues which may have affected either the original situation or the current process.

Students are advised to liaise with the Disability/ Dyslexia Team in Student Advice and Welfare and their Academic Advisor if they need adjustments in place.

Staff are advised to contact the Human Resources Directorate for support in this area.

8.4 Where a diversity issue (e.g. a disability including chronic physical or mental health condition) has been disclosed to the School, whether prior to the situation which triggered this process or during the process, the line manager co-ordinating the process is responsible for checking with the employee to determine their needs and for making the appropriate arrangements.

8.5 Employees who have not previously disclosed a diversity issue which may be relevant to this process are encouraged to do so, as early as possible, so that it can be taken into account.

9. Information on the Dignity @ SOAS Advisors:

Insert link to website with up to date names, descriptions and pics details here

You are encouraged to approach one of the following members of School staff if you have any concerns about harassment and bullying:

- The first point of contact should be a Dignity@ SOAS Advisor. (Student or Staff)
- Your Academic Adviser, Supervisor or Departmental Tutor
- The Student Advice and Wellbeing Team

Insert SU details for students here

Insert HR details here

Insert EAP details for staff here
Insert details of our in-house mediators for staff complaints

External Agencies - insert details here:

Insert flowchart as appendices XXXXXX showing the steps someone should take if they want to report an incident. There will be separate flowcharts for students and staff.

10. Policy ownership & review

10.1. This policy was developed by the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager who will be responsible for ensuring a review in MONTH YEAR (or every XX years), unless changes to statute necessitate an update prior to this date. Comments on the content and operation can be emailed to: Diversity@soas.ac.uk

11. Procedure

11.1. The School has a number of impartial Dignity @ SOAS Advisors, they can be contacted in the first instance to explain the intention and steps of this policy, and whether it is appropriate in the specific incident; to offer advice and guidance as to the options available, and how to access them.

Their role is not to advocate on your behalf or to attend meetings with you as they are required to remain neutral at all times. That type of support should be accessed through Trade Union officials, a colleague or the Students Union as appropriate.

Insert Staff Grievance Procedure [link]
Insert Student Complaints’ Procedure [link]
Insert Student Disciplinary Procedure [link]

If you have any queries regarding this policy, or its application, and you are a student, please contact either The Student Advice and Welfare Team, or the SU, or the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager.

If you are a member of staff, please contact your Employee Relations Consultant or the Human resources Equality Adviser or the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager.

If you require an alternative format of this document, or any assistance or communications support to access this policy, please contact:

Arvind Sandhu
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager as162@soas.ac.uk
0207 898 4957