# OPEN AGENDA

## 13th March 2018
(Conference Suite, Paul Webley Wing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 4 A</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>[Attached]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2018/19 4 B</strong></td>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2018/19 4 C</strong></td>
<td>Matters Arising/Matters for Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2018/19 4 D</strong></td>
<td>Global Engagement and New Initiatives Presentation</td>
<td>[Oral Updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2018/19 4 E</strong></td>
<td>Research and Enterprise</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code of Practice 2021- Draft for submission on 7th June 2019</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Strategy Risk Register</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REF guidance update</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2018/19 4 F</strong></td>
<td>Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew University options paper</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access and Participation 2020-25</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update on School of Finance and Management CDR</td>
<td>[Oral Updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Interdisciplinary Studies Response to Review</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics CDR</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Languages Review Progress update</td>
<td>[Oral Updates]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment gaps</td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Union Academic Priority updates</td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Risk Register</td>
<td>To consider</td>
<td>[Attached]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB 2018/19 4 G</th>
<th>People and Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Workload Model</td>
<td>To approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18s Policy</td>
<td>To approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Practice</td>
<td>To approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates - space and policy updates</td>
<td>To approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies: Andrew Newsham, Simon Rofe, Brenna Bhandar, Ian Pickup, Carol Tan, Michael Jennings, Hugh Bendor-Samuel, Mark Laffey, Peter Baran, Reinhard Bachman, Sarah Pett, Graham Davies, Ulrich Pagel, Paula Sanderson, Andrea Cornwall

AB 2018/19 3 A Minutes
AB noted that the TNE presentation would be provided in March 2019. The Hebrew University paper would be brought back in March to enable School to consider additional options. Nathan Hill was present.

AB approved the minutes from 12th December as an accurate record.

AB 2018/19 3 B Action Points
AB noted that updates had been provided for all due actions, either on the tracker or on the agenda.

AB 2018/19 3 C Matters Arising/Matters for Report

SU Educational Priorities
AB noted that the SU Educational Priorities report would be provided at the March report.

Centre for Sustainable Finance
AB noted that EB had discussed the proposal for the creation of a Centre for Sustainable Finance. The Centre was proposed to provide a central place for the various colleagues working on finance and sustainability issues. The Centre would improve the visibility of the work and establish research platform and hub. It was agreed that it was an interdisciplinary endeavour and so would sit in the Department for Interdisciplinary Studies. The Centre would not require additional financial support of space. A website would be created to promote the work.

AB noted the creation of a centre.

AB 2018/19 3 D Research and Enterprise
Doctoral Scholarships

AB noted that there were a small number of doctoral scholarships and there was no support for decolonisation and widening participation at the research level. The revised proposal for scholarships would commit to the values of the School and propose.

AB discussed the potential implications of the changes and that some disciplines would receive more scholarships due to their intake. AB agreed that the definition of Global South and what counted as British Citizenship would have to be carefully defined and published online to avoid confusion. AB discussed the implications of Refugee status and how this would be represented.

AB agreed that the Scholarships should be used to attract and engage students with SOAS. AB noted that the proposals aligned with equality law as it was positive discrimination to promote inclusion.

AB noted that next academic session would be a pilot year and the engagement and impact would be evaluated.

AB approved the proposal.

Doctoral School Management Group Update

AB noted the proposal for the creation of the Doctoral School Student and Academic Experience Panel. The panel intended to improve provision for students as well as provide rapid and informal resolution to issues. It would provide an opportunity for resolution prior to formal complaints, although that avenue would remain open to students.

The constitution of the panel was proposed to be small enough to be nimble but also to offer a range of perspectives and inputs. The panel would only be able to make recommendations to improve practice or provision but recommendations could often make a powerful impact.

AB noted that the panel would sit under the Doctoral School Management Group. Reports on engagement and outcomes would be reported to enable wider improvements in practice.

AB discussed the training required for panel members and the need for agreement on when issues would reach a threshold to become formal. It was reported that the panel intended to support departments and not undermine processes. It was agreed that if allegations were serious enough the formal processes would be immediately initiated.

Change to Research and Enterprise Committee Standing Orders

AB noted that the proposed changes would ensure the right stakeholders were represented on the committee. The changes would support the move to departments and changes in Professional Services.

AB approved the changes.

Research Strategy Risk Register
AB noted that an external expert had been commissioned to review the School's income and reporting on finances. The review would include department income and be linked the RAM.

The new OPS structure would enable a pre and post award structures.

The report on the School's impact strategy had been adopted and operationalised. An Associate Director Research Impact had been recruited. All case studies had been reviewed. The risk had moved from red to green.

AB noted the changes in administration in the REO team. The School would recruit new people but there was currently a transition period. The changes would provide an opportunity to refresh and renew the School's approach.

AB noted that there had been School wide GDPR training however AB felt that more substantive training was required.

Action: Agree a programme of GDPR training for staff.

AB agreed that the risk register would return in March

Action: Provide updated risk register at the March Academic Board meeting.

AB 2018/19 3 E Academic Strategy and Key Performance Indicators

School of Finance and Management action plan and timeframes

AB noted that proposal recommended the creation of a task force to take forward a number of recommendations from the department review in relation to CeFEMS. There were frustrations that some of the recommendations in the report had also been made in 2016 but no progress had been made against them. Applications and revenue for CeFEMS had begun to decline. The task force would provide experience and capacity from other areas of the School to enable rapid progress.

AB noted that the Department had spoken to students on their courses and they had consistently said that they did not want to move to online materials. The Department would prefer to trial online resources prior to full implementation to ensure that students were not disengaged. The Department asked about a wider report considered by EB in relation to the leadership of the department. AB noted that leadership decisions did not sit within the Board’s remit and it would not be appropriate to discuss them.

AB discussed the implications of appointing a task force and the support it would provide to the department.

AB approved the recommendation to establish a task force.

Languages review: recommendations, action plan and timeframe

AB noted that there had been a review of the four major languages. The School had approved a cross subsidy to support language provision of 1.6million but each department
had a deficit on top of this subsidy. The review had resulted in a large number of recommendations to improve the provision.

AB discussed how the library had engaged with the review and what support could be provided going forwards.

AB noted that the subsidy for languages should not be supporting the four major languages and there needed to be changes to ensure each provision was financial sustainable. The changes would require a culture change within the School.

AB discussed the need to ensure there was clear leadership of the action points and practice was shared across the two languages departments. AB agreed that there needed to be a shift in the way languages were taught. Both departments were moving in the right direction and identify ways to save costs but also improve provision.

AB agreed the recommendations.

AB asked for progress reports to be brought to each AB meeting.

Options for Hebrew University provision

AB noted that the options for Hebrew University provision would be reported to the March AB meeting to enable an additional alternatives paper to be considered.

Review of SIS

AB noted that the Pro-Director Research and Enterprise had undertaken a review of SIS and provided three proposals for the department to consider. The department would consider the proposals and amend their department operational plan to reflect the proposal.

The department would bring a detailed action plan back to AB outlining how recommendations would be taken forwards. AB noted the opportunities for growth outlined in the report.

Action: Provide a detailed action plan back to AB outlining how recommendations would be taken forwards.

AB discussed the importance of clarity on the relationships between SIS and other departments and disciplines across the School. It was important that specialists within SIS with disciplines that sat in other departments spoke to each other and maintained the high standards of the discipline.

AB discussed the need to establish synergies and avoid duplication. The School should not have any duplicating programmes. It was agreed that duplication happened in all areas of the School and not just in SIS. The School needed to establish a collaborative culture to support interdisciplinarity.

AB agreed that CQAC would review duplication of programmes and programme approval forms should be amended to include a section on duplication.

Action: Ensure CQAC reviews duplications of programmes and update programme
approval form.

AB discussed the School’s online provision and how that was supported centrally. AB discussed the importance of the Central for Innovation in Learning and Teaching.

AB agreed that the reviews of department provision should be continuous to ensure all programmes were attractive and effective.

AB approved the recommendations.

Workload Planning

AB noted that the working group had met a number of times and were developing a tasks and tariff document. The proposal would be brought to the March Academic Board meeting for approval to enable implementation next academic session. The value given to certain roles and responsibilities were still being considered. The planning model would enable departments to be strategic in their planning and provide a better handle of financial implications.

People and Change

Revised Code of Conduct

AB noted that the Students Union had raised concerns that there were no consequences for students that did not undertake the Enough is Enough workshops. The revision to the code of conduct provided some clarification on the implications for not engaging with the workshops. A review of the whole Code of Conduct was planned as part of the culture work.

AB approved the amendment to the Code of Conduct

Revised Dignity at SOAS policy

AB noted that the Dignity at SOAS policy was revised as part of the culture work and ensuring all School policies were fit for purpose. The policy provided clarity on expectations and consequences.

The policy would be part of a broader policy framework that would support culture.

AB approved the revised Dignity at SOAS policy.

AB asked to see the broader policy framework.

Action: Report the broader policy framework to AB.

Academic Promotions

AB approved the appointment of Professor Francesca Orsini to the Academic Promotions
Panel.

Appointment of AB member to Resources and Planning Committee

AB approved the appointment of Narguess Farzad as one of the Academic Board representatives on Resources and Planning Committee.
<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>Safeguarding Policy Implementation</td>
<td>12/12/18</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Under 18s Policy included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide further guidance for staff working with under 18s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st October 2018</td>
<td>Education focus career route</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>DJ/AC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop research career route.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Education focus career route</td>
<td>30/01/19</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a Singapore School presentation for AB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td>30/01/19</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrew University options paper to be considered at January AB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Action Points</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide attainment gap strategy and impact report to future AB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Equality and Diversity report</td>
<td>12/06/19</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Not yet due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide AB with revised EDI objectives in the Spring term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Reports from new Academic Committee Structure</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></td>
<td>Review programme and module change processes and identify whether there was room for any flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Professor of Practice</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide financial framework and how the roles would be supported if external funding was not secured to a future meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
<td>Student Development Fund</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></td>
<td>All Heads of Department to share what funds have been provided to students to support their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>12/06/19</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Not yet due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</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>Oral update to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload model</td>
<td>Include Workload Model on the next AB agenda.</td>
<td>13/03/19</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Included on the agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Every institution intending to make a submission to REF 2021 is required to develop, document and apply a Code of Practice setting out its policies and procedures for determining who is an independent researcher and the selection of outputs, including its approaches to supporting staff with circumstances. This is the first draft of SOAS’ Code of Practice for REF 2021. It will be made available for School-wide consultation shortly. The final version has to be submitted to Research England’s Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) for REF 2021 by noon on 7 June 2019.

The Chair of EDAP has committed to reading all Codes of Practice. Institutions may be asked to make amendments, and will be provided with two opportunities to do so. All Codes will be published by the funding bodies in December 2019. The funding bodies have reserved the right to bar an institution from submitting to REF 2021 if they do not produce a Code of Practice in line with the requirements.

The attached (first) draft has been written by the School’s Research Excellence Manager (Elizabeth Nolan) with input from the Chair of the REF 2021 Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Working Group (Marloes Janson) and one of the two Outputs Co-Directors (Matt Craven) as well as the School’s Diversity and Inclusion Manager and Equality and Diversity Adviser (Arvind Sandhu and Dominik Jackson-Cole).

The template provided by Research England has been used and the guidance provided by RE has been closely followed.

The content has been informed by advice given by RE at two separate events for REF Managers held in February and March.

Recommendations & Next Steps

- The Code is not yet complete – appendices with flow charts, timelines and membership and terms of reference for the various bodies mentioned in the Code have yet to be drafted. These should be completed within the next week.
- The Code will be considered further by the Pro-Director for Research and Enterprise and the newly constituted REF Operations Team and a first draft will then be brought to various Committees and Boards, discussed with the Trade Unions, and put on MySOAS for wider consultation, as set out in the Code.
- Feedback is welcome. Members are asked to send feedback to soasresearch@soas.ac.uk
Financial Impact

Failure to do well in REF 2021 will impact negatively on the School’s reputation and finances. The Code of Practice is a very important element of our preparations for REF.

Risks

The most significant risk to the School is the possibility of failure to achieve success in REF 2021. Having a clear and effective framework for the School's submission, in line with the requirements of the funding bodies and EDAP, is important in terms of mitigating some of the risks.

Equality implications

Very careful consideration has been given to equality, diversity and inclusion implications. Arvind Sandhu, the School’s Diversity and Inclusion Manager, and Dominik Jackson-Cole, the School’s HR Equality and Diversity Adviser, have provided information for some sections, and have also read the current draft and have provided feedback.

Consultations

Consultation on the draft Code will take place shortly, as articulated above.
1. This annex provides the template for institutions’ codes of practice, annotated with guidance about the information required in each of its sections. This should be read alongside the full guidance on codes of practice in the main document. The code of practice template will also be available in Word.

2. Links to HEI intranet pages should not be used as evidence of any aspect of a code of practice.

### Part 1: Introduction

*Codes should address the following:* How the code relates to broader institutional policies/strategies that promote and support E&D; an update of actions taken since REF 2014; How the institution is addressing the principles of Transparency; Consistency; Accountability and Inclusivity in demonstrating fairness; Reference to these principles should also be made, as appropriate, in completing the sections below; How the code is being communicated to staff across the Institution (including to those on leave of absence), through various mechanisms and channels, including the staff intranet.

### Introduction

This Code of Practice is intended to meet, with respect to SOAS, the requirement of the funding bodies for a code of practice as specified in REF 2018/01 Guidance on Submissions (paragraph 45d) and REF 2019/03 Guidance on Codes of Practice. It is intended to provide a clear, consistent and appropriate basis for preparing our submissions to the REF.

### General Principles

The Code of Practice is not only a REF requirement; it also relates to our mission and vision to embed equality and diversity in our academic environment and our agenda to decolonize all modes of knowledge acquisition and transfer, as well as our deeply-felt wish to prohibit any form of discrimination against members of staff with protected characteristics. In this context, we wish to make it clear that we are committed to supporting our fixed-term and part-time staff in the same manner as our full-time staff. The policies, processes and procedures set out in this code will apply to all eligible staff whether employed on full-time or part-time or fixed-term or open-ended contracts.

Our key objective for REF 2021 is to maximise our performance in each submitted unit of assessment, but we will ensure that sound consideration is given to equality and diversity issues in order to promote equality, comply with legislation and avoid discrimination whilst maintaining the excellent quality of the School’s submission. Final decisions will not be taken into account in relation to any promotion, progression, extension of contract or performance management procedures.

SOAS intends to submit to REF 2021 all Category A eligible staff, which means
we are not required to develop and document criteria and processes for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research. Category A eligible staff are defined in REF 2018/01 Guidance on Submissions (paragraph 117) as “Academic staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater, on the payroll of the submitting institution on the census date (31 July 2020), whose primary employment function is to undertake either ‘research only’ or ‘teaching and research’. Staff should have a substantive research connection with the submitting unit. Staff on ‘research only’ contracts should meet the definition of an independent researcher.”

We are however required to develop, document and apply a code of practice on determining who is an independent researcher and the selection of outputs in our REF submissions (REF 2019/03 Guidance on Codes of Practice [paragraph 2]).

This Code explains how decisions will be taken within the School and how measures have been set in place to take account of the effect of individuals’ circumstances on research productivity during the assessment period. These measures, with an appropriate degree of confidentiality, will allow an individual to be returned without the required minimum of one output without penalty in the assessment, where the circumstances are deemed to have had an exceptional effect on productivity.

The REF process is subject to the requirements of General Data Protection Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and the Data Protection Act 2018. One copy of the submission will be retained permanently in the School's archives. Personal data will be retained until the end of the assessment period and will be destroyed in December 2021.

There has been wide consultation on the code. Staff Groups including the Women’s Network, BME Network and the School’s Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team (SAT), Trade Unions and all academic and research staff have been invited to comment on the Code.

The Code will be considered by the following institutional Boards and Committees:

- REF Steering Group (22 March 2019)
- Equality and Diversity Committee (9 May 2019)
- Research and Enterprise Committee (14 May 2019)
- Academic Board (13 March 2019)
- Executive Board (11 March 2019 and 3 June 2019).

It will be approved by the Executive Board of the School and a copy of the Code will be made available on the School’s external website and intranet.

How the code relates to broader institutional policies / strategies that promote and support E&D.

1. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Overview
The principle of valuing Equality, Diversity and Inclusion at SOAS is evidenced by the fact that this is enshrined in our values. The School has an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy, which impacts on all areas of our work, and we are working towards continually building an approach that enables and ensures that considerations of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion are embedded in all our activities, be they for students, staff or external suppliers.

The strategy covers three domains which are:

- The recruitment and teaching of diverse students
- Becoming an employer of choice
- Delivering inclusive central and professional services

The principles behind the strategy are to ensure that our approach goes beyond merely meeting our statutory and regulatory requirements under the Equality Act 2010. We want to ensure that through having an approach that encompasses all our activities, we can develop and continue to strengthen a culture in the School where considerations of Equality and Diversity are “an integral part of the way that we do things here”.

The full time EDI Manager was appointed in August 2017. This post is based in our Legal and Governance Team within the Directorate, and as such, it is at the heart of the School. In addition to this role, there is a part time HR Equality and Diversity Advisor (0.6 FTE), and a part-time diversity data analyst (0.4 FTE).

2. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee
Since January 2019, the Chair of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee is the Pro–Director for Research and Enterprise. The Committee membership comprises representation from key decision makers in relation to the action plan, the Research Excellence Manager, the Chair of the Athena SWAN Self-Assessment Team, and representatives from the Trades Unions. The Committee meets on a termly basis, primarily (though not exclusively) to monitor and review progress against the School’s EDI action plan. The Committee reports to the Board of Trustees.

Other key areas of Equality, Diversity and Equality work that has priority at the School include the following:

(i) Athena SWAN.

SOAS was awarded a Gender Equality Charter Mark (Bronze) in September 2014, which was converted to an Athena SWAN (AS) bronze award in May 2015. The School is committed to the principles of the Athena SWAN Charter and we will be entering a submission for renewal of our institutional Bronze award in April 2019. Our Director, Baroness Amos, is the Athena SWAN Champion, which is further evidence of our commitment to the principles of the charter. The Self – Assessment Team (SAT) is chaired by Gina Heathcote, Reader in Gender Studies and International Law (who is also a member of the REF Equality, Diversity and Inclusion [EDI] working group, as well as being a member of the EDI Committee). The Self–Assessment Team membership comprises representatives from all areas of the School, and is balanced in terms of gender and academic and professional services.
Specifically in relation to the overlap of Athena SWAN and the REF, some examples from our Athena Swan submission include the following:

(a) Supporting and Advancing Women’s Careers (Section 5 of Athena SWAN Submission.)
Our data shows that our performance has improved in relation to applications from, interview for and appointments of female identifying candidates. This increase correlates to our concerted focus on:
- Introducing Unconscious Bias training
- Instigation of compulsory training for anyone who is required to take part in recruitment and selection
- From 2016 a policy about gender representation on interview panels was adopted
- In 2017 the Recruitment and Selection training was reviewed, to coincide with the release of the updated curriculum for the commencement of the 2018/19 academic session.
- Whilst these outcomes are encouraging, we are interested in the next level of quality outcomes and in focusing on intersectional aspects going forward.

(b) Induction
For early career researchers, SOAS provides a three–year probation period where staff are supported in the development of their career via a reduced teaching load (50% in year 1, 67% in year 2) and two terms of internally funded research leave on successfully completing probation. All academic probationers have a mentor for the period of probation and with the new mentoring scheme (PAGE X) mentoring is also provided to staff after probation. Review meetings are scheduled after 9 months, 21 months and 30 months after commencing their appointments.

(c) Promotion
The overall data for the assessment period of our submission showed that there were tangible improved outcomes connected to key changes in practice, including the re- modelling of promotions panel, re- design of promotion application process, and ‘Promotion Done Better’ meetings to all staff leading up to key deadlines.

(d) Staff submitted to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) by gender
All eligible staff are to be submitted to REF 2021. In both the 2008 and 2014 RAE / REF clear gender imbalances in submissions were evident (Table 5.2). The decision was taken early on to submit all eligible staff to REF 2021 and to ensure an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion process was inbuilt through training for departmental and institutional REF leads, as well as support with the provision of research mentors to members of staff. The SAT regards this as fundamental to moving beyond the figures to build a culture of inclusion and the process of the delivery, support and monitoring of mentoring for research informs our key objective to address the reward and recognition of female professors, and BME women in particular. Through promoting the progression of women professors, a range of other concerns raised in the assessment process are also likely to be addressed, including women’s inclusion as Head of Departments, mentoring and role models in the institution for diversity colleagues, and further reduction of the pay gap.” In essence, this is about us looking at every possible way that we can to begin
to develop the diversification of our talent pipelines going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RAE 2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>REF 2014</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Population (no.)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted (no.)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Excluded</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Attainment Gap

Our focus on reducing the racialised attainment gap is divided into two parts – at a national level and internal to SOAS as follows:

National

At a national level, Baroness Amos has led an enquiry as a joint project with the NUS and Universities UUK. This has involved the development and roll out of a survey, together with an analysis of responses. This has been supported by six regional focus groups, which were attended by students, as well as Heads of Institutions. There was also a virtual Vice Chancellors group. The aim of this enquiry was to develop and disseminate a better understanding of the key reasons for this disparity, with an emphasis on sharing best practice examples (and examples of approaches that have not worked). At the time of writing this submission, the report is being finalised and is due to be published.

Internal

SOAS is committed to reducing inequality of academic outcomes on the basis of race. Therefore, we have established a working group to ensure that our understanding and approach remains a priority. This group is chaired by a Senior Lecturer (reporting to our Pro – Director, Learning and Teaching.) From an analysis of outcome data, we have determined to focus on a number of programmes for improvement. Actions to deliver these outcomes include the delivery of bespoke face to face workshops for all staff on unconscious bias, mentoring, and further development of our approach to inclusive learning and teaching.

(iii) Culture@SOAS

We have very recently developed a programme of work aimed at bringing about transformational change at SOAS. This is so that we ensure we continue to improve the culture and environment at the School, where everyone feels valued, respected and included. To this end, we have launched a Culture Survey. Since August 2018, we have developed a Dignity@SOAS policy, aimed at addressing all forms of unwanted behaviour. We have implemented an anonymous reporting tool (Report and Support) to enable confidential reporting of unwanted behaviour. We have
trained a number of Dignity Advisors who can act as a first point of contact and ensure that students and staff are offered the right support in a timely way. We have undertaken a review of our case management procedures. Additional work of this group will include amongst other things, a review of the SOAS values (in readiness for the review of our Corporate Strategy), a systematic review of relevant policies, and a review of our staff development (appraisal) processes.

(iv) Key Policies

Dignity@SOAS Policy
Gender Reassignment and Trans Equality Policy

(v) Key EDI Training

Equality and Diversity training is mandatory for all new staff. Unconscious Bias training is also offered, which is made mandatory for those sitting on selection panels.

An update of actions taken since REF 2014

REF Working Group on Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion

In 2016 the REF Steering Group approved the creation of a REF Working Group on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. The Group is supporting the development of this Code of Practice for REF2021. The Group is responsible for ensuring all REF processes are fair, transparent and lawful, and in compliance with REF requirements.

Mentoring

We have examined our policies and practices relating to the mentoring of staff on research matters, one of the actions in our REF 2014 EIA, which has led to the approval of a new Mentoring Policy for researchers which puts in place a significantly strengthened mentoring and career development structure for early career researchers.

Enhanced Mentoring Guidance circulated to Departments in 2017 has been reviewed and incorporated into the new Mentoring Policy alongside a revised Staff Development Review (SDR) process. The revised process is an evidence-based approach to appraisal that focuses on development, support and instituting a “coach approach” rather than a target-based or accounting model of annual review. The updated Personal Research Plan focuses on putting in place a stronger mentoring and career development structure for early career researchers, including research-active senior teaching fellows. It provides a tool for self-assessment and development, and will feed into the SDR and serve as a basis for meetings with Research Coordinators and research mentors.

The aim of the scheme is to contribute to developing an enabling environment for early career researchers with a view to supporting their professional development and their contribution to the School’s overall mission and purpose. Specifically, it aims to support researchers to produce their best possible work, to have the greatest
possible impact and to generate the funding that can sustain and expand the originality, significance and reach of their research.

The new Mentoring Policy will also support the School’s implementation of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Early Career Researchers.

Collection and Management of REF Data

We have also significantly developed our systems for the collection and management of REF data, another action in our REF 2014 EIA. Dedicated posts to support this work have been created within HR and the Research and Enterprise Office and data relating to staff and outputs is now collated in confidential spreadsheets in the School’s intranet, with access strictly limited to only those staff who need it. Staff in HR and REO liaise monthly to ensure the information on staff is up-to-date. This has meant that issues can be identified and rectified quickly; for example, any members of staff who need additional support are provided with appropriate mentoring and assistance at an early stage.

How the institution is addressing the principles of Transparency, Consistency, Accountability, and Inclusivity in demonstrating fairness (see paragraph 37).

Transparency:

All processes will be transparent. This Code will be made available and publicised to all staff. In addition to our communication plan for disseminating this code (PAGE X), the following actions have been taken:

❖ Personal emails have been sent to all Category A eligible staff explaining the REF processes at SOAS and where to seek advice and help (December 2017 and 2018 - to be repeated in December 2019).
❖ Personal emails are sent to all new Category A eligible staff within a month of their arrival, explaining the School’s REF processes, what they are required to do, and where to seek advice and help.
❖ Information about REF 2021 and the School’s processes is provided on the School’s intranet and on its external website.
❖ Information and updates on REF 2021 are disseminated regularly in the School’s monthly “Research Excellence” newsletters and in the School’s weekly e-bulletin to all staff.
❖ REF information sessions open to all staff have been provided as part of the School’s annual Research Development Workshop series since 2015.
❖ Information about the School’s REF processes, and the help available, is disseminated regularly at Departmental meetings. In addition, all departments organise annual Research Away Days, during which REF-related issues are discussed.

Consistency:

The policies and processes for determining independence, the selection of outputs, consideration of staff circumstances and appeals will be implemented
uniformly across the School. All Units of Assessment have similar criteria for the selection of outputs via internal and external peer review processes (PAGE X).

Accountability:

Responsibilities will be clearly defined, and the individuals and bodies involved in REF processes will be identified by role. Operating criteria and terms of reference for individuals, committees, advisory groups and any other bodies involved will be made readily available to all the individuals and groups concerned. We have put in place a REF Equality Diversity and Inclusion Working Group to ensure that Equality and Diversity matters are taken into consideration in our REF processes.

Inclusivity:

Our code will promote an inclusive environment. Diversity has been and will continue to be taken into account in the composition and working practices of committees, advisory groups and any other bodies involved. This inclusive environment will enable us to identify the excellent research produced by staff across all protected groups.

Reference to these principles should also be made, as appropriate, in completing the sections below.

How the code is being communicated to staff across the institution (including to those on leave of absence), through various mechanisms and channels, including the staff intranet

In accordance with the principle of transparency, the code will be communicated to staff as follows:

❖ The code will be made public in an easily accessible format on the School's intranet.
❖ Electronic copies will be sent to all academic staff via email and hard copies will be available on request.
❖ Hard copies will be posted to staff absent from work.
❖ The code will be publicised regularly in the School’s weekly e-bulletin;
❖ It will be officially launched at an internal REF Q&A event in June 2019, which will be repeated in October 2019.
❖ After distribution the School’s Research Excellence Manager will attend departmental meetings to lead Q&A sessions specifically on the Code.
❖ The Code will be made available on the School's external website when approved by Research England.

Part 2: identifying staff with significant responsibility for research

Part 2 need only be completed where the institution will not be submitting 100% of Category A eligible staff in one or more UOA.

NOTE: SOAS DOES NOT NEED TO COMPLETE PART 2
**Part 3: Determining research independence**

*Policies and Procedures - Criteria used for determining staff who meet the definition of an independent researcher, including information about how the criteria are being applied; how decisions are being made and communicated to staff, including timescale; codes of practice should describe stages of approval (diagrams, schematics and timelines might be included as an aid).*

Staff, Committees and Training - Procedures for identifying designated staff and committees/panels responsible for determining research independence (distinguishing between those with advisory and those with decision making roles); information provided should include role descriptions for individuals and terms of reference for committees/panels, modes of operation, and record-keeping procedures, as well as information about where these roles/committees/panels fit into the wider institutional management structure; details of training provided to individuals and committees involved in identifying staff; the timescale for delivery and content (including how it has been tailored to the REF).

Appeals - How the appeals process has been communicated to staff; details of the process, including how cases are submitted, eligible grounds for appeal; details of those involved in hearing any appeals (demonstrating their independence from earlier decision processes), timescales and how decisions are being communicated to staff.

Equality impact assessment - How an EIA has been used to inform the identification of staff and make final decisions.

**Policies and procedures** (see paragraph 40).

**Criteria used for determining staff who meet the definition of an independent researcher, including information about how the criteria are being applied.**

As a small, specialist institution focused on the arts, humanities and social sciences the School has a relatively small number of staff (c.60) who may be defined as independent researchers.

The School’s approach to determining independence will be applied consistently across the School and is based on REF 2018/01 Guidance on Submissions (paragraphs 128-134).

The School’s definition of research independence for the purposes of the REF is “an individual who undertakes self-directed research, rather than carrying out another individual’s research programme”.

Indicators of independence include:

- Leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on an externally funded research project.
- Holding an independently won, competitively awarded fellowship where
research independence is a requirement - the list of independent fellowships published by the funding bodies will be made available to staff accompanied by an explanation that this is illustrative only, and that other fellowships will be considered.

❖ Leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package.
❖ Being named as a co-investigator on an externally funded research grant/award.
❖ Having significant input into the design, conduct and interpretation of the research.

The School takes the view that:

❖ Each indicator may not individually demonstrate independence and where appropriate multiple factors will be taken into consideration.
❖ A member of staff is not deemed to have undertaken independent research purely on the basis that they are named on one or more research outputs.

How decisions are being made and communicated to staff, including timescale.

The School considers that all members of staff employed on academic (teaching and research) contracts are independent researchers.

The School considers that the following members of staff employed on research contracts do not usually meet the definition of independence:

❖ Staff employed to carry out another individual’s research programme. Such staff may be called Research Assistants, Postdoctoral Research Assistants, Postdoctoral Researchers, Research Associates, or may have a different title.

The School considers that the following members of staff employed on research contracts do meet the definition of independence:

❖ Staff who have acted or are acting or who will act as Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator on externally funded research projects between 1 January 2014 and 31 December 2020.
❖ Staff who have held or hold or who will hold a fellowship on the illustrative list of fellowships between 1 January 2014 and 31 December 2020.

Members of staff employed on research-only contracts who do not meet these two indicators of independence will be invited to make a case that they meet the definition of independence.

In addition to communicating the Code of Practice as described in Part 1, in accordance with the principle of transparency, the School’s approach to determining research independence for the purposes of REF will be communicated in the following ways:

❖ By personal email to staff employed on research only contracts as explained on Page X.
❖ Information will be provided on the School’s intranet and external website.
❖ Information will be disseminated in the School’s weekly e-bulletin to all
At the School’s termly lunches for early career researchers facilitated by staff development. All staff employed on research only contracts are invited to these workshops. The information was first disseminated at the workshop held on 13 March 2019, and it will be repeated at the workshop in Term 1 of 2019/20.

Codes of practice should describe stages of approval (diagrams, schematics & timelines might be included as an aid).

Members of staff employed as Research Assistants, Postdoctoral Research Assistants, Postdoctoral Researchers or Research Associates will be informed by personal email in June 2019 that the School does not consider them to be independent researchers for the purposes of REF. New members of staff in this category who commence employment between 1 July 2019 and 31 July 2020 will be informed by email within one month of commencing employment that the School does not consider them to be independent. They will be invited to make a case for independence, should they disagree with this decision.

Members of staff employed on research contracts who clearly meet the two indicators of independence stated on Page X will be informed by personal email in June 2019 that the School considers them to be independent researchers for the purposes of REF. New members of staff in this category who commence employment between 1 July 2019 and 31 July 2020 will be informed by personal email within one month of commencing employment that the School considers them to be independent. All such staff will be advised where to find further information about the School’s policies and processes for REF 2021.

All members of staff on research-only contracts who do not meet the two indicators of independence stated on Page X will be invited to submit a case for independence. A form will be provided for this purpose. Applicants will be asked to explain how they meet the definition, and to provide evidence of meeting one or more indicators of independence. Initially there will be two deadlines for applications: 1 September 2019 and 1 December 2019. There will be one further deadline of 1 September 2020 for any new members of staff who commence employment between 1 December 2019 and 31 July 2020. Applications will be considered by the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group.

If required, the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group will consult with Heads of Departments who will have an advisory role. Staff will be advised by personal email about the outcome of their application within two weeks of the Group’s meeting and will be provided with information about the appeals process, should they disagree with the outcome.

The REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group will review applications against the list of staff on research-only contracts, and where deemed appropriate, will contact staff who have not submitted applications to encourage them to apply.

APPENDIX – FLOW CHART

Staff, Committees and Training (see paragraphs 44 to 48)

Procedures for identifying designated staff and committees/panels
responsible for determining research independence (distinguishing between those with advisory and those with decision-making roles).

All applications for independence will be considered by the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group. This will be a decision-making group. If deemed necessary, Heads of Departments will be consulted, who will have an advisory role.

Information provided should include role descriptions for individuals and terms of reference for committees/panels, modes of operation, and record-keeping procedures, as well as information about where these roles/committees/panels fit into the wider institutional management structure.

Careful consideration has been given to the membership of the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group, to adhere to the key principle of inclusivity, and to ensure appropriate knowledge and representation. It will be chaired by the Pro-Director (International) with representation from HR, the School's academic lead for Athena Swan, a senior academic and an early career researcher. Staff will be advised to submit applications to a mailbox which will be monitored by HR. Information relating to applications, including outcomes, will be stored securely in a password protected database maintained by the Clerk to the Group and to which only the Group will have access.

The Group will meet three times: in October 2019; mid-December or early January 2020 and September 2020. The Group will report to the REF Strategy Group. The Terms of Reference of the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group will be made available to all staff, in accordance with accountability and transparency principles.

APPENDIX with ToR and diagram of management structure

Details of training provided to individuals and committees involved in identifying staff, the timescale for delivery and content (including how it has been tailored to the REF).

Training will be facilitated by the School’s Equality and Diversity Adviser and the School’s Research Excellence Manager and will be provided to all members of decision-making bodies including the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group, the REF Appeals Panel and the REF Strategy Group. All members will be required to attend. This will be scheduled to take place at least twice between June and September 2019 (before the first meeting of the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group), and will be repeated as needed in order to ensure that all members attend. Staff in advisory roles will be invited to attend this training. On-line training will also be developed and made available which staff in advisory roles will be required to complete if they are unable to attend the scheduled workshops. Attendance and completion will be carefully monitored. Training will also be offered to other staff, for example, staff may wish to gain better understanding of the staff circumstances processes, and how to apply.
The training will be tailored to REF 2021, and will include information about the purpose and context of REF 2021; the interaction between equality and quality; an overview of equality and diversity law and SOAS’ and the funding bodies obligations under the law; the issues and changes to be aware of since REF 2014; the School’s policies, procedures and processes for REF 2021 with particular reference to the criteria for determining independence, the selection of outputs and staff circumstances, and the implications for staff with responsibility for making decisions. It will also incorporate unconscious bias training appropriate to the REF. The training will be interactive, with exercises incorporated.

Appeals (see paragraphs 75 to 78).

How the appeals process has been communicated to staff.

For transparency, the appeals process will be communicated to staff in the same way as the Code, as set out on page X. The reasons behind decisions will be communicated by personal email to the individual concerned within 2 weeks of the meeting of the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group. Members of staff whose application for independence is rejected will be provided with information about the appeals process at the same time.

Details of the process, including how cases are submitted, eligible grounds for appeal.

Staff will be advised to submit written appeals to a mailbox which will be monitored by HR. Information relating to applications, including outcomes, will be stored securely in a password protected database to which only the Clerk to the Appeals Panel and members of the Appeals Panel will have access. Eligible grounds for appeal will be: a) that a member of staff has either been included, or excluded, contrary to the stated criteria; and/or b) that due process has not been followed.

Details of those involved in hearing any appeals (demonstrating their independence from earlier decision processes), timescales and how decisions are being communicated to staff.

The REF Appeals Panel will convene in February and October 2020. Again, careful consideration has been given to membership to ensure appropriate representation, inclusivity and independence. This panel will be chaired by the Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) with representation from HR and the School’s Diversity and Inclusion Manager. The members of the panel will all be completely independent of any earlier decision processes. The Appeals Panel will report to the REF Strategy Group. The first deadline for appeals will be 1 February 2020 and the final deadline for appeals will be 31 August 2020. The reasons behind final decisions will be communicated by personal email to the individual concerned within two weeks of the panel meeting. The Terms of Reference of the Appeals Panel will be made available to all staff, in accordance with accountability and transparency principles.

APPENDIX- TOR for Appeals Panel
Equality impact assessment (see paragraphs 59 to 72).

How an equality impact assessment has been used to inform the identification of staff and make final decisions.

The School will conduct an interim EIA in April-May 2020 on those staff expected to be employed on research-only contracts on the REF census date of 31 July 2020. The EIA will compare the characteristics of those staff deemed to be independent against the characteristics of those staff deemed not to be independent. Should the outcomes show under-representation of staff with protected characteristics in the independent group, we will review the process used and consider if any changes should be made. This EIA will be conducted again in September 2020, and if the final outcomes still give cause for concern the matter will be referred to the School's Research and Enterprise Committee and Equality and Diversity Committee, and any agreed actions will be reflected in the institutional Environment Statement. The EIA will be a living document which will be updated over time and linked to future actions. We will adhere to best practice in conducting the EIA. It will be conducted by a team with knowledge of both equality and research assessment, and we will engage, consult and/or involve staff from protected groups to inform our EIA.

Part 4: Selection of outputs

Codes should address the following:

Policies and procedures (see paragraph 40).

- Details of procedures that have been developed to ensure the fair and transparent selection of outputs, including the HEI’s approach to submitting outputs by former staff, including those made redundant

- Information should be provided about how processes for selecting outputs have been developed and the rationale for adopted methods.

- Codes of practice should describe stages of approval (diagrams, schematics & timelines might be included as an aid).

Staff, committees and training (see paragraphs 44 to 48).

(Where such staff and committees are the same as those outlined in Parts 2 or 3, institutions can cross-refer to that section)

- Procedures for identifying designated staff and committees / panels responsible for selecting outputs (distinguishing between those with advisory and those with decision making roles).

- Information provided should include role descriptions for individuals and terms of reference for committees / panels, modes of operation, and record-keeping procedures, as well as information about where these roles / committees / panels fit into the wider institutional management structure.
- Details of training provided to individuals and committees involved in the output selection process, the timescale for delivery, and content (including how it has been tailored to REF).

### Staff Circumstances (see paragraphs 49 to 56)

- Procedures for taking into account staff whose circumstances have affected their ability to research productively throughout the period in relation to the unit’s total output requirement.

- Procedures for taking into account the effect of circumstances that have had an exceptional effect on the ability of an individual staff member to research productively throughout the period so that they do not have the required minimum of one output.

- For both of the above cases, procedures for:
  - staff to declare voluntarily circumstances in a confidential manner
  - units to adjust expectations about staff contribution to the output pool, as appropriate.

### Policies and procedures (see paragraph 40).

**Details of procedures that have been developed to ensure the fair and transparent selection of outputs, including the HEI’s approach to submitting outputs by former staff, including those made redundant**

Assessments of the quality of outputs are being conducted on an on-going basis. Assessments commenced in January 2017 and will conclude in May 2020. Outputs are being evaluated by reference to the published REF criteria of originality, significance and rigour. Granular scoring is being applied and outputs are being evaluated by internal and external assessors. All assessors are selected on the basis of relevant expertise and experience.

*Add something about feedback here.*

The School does not expect that all eligible staff members will contribute equally to the volume of outputs in the submission pool and this has been and will continue to be made clear to staff. Our Academic Performance Framework states that the reasonable expectation is ‘regular publication of research work…with appropriate allowance for periods of absence’.

**Information should be provided about how processes for selecting outputs have been developed and the rationale for adopted methods.**

The School took a strategic decision early in this REF cycle to conduct regular reviews of outputs rather than formal ‘mock’ exercises, with a view to reducing the pressure on staff that was likely to be incurred with scheduled formal mock exercises. It was also anticipated that ongoing reviews would enable the School to identify staff members at an early stage who might need additional support, and this has indeed been the case. The support measures provided have been discussed with individuals and tailored to their specific requirements, and include
the granting of research leave and provision of mentoring.

Two selection criteria will thus inform the approach adopted. The primary criterion will be the quality of the outputs. The secondary selection criterion will be the representativeness of protected characteristics of staff in the submission.

We believe that the granular way in which we have gathered information and data on outputs will allow us to build quality submissions by attributing a single output to each individual in such a way as to maximise the overall quality profile, followed by the best of the remaining outputs in the output pool. Our secondary selection criterion will be the representativeness of protected characteristics of staff in the submission. The interim EIAs will provide information and data sufficient to ensure that equality issues are carefully considered, and changes made where deemed appropriate.

We are also confident that the division of responsibilities between the Unit Panels (advisory) and the REF Strategy Group (decision-making) will result in a fair process for the selection of outputs.

We will ensure that final decisions about the selected outputs are communicated to staff by personal email to ensure transparency. Staff will be advised which outputs on which they are named as an author or co-author will be submitted.

**Codes of practice should describe stages of approval (diagrams, schematics & timelines might be included as an aid).**

The approach adopted for the selection of outputs has been/ will be as follows:

a) Staff have been asked to flag all of their personal outputs that they deem to qualify for the REF, and in many cases have been asked to provide an indicative score.

b) Those outputs are then reviewed by an internal review panel with input from external advisors.

c) An indicative list will be drawn up that includes the best single output from each member of staff. [?? Consultation with member of staff concerned?]

d) The ‘balance’ of outputs for each UoA will then be selected from a graded list to produce a preliminary list of outputs.

e) The preliminary list of outputs will then be subject to an EIA and reviewed accordingly

Internal Panels are being formed for each of the 11 Units of Assessment to which the School will be submitting in REF 2021. A multiple submission will be requested in one case, which means there will be 12 UoA panels.

Between January-March 2020 the internal panels will produce ranked ordered lists of outputs on the basis of quality. Outputs by former staff will be considered using the same criteria. The School will consider outputs
authored by staff who have left the School voluntarily, including those who have opted for voluntary severance, and outputs authored by any staff who may have deceased, but we will not include single-authored outputs from staff who have been made compulsorily redundant.

In April-May 2020 EIAs will be conducted on the UoA output lists, following which the internal panels will be invited to review the data, consider any implications, and decide whether any adjustments should be made to the lists.

In July 2020 Panels will refer their finalised lists to the REF Strategy Group which will make the final decision about which outputs should be submitted by October 2020.

For transparency, all members of staff will be advised by personal email which of their outputs on which they are named as an author or co-author will be included in the final submission.

APPENDIX FOR PROCESS

Staff, committees and training (see paragraphs 44 to 48). (Where such staff and committees are the same as those outlined in Parts 2 or 3, institutions can cross-reference to that section)

Procedures for identifying designated staff and committees / panels responsible for selecting outputs (distinguishing between those with advisory and those with decision making roles).

The internal panels in each of our UoAs will be chaired by one of our two Outputs Co-Directors to ensure consistency, and each will be comprised of the following members, with due regard paid to representation to adhere to the key principle of inclusivity, and to ensure appropriate knowledge and representation:

the Unit’s REF/Research Coordinators; at least one early career researcher and at least one senior, research-experienced academic.

These Panels will have an advisory role with regard to the selection of outputs.

Final decisions about the outputs to be submitted will be taken by the REF Strategy Group. This Group is chaired by the School’s Pro-Director for Research and Enterprise. A call for nominations has been issued, following which members will be selected on the basis of their interest and research experience, with careful consideration given to the overall membership to ensure inclusivity.

Information provided should include role descriptions for individuals and terms of reference for committees / panels, modes of operation, and record-keeping procedures, as well as information about where these roles / committees / panels fit into the wider institutional management structure.
Our UoA Panels are responsible for the initial selection of outputs, for ensuring that outcomes arising from the EIAs are taken into consideration, and for producing recommendations about which outputs should be submitted. The UoA Panels report to the REF Strategy Group. Formal meetings will be scheduled for the Panels, chaired by one of our two Output Co-Directors. A clerk will be appointed to each Panel to service meetings. Confidential records will be password protected.

Our REF Strategy Group is responsible for the final selection of outputs. It reports to the School’s Research and Enterprise Committee. The REF Strategy Group will be serviced by the School’s Research Excellence Manager and formal meetings will be scheduled. Confidential records will be password protected.

APPENDIX with TOR for UoA Panels and REF Strategy Group and DIAGRAM of Committee Structure

Details of training provided to individuals and committees involved in the output selection process, the timescale for delivery, and content (including how it has been tailored to REF).

See the section on training (PAGE X).

Staff Circumstances (see paragraphs 49 to 56)

Procedures for taking into account staff whose circumstances have affected their ability to research productively throughout the period in relation to the unit’s total output requirement.

We are putting in place supportive procedures to enable eligible staff members to declare voluntarily their individual circumstances and have the impact of those circumstances reflected in our expectations of their contribution to the output pool. Staff will be advised of the exceptional circumstances which will allow an individual to be returned without the required minimum of one output without penalty in the assessment.

These procedures will ensure that staff are aware of the applicable circumstances, the cumulative effect of staff circumstances, and the adjustments to which they are entitled, although it should be noted (as previously stated) that the School does not expect all eligible staff members to contribute equally to the volume of outputs in the submission pool. We fully appreciate that there may be many reasons why staff may have varying numbers of outputs.

Information about the processes for declaring staff circumstances will be widely communicated using the staff intranet, SOAS staff bulletins, and by email to all eligible staff to ensure transparency.

Eligible staff circumstances include:

- Qualifying as an Early Career Researcher (ECR). *(The REF definition of an ECR is a member of staff who meets the definition of Category A eligible on the census date who started their career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2016)*
• Absence from work due to secondments or career breaks outside the HE sector
• Qualifying periods of family-related leave
• Circumstances with an equivalent effect to absence, that require a judgement about the appropriate reduction in outputs, which are:
  o Disability (the definition of disability includes physical and mental impairments which have “a substantial and long-term adverse effect on ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities”. Long term impairments include those that last or are likely to last for at least 12 months).
  o Ill health, injury, or mental health conditions
  o Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, paternity, adoption or childcare
  o Other caring responsibilities (such as caring for an elderly or disabled family member)
  o Gender reassignment
  o Other circumstances relating to the protected characteristics described in the Equality Act 2010.

All eligible staff will be invited to complete a form about their circumstances. In order to ensure the appropriate level of confidentiality and consistency, the process will be managed centrally. Staff will be advised that no information will be passed to other departments without their express permission.

Initially there will be two deadlines for applications: 1 September 2019 and 1 December 2019. Applications will be considered by the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group (PAGE X). There will be one further deadline of 1 September 2020 for any new members of staff who commence employment between 1 December 2019 and 31 July 2020.

Staff who wish to submit applications will be advised to email their forms to a mailbox which will be monitored by HR. Information relating to applications, including outcomes, will be stored securely in a password protected database maintained by the Clerk to the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group and to which only the Group will have access. The Group will meet three times to consider applications and agree outcomes: in October 2019; mid-December or early January 2020 and September 2020. The Group will report decisions to the REF Strategy Group, excluding confidential data. Staff will be advised by personal email about the outcome of their application within two weeks of the Group’s meeting and will be provided with information about the appeals process, should they disagree with the outcome.

Reductions arising from the circumstances of individual staff will be determined according to the tables and guidance in Guidance on Submissions (Annex L) and applied to the individuals concerned.

A decision about whether to submit reduction requests to EDAP will be made on a Unit-by-Unit basis. Several of our Units have FTE of less than 20, and therefore the cumulative effect of staff circumstances may have a disproportionate effect on those output pools. We will take into consideration the proportion of staff who have had circumstances over the REF period, and the size of the available pool from which selection will be made in terms of its proximity to the total number of outputs required.
Procedures for taking into account the effect of circumstances that have had an exceptional effect on the ability of an individual staff member to research productively throughout the period so that they do not have the required minimum of one output.

The procedures described above will also be used to enable eligible staff members to declare voluntarily individual circumstances which they feel have had an exceptional effect on their ability to research productively such that they do not have the required minimum of one output.

Exceptional staff circumstances include but are not limited to:

- an overall period of 46 months or more absence from research during the assessment period, due to one of more of the circumstances set out above
- circumstances equivalent to 46 months or more absence from research, where circumstances set out above (such as mental health issues, caring responsibility, long-term health conditions)
- two or more qualifying periods of family-related leave.

Consideration will also be given to cases where the individual’s circumstances are deemed to have resulted in a similar impact (including where there is a combination of circumstances).

Where such applications are approved by the REF Independence and Staff Circumstances Group, individuals will be informed by personal email, and the School will submit requests for these reductions to EDAP in accordance with the instructions in Guidance on Submissions (Paragraphs 180-182).

For both of the above cases, procedures for:
- staff to declare voluntarily circumstances in a confidential manner
- units to adjust expectations about staff contribution to the output pool, as appropriate.

ADD SOMETHING HERE ABOUT APPEALS (PROCESS WILL BE THE SAME AS FOR INDEPENDENCE APPEALS).

Appendix for process.

Equality impact assessment (see paragraphs 59 to 72).

How an equality impact assessment on the spread of outputs across staff (in relation to their protected characteristics) has been used to inform the final selection of outputs to be submitted.

The School will conduct interim EIAs in April-May 2020 on the provisional lists of outputs for submission. The EIAs will consider the distribution of the outputs pool for each UoA, and will compare the proportion of outputs from staff with protected characteristics in the context of the whole pool. UoA Panels will be responsible for considering the information in the EIAs and deciding if any changes should be made if the outcomes show under-representation of outputs from staff with protected characteristics. If the final outcomes still give cause for concern the issue will be referred to the School’s Research and Enterprise Committee and Equality and Diversity Committee for action, and any agreed
actions will be reflected in the institutional Environment Statement. The EIA will be a living document which will be updated over time and linked to future actions. We will adhere to best practice in conducting the EIA. It will be conducted by a team with knowledge of both equality and research assessment, and we will engage, consult and/or involve staff from protected groups to inform our EIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 5: Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attach any relevant appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound post award processes established; improved initiation, management and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment and Processes to Increase Efficiency of Research Support and Administration to Maximize Research Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-down of Collaborative Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Appropriately Negotiated and Put in Place in a Timely Fashion with Risks Fully Considered and Managed</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intranet (MySOAS) and internet content revised/improved to meet information/training needs of SOAS researchers | **Amber** Pre-award, scholarly communications and REF information currently available. Enterprise work affected by vacancies. Content to be signed off by end of Oct. 2018. Post-Award processes and procedures clarifying responsibilities of PIs and HoDs are under development - expected by April 2019 | 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 staffing constraints. Successful Bid library has been launched. | December 2019
<p>| | | Deadline extended to May 2019 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Professional</td>
<td>Updated</td>
<td>Pages being gradually updated by various teams in REO. Focused work on the structure and content of the Research and Enterprise web pages is being undertaken by the Research Funding Officer and REO Admin Assistant.</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>Amber</td>
<td>Information currently held by departmental administrators; outputs of research leave not consistently captured. Work is being undertaken to re-design individual research plans and SDRs which will help with defining research objectives, outputs, and outcomes.</td>
<td>March 2019</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>Red</td>
<td>Worktribe Pre-Award module embedded. Trial of VV Impact Tracker Tool scheduled summer 2018. Agreed to postpone decisions on new purchases due to School’s budget position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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. Impact repository in MySOAS continues to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced contracts and post award systems in place</td>
<td><strong>Red</strong></td>
<td>Improvements on contracts with joined up spreadsheets; dependency on resource availability for further system improvements; external research finance review completed; implementation of recommendations started Post-Award and Contracts joint procedures still to be discussed and agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>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. The central contracts function is likely to move to Legal &amp; Governance. Any further work in this area is on hold until the final consultation for OPS is announced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidding for research funding directed towards global challenges, building on our unique regional and global research portfolio and strengths</td>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Sound post award processes established; improved initiation, management and close-down of collaborative grants External research finance review completed Post-Award processes and procedures - These do not only rely on REO but Finance, HR and Payroll teams. The report with some actions points has been produced. A few points need to be actioned by the Director or Research and one point with the REO Finance Manager Work has started, and current REO Finance Manager has fully engaged with other teams, but due to the OPS restructure this might now take longer than expected and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| maintained and is adequate. Discussions with IT ongoing to develop automated reports for Research. |
| 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 |
| May 2019 | July 2019 (earliest) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes have been improved. However, due to time and resources constraints, this has not been written into policies/procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant budgets more effectively used for strategically important support roles eg Research Data Management, Impact and Engagement, where permitted by funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large grant budgets are currently used to support Project Administrator/Coordinator/Manager roles, however these are being costed at different grades. This needs to be reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further review of current grants held needs to take place. Schedule over February/March due to resource constraints. This is more an audit of existing large grants to ensure we are compliant with funders T&amp;Cs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work with finance required on annual profiling of budgets. This will not take place until after the OPS restructure, as Finance does not have the capacity currently to work on this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently prioritisation of high risk projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High quality research and enterprise training and development programme in place (face-face and online) with sessions and materials to meet needs of different audiences - PhD Students, ECRs, established researchers, P.I.s - using external and internal facilitators, including some of our academic staff, 'best practice'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online training sessions have been launched in October enabling researchers to access them remotely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing a new generation of academic leaders through tailored support for our academic community whether early career researchers or senior academics striving for large collaborative grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 ethics and impact training offered (Epigeum). Other online training in development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further modules under development to cover the whole research life cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| Summer 2019 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios in each session</th>
<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</th>
<th>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).</th>
<th>End of December 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All researchers (staff and students) have appropriate understanding of ethics and research integrity and have undertaken online Epigem training</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Ethics Policy and Procedure have been updated to reflect the requirement for academic staff to now complete the Epigem 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</td>
<td>Research Governance Officer has updated all Research ethics documents (assessment toolkit, policy, procedure, Investigations into the allegations of misconduct, code of conduct for using personal data, PhD forms) Research Governance Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 students have passed the course already.

There is a relatively low number (c.15%) of research staff who have passed the course.
| Expanding our national and international presence by engaging with HEIs, industry and the third sector to achieve meaningful and lasting research impact | Impact Case Studies with highest potential for submission to REF formally reviewed | Green | Formal review commenced January 2019 - to be completed by June 2019. | March 2019
Formal review to be completed by June 2019 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every large grant holder to have received appropriate support and training to be capable of managing their grant(s) successfully</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Kick-off meetings in place Kick-off meetings format to be reviewed with the Pre Award team, as some processes have now changed</td>
<td>Working Meeting with Pre-award and post-award to be held in late October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring provision for academic and research staff in all departments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Mentoring Guidance published and circulated to Departments 2017 Revised draft mentoring guidance circulated for review. Revised SDR trialled in economics and development.</td>
<td>This is an action for HoDs. Work started with MN to facilitate. Mentoring guidance written by Andrea Cornwall. SDR form reviewed by Andrea Cornwall and additional research planning section added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Impact/PER Strategies and implementation plans published and implemented</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Impact Strategy has been approved. Impact Working Group has been asked to develop an implementation plan. First meeting scheduled 21 February. The delay in scheduling the meeting means that the timeframe for the implementation plan is now June 2019.</td>
<td>Impact Strategy approved at Oct18 REC and circulated. Impact Working Group to work on implementation plan during Jan-March 2019. Impact Working Group meeting 21 February - implementation plan will be worked on March-May 2019.</td>
<td>December 2018 June 2019 for implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AB is asked to note:

- the key points in the final REF Guidance documents published on 31 January 2019
- the progress made with REF preparations during January and February 2019
- the recommendations and next steps.

Executive Summary

On 31 January the final guidance documents for REF 2021 were released:

- Guidance on Submissions
- Panel Criteria and Working Methods
- Guidance on Codes of Practice

This paper summarises the requirements for REF 2021 in the context of the SOAS submission and progress with REF preparations.

Recommendations & Next Steps

Overall, not many changes have been made to the draft guidance. The most controversial is the decision to allow the outputs of staff who have been made redundant to be included in submissions.

It is clear that far from reducing the burden on HEIs (as recommended by Stern), REF 2021 will significantly increase the burden, and some of the requirements (such as those regarding the Code of Practice) will be onerous for small institutions like ours (and in some cases, impossible). Support (time and resources) will be required from across the School in order to pull together a submission of the highest possible quality.

Financial Impact

Additional resources will be needed between now and submission in REF 2021 to ensure a submission of the highest possible quality. These include additional (temporary) staffing – not only in REO, but also in other Directorates such as HR, Library and Governance, to generate data, write Equality Impact Assessments, and provide REF E&D training to decision makers – and also financial, such as funding to bring impact case studies to fruition. It is anticipated that some of the required resourcing may be found from the REF budget.

Risks

There are significant risks involved in failing to take appropriate notice of the guidance documentation in terms of our preparedness for REF 2021 and in failing to provide adequate resourcing.
1. Final REF Guidance

The final REF Guidance was published on 31 January 2019. The three documents published were: Guidance on Submissions; Panel Criteria; Guidance on Codes of Practice. The publication of these documents was accompanied by a ‘Key Decisions’ summary and by a letter from the Chair of the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel.

Overall, not many changes have been made to the draft guidance. The most controversial decision is that the outputs of former staff made redundant may be included in the submission.

The Key Decisions summary emphasizes the following:

- HEIs must work with their staff to identify who has significant responsibility for research.
  
  *NB - SOAS has taken a strategic decision to submit all staff on Category A eligible contracts employed on the census date of 31 July 2020 who are deemed to be independent researchers, so this is not such a concern for us as other institutions.*

- Only staff on T&R or research contracts may be submitted. Staff who move from a Category A eligible contract to a non-eligible contract such as an administrative/senior management role will be considered to be former members of eligible staff (i.e only outputs published whilst employed on an eligible contract are eligible for submission).

- Independent researchers are defined as individuals employed to undertake self-directed research, rather than carrying out another individual’s research programme. This is not expected to cover research undertaken by individuals outside their contracted responsibilities. The majority of postdoctoral research assistants are not expected to be eligible for submission.

- To address concerns about the possibility of identifying staff who are submitted without the minimum of one output (due to special circumstances), the list of staff submitted will not be published at the end of the exercise.

- The eligibility of outputs of former staff is based on the date when the output was first made available. The funding bodies say “this will undoubtedly be revisited when considering the arrangements for the next assessment exercise”.

- The outputs of former staff made redundant may be included in the submission. The funding bodies say this is to address concerns about early career researchers on research fellowships, who are often employed on fixed term contracts and who are usually considered to be made redundant at the end of their contract if their service extends beyond two years.

- Panels A, B and C have agreed that co-authored outputs may only be returned once in a single submission (unless double-weighted) but Panel D has decided to accept the inclusion of the same co-authored output twice in a submission.

- In each UoA, there will be a 5% tolerance band or one non-compliant output (whichever is higher) for outputs which do not meet the Open Access requirements (and for which we cannot claim an exception).

- There will be no advantages or disadvantages to flagging an output as interdisciplinary and there will be no negative consequences if an output is incorrectly flagged.
The letter from the Chair of the EDAP states that institutions are required to:

- Establish safe and supporting processes to enable individuals to declare voluntarily their individual circumstances.
- Recognise the effect of circumstances on a staff member’s ability to contribute to the output pool at the same rate as other staff, and provide appropriate support for affected staff.

And to note that:

- **Institutions will not routinely need to request reductions to the number of outputs required**, given the reduced requirement from 4 outputs per person to 2.5 outputs per FTE. Requests should usually only be made where there are high proportions of staff in the units with circumstances.
- Institutions will be required to provide a report after submission in November 2020 showing a breakdown of the circumstances declared with a narrative statement about how decisions were made regarding unit reductions.
- **Individuals may be returned without the required minimum of one output without penalty** where the nature of the circumstances has had ‘an exceptional effect’ on their ability to work productively throughout the period.
- The EDAP Panel will be reading the ‘People’ section of the completed environment statements and particular attention will be paid to how units address all relevant aspects of support for equality and diversity. **There should be synergy between the strategies and structures set out in the environment templates and the institution’s code of practice.** Units will have to explain how their approach to construction of their REF submission relates to the process documented in the code of practice.

2. **Other decisions of note to SOAS**

   **a) Descriptor for REF Sub-Panel 26, Modern Languages and Linguistics**

   In the draft guidance, this descriptor was focussed on European languages only. Following criticism about this in the consultation responses, the descriptor has been reworded. This provides confidence that we may proceed with our submission to MLL as planned, which means that our submission to Area Studies can be focused on East Asia as previously agreed:

   **Panel Criteria and Working Methods, Paragraphs 133-134:**

   The UOA includes research on the languages, literatures, cultures and societies of all regions, countries and communities where Celtic, Germanic, Romance or Slavonic languages or other languages of Europe and Latin America are, or were, used. This includes areas where European languages have interacted with other cultures and languages… The sub-panel has expertise to assess a wide range of work and takes an inclusive view of the subject areas within its scope. Given the broad range of its descriptor, it recognises that submissions may be made in this UOA that include work on languages, literatures, cultures and societies falling wholly or partially outside its members’ expertise. The sub-panel consequently expects some degree of overlap with UOA 25 (Area Studies).
b) ‘Negative’ impacts

In the draft guidance, Panel C published guidance making it clear that impacts which do not result in change would be eligible where it involves holding public or private bodies to account. Following feedback in the consultation that this should apply to all Panels, the final guidance has been amended to clarify that this applies to all panels. This is good news for SOAS, as some of our impact case studies are engaged in such work in Panel D as well as Panel C:

Panel Criteria and Working Methods, Paragraph 303:

_The panels acknowledge that there may be impacts arising from research which take forms such as holding public or private bodies to account or subjecting proposed changes in society, public policy, business practices, and so on to public scrutiny. Such holding to account or public scrutiny may have had the effect of a proposed change not taking place; there may be circumstances in which this of itself is claimed as an impact. There may also be examples of research findings having been communicated to, but not necessarily acted upon, by the intended audience, but which nevertheless make a contribution to critical public debate around policy, social or business issues. The panels also recognise that research findings may generate critique or dissent, which itself leads to impact(s). For example, research may find that a government approach to a particular social, health, food-/biosecurity or economic issue is not delivering its objectives, which leads to the approach being questioned or modified._

3. Progress made during January and February

- The governance structure for REF has been reviewed. A REF Strategy Group, REF Operations Team and REF Coordinators Forum (with the same membership as the current REF Steering Group) will be constituted, which will reflect a sharper focus on strategy, delivery and mutual support and accountability.

- The 2019 interim review of outputs is under way. Emails were circulated to all staff on academic and research contracts in December 2019 about the exercise, what they need to do, and where to seek help. Emails were also sent to all REF Coordinators about what is required of them. It is anticipated that this exercise should be concluded by May 2019.

- Heads of Department have recently provided updates about the position of staff with no outputs and it seems that progress is being made in many cases (there are currently c.10 staff on academic contracts, and 10 staff on research only contracts (not all of whom may be ‘independent’ researchers), who do not yet have the required minimum of one output).

- 40 ‘draft one’ impact case studies have been received. Each is being reviewed by our Impact Officers and Alison Scott-Baumann (Associate Director for Research – Impact and Engagement). After internal review, the impact case studies are being sent for external review by Bulletin. 12 have been sent to date, and feedback received on 4, following which further discussions will take place with the ICS leads. This exercise is expected to be concluded by June 2019.

- A first draft of the institutional environment statement has been written and widely circulated for feedback. Units of Assessment will be asked to update their Environment Statements over the next few months using the new template. The Unit-level Statements should draw down from the institutional statement but will need to explain how institutional policies and practices have been applied at the unit level. Units/Departments will need to consider what practical actions/steps could be implemented between now and submission in November 2020 to strengthen these statements.
Drafting of the code of practice has begun and this will be shared for consultation as soon as possible. The first draft will be brought to Executive Board in March, and the final version will need to be approved by Executive Board in late May/early June, ready for submission by the deadline of noon on 7 June 2019.

4. Recommendations and Next Steps

The School will continue with its submission to REF 2021 as originally planned:

- 12 submissions to 11 Units of Assessment.
- Submission of all staff on Category A eligible contracts employed on the census date of 31 July 2020 who are deemed to be independent researchers.
- A submission of the highest possible quality, strategized appropriately to bring the maximum possible benefit to SOAS.

Directors of Professional Services are reminded that support will be needed for various aspects of the submission from staff within their Directorates, and are asked to respond positively to such requests.

Heads of Department are asked to continue their efforts to meet staff who do not yet have the minimum one output to ensure they are provided with appropriate support, and to provide the Pro-Director (Research and Enterprise) and Research Excellence Manager with regular updates.

Members of Executive Board are asked to note that the School will need to commit additional resources (time and budget) in order to pull together a submission of the highest possible quality.

Elizabeth Nolan, Research Excellence Manager, 25 February 2019
The options for Hebrew Year Abroad provision

AB is asked to approve 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. This paper also provides a response to the counter-proposal sent in advance of the last Academic Board.

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 the Kibbutz Ulpan, there will be challenges in agreeing a programme that fits out 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. The Universities of Bir Zeit and al-Quds have also been considered but unfortunately these are not viable options.

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.
1 March 19

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.

The Alternative Proposal document mentioned two alternative options - the Universities of Bir Zeit and al-Quds. Unfortunately these are not viable options.

The premise of the Year abroad is to allow students to study the language in an immersive environment, where they encounter it not only in language classes. This is the pedagogical value and logic of the Year Abroad.

In Bir Zeit, which is in the Palestinian occupied territories, Hebrew is taught as a foreign language. Otherwise, teaching is conducted in Arabic or English. Therefore students would have very limited exposure to Hebrew, and they would not hear Hebrew spoken outside class, unless they travel especially to areas in Israel proper (which would be limited to weekends at best). In that sense, there is no point in sending them on a year abroad in the first place.

The second option mentioned in the document was Al-Quds university. Teaching in a-Quds is conducted in Arabic, and again, Hebrew would be taught as a foreign language, which defeats the purpose of the year abroad. However, given al-Quds’s location in Jerusalem, at least students would have exposure to Hebrew. Depending on the quality of the programme, and how it is tailored and organised, we would have considered such an option, had it existed.

But there is no Hebrew programme advertised in al-Quds. There is no mention of any Hebrew tuition in al-Quds’s website. We have emailed al-Quds to express our interest and to ask if they offer Hebrew, but have not received reply. We also requested more details from Sai Englert, the author of the proposal, but have not heard back.

The options for the Hebrew Year Abroad are therefore outlines as below

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/changes, 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, Jeursalem:
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.
SOAS 2020-25 Access and Participation Plan

Executive Summary
One of the conditions of registering with the Office for Students is that we must have an approved Access and Participation Plan, in which we assess our performance in widening access and participation, outline our aims and strategy, and identify key measures we will undertake to achieve these aims. In addition, as part of the process we set targets, and outline what proportion of our additional fee income we will spend on measures in this area.

The OfS have outlined their key priorities which include reducing gaps between access for high and low tariff students, and reducing unexplained gaps in attainment for students from ethnic minorities and disabled students. There is an expectation that these gaps will be reduced across the sector within a period of 20 years.

The next Access and Participation Plan, which will cover the period 2020-25, is due to be submitted in the Spring, and will be the first since the Office for Students changed its approach to regulating widening access and participation. This paper outlines some of the key issues to be considered and makes recommendations regarding them.

Recommendations

1. To adopt the approach outlined in the paper which will form the basis of the School’s approach for widening access and participation
2. To adopt the approach outlined in the paper to form the basis of the School’s targets in widening access and participation

Financial Impact
Existing widening access and participation activity is funded through fee income, the proportion of which we commit to spending approved in advance by the Office for Students. The approach proposed and activities contributing to the targets proposed would continue to be resourced through fee income and potentially supplemented through fundraising and other forms of income.

Risks
Poor performance towards meeting our targets (or targets deemed insufficiently stretching) could lead to query and ultimately significant sanction from the Office for Students.

Equality implications
Broadly speaking, the scope of the paper should contribute to making SOAS a more equitable institution.
Consultation

This paper is the result of consultation primarily within the Access & Participation Plan Steering Group (chaired by Pro-Director Learning and Teaching) during 2018-19. In addition it has been submitted for consultation to the following committees during the spring term; TeLSOC, EDC, Audit and Senate.
SOAS 2020-25 Access and Participation Plan (draft version 1.1)

Introduction

1. This paper contributes to the drafting of the School’s 2020-25 Access and Participation Plan (APP), due to be submitted to the Office for Students in the late spring. It summarises key sections from the previous APP, and identifies questions for consideration, based on changes to the process identified by the OfS.

2. It is to be noted that the APP will cover a number of areas linked to School level KPIs such as the attainment gap and student retention. It provides a timely opportunity to take a strategic overview of how the work of access and participation engages with, supports and drives forward changes in student success and outcomes, learning pedagogy, inclusivity, decolonisation and equality and diversity. Therefore colleagues from across the School will be collaborating in the production of the plan, and the forthcoming strategy for access, alongside engagement with the Students’ Union.

Guidance from the Office for Students

3. The OfS recently released the guidance for how to prepare the APP at the end of February. The regulatory body has set the following targets for the higher education sector:

   3.1. To eliminate the gap in entry rates at higher-tariff providers between the most and least represented groups by 2038-39.
   3.2. To eliminate the unexplained gap in non-continuation between most and least represented groups by 2024-25, and to eliminate the absolute gap (the gap caused by both structural and unexplained factors) by 2030-31.
   3.3. To eliminate the unexplained gap in degree outcomes (1sts or 2:1s) between white students and black students by 2024-25, and to eliminate the absolute gap (the gap caused by both structural and unexplained factors) by 2030-31.
   3.4. To eliminate the unexplained gap in degree outcomes (1sts or 2:1s) between disabled students and non-disabled students by 2024-25.

4. The guidance asked institutions to assess their performance in relation to access and participation; develop strategic aims, objectives and set targets; develop strategic measures in line with strategic aims; and outline the investment. These areas must be covered within the context of the student lifecycle, and closely align to the targets listed above as well as other underrepresented groups such as care leavers and estranged students.

Assessment of performance

5. Table 1 condenses a full assessment of our performance from the previous APP into a traffic light system. The grading has been fairly harshly applied – for example, access for BME students is graded as amber even though we have good performance overall compared to the sector as a whole, because of a specific dip in the proportion of Asian students gaining a place at SOAS. In some cases new data in these areas will become available before the submission of the APP, but it is not expected to be significantly different. As a reminder: access refers to students enrolling at SOAS, success refers to student outcomes when here, and progression refers to outcomes after graduation.

Table 1: Assessment of Performance from 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Lifecycle Stage</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Description</th>
<th>Performance Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 State school students</td>
<td>Steadily increased since 2012-13, until a 4% point drop in 2017-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Young students from Low Participation Neighbourhoods (POLAR quintile 1)</td>
<td>Improving performance until a 0.2% point drop in 2017-18, but consistently just short of HESA benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students from most socio-economically deprived 40% of postcodes (IMD quintiles 1 and 2)</td>
<td>Good performance; Indices of Multiple Deprivation is a more appropriate measure for London institutions than POLAR (#2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BME students</td>
<td>Good performance overall; however most recent data shows a significant fall in proportion of Asian students. New data available in February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mature students</td>
<td>Improvement in 2017 but still below national average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mature students from Low Participation Neighbourhoods (POLAR quintile 1)</td>
<td>Small drop in proportion in 17/18 albeit having also halved the number of % points to the HESA benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Students in receipt of DSA</td>
<td>Upwards trend before stabilising in 2017-18, above both HESA benchmark and England average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Students with experience of being in care</td>
<td>Little to no progress made over recent years (including 2018 entrants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Non-continuation of young students from Low Participation Neighbourhoods (POLAR quintile 1)</td>
<td>Performance above HESA benchmark and England average. But a very small sample size; better to develop an additional measure (using IMD?), which is likely to show worse performance. New data available in March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Degree outcomes for Black students</td>
<td>Assessment based on Continuum research; new internal data now available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large gaps also exist for Asian students.

Improving performance, but still below HESA benchmark and England average. New data available in February.

Wide variation depending on nature of the disability declared; based on Continuum data. More robust data required.

Data not systematically collected.

Above the TEF benchmark (TEF 3), but below benchmark for this group being in highly skilled employment or further study. This is not reportable in TEF 4 as the response rate is too low.

Just below the TEF benchmark, but just above for this group being in highly skilled employment or further study.

Narrowly below the TEF benchmark, but previously showing consistent improvement over time

Worsening trend over time, and below TEF benchmarks

Below the TEF benchmark for the proportion in employment or further study, but meeting the benchmark for the proportion in highly skilled employment or further study.

Data not systematically collected.

6. In most cases our full assessment of performance is likely to be very similar to the judgment we reached last year, which was summarised in the Access and Participation Plan as below:
“The assessment of our performance above provides a robust measure of performance in access, student success and progression at SOAS University of London, taking into account our institutional context and the performance of the sector overall. Whilst there are elements of good performance across the student lifecycle, there are also clear areas requiring improvement. Most significantly, the gaps in student success outcomes, especially for students of particular ethnicities, are the highest priority for improvement. Performance at both the access and progression stages is overall good and must be maintained as a minimum with specific areas of required improvement identified as above. Further to this there is a need to establish measures and procedures for monitoring outcomes for certain groups of students (in particular care-leavers) at all stages of the student lifecycle.”

Ambition and strategy

7. Based on the assessment of performance, the ambition and strategy identified in our previous APP were as follows:

“As a result of the strategic aims and assessment of performance above, our key ambitions in widening access and participation – closely aligned to the priorities identified by the Office for Students – are:

7.1. To recognise and maintain our improving performance in access, whilst also seeking to reduce specific gaps where these exist, and to continue to contribute to sector-wide improvements in access to higher education by students from underrepresented backgrounds
7.2. To reduce gaps in student success, with those for students from particular ethnicities as the highest priority, as this is where large and persistent gaps exist
7.3. To continue to deliver our existing commitment to improve the progression outcomes of students from underrepresented backgrounds
7.4. To increase our evidence base for existing gaps in all three phases of the student lifecycle at SOAS through the means of qualitative and quantitative co-created research, and to continue to use an evidence-led approach of evaluation and reflection to reduce these gaps”

In order to achieve these key ambitions and reflect the School’s strategic priorities, our access outreach activities will focus on inspiring and encouraging students from the most underrepresented groups to engage with and interpret the world around them, and on providing support and guidance in assisting students at all educational levels to achieve their academic and personal potential. Activities will be differentiated in their objectives to produce the most effective impact for learners according to their age and stage of education. We recognise that sustained interventions have the greatest impact, and the earlier a learner can be engaged, the better. In our admissions processes, we will continue to ensure we fairly and transparently assess the academic potential of students regardless of their background. We expect our activity not only to contribute to reducing gaps in access to SOAS itself, but also to contribute to increasing the entry rates of students from underrepresented groups to higher education in general, including to higher tariff providers where gaps are widest.

Our highest priority ambition is to significantly reduce gaps in student success, particularly for students from particular ethnicities, as this is where gaps are largest and where closing them will have greatest impact given the ethnically diverse make-up of our student body. This will also contribute directly to the Office for Students’ priorities for student success. At SOAS, these gaps exist both in non-continuation and degree attainment, and we will focus on both issues through whole-institution change and specifically targeted initiatives to deliver significant progress. Whilst recognising that reducing gaps in student success should also contribute to improving performance in progression, our strategic approach to reducing gaps in the progression phase of the student lifecycle will be founded upon increasing our evidence base and using it to shape future interventions.”

8. It was planned that the new WP Strategy would be in an advanced stage of development at this point in the year, but we are behind schedule. Nevertheless, based on the above ambitions and strategy, sector best practice and discussions in the Access and Participation Plan Steering Group the following approach is proposed for widening access and participation at SOAS.
9. Access
9.1. An evidence-informed framework approach to access which is identifiably “SOAS”, incorporates decolonised approaches, is responsive to the needs of learners, prioritises mechanisms which enable working with targeted learners over sustained periods of time, and in which impact evaluation is central.
9.2. An inclusive approach to admissions, recruitment and marketing which mainstreams information, advice and guidance for underrepresented groups, and which takes an evidence-based approach to contextual admissions.

10. Success
10.1. Further developing inclusive procedures, practices and pedagogies across all student-interacting parts of the School (including in the classroom), and in partnership with students from disadvantaged backgrounds. This will necessitate raising institutional awareness of the issues, developing staff’s skills and capacity to inform their practice, and demonstrating with evidence and evaluation the impact of this practice on the outcomes of learners from target groups.
10.2. Providing a financial support offer which is appropriate to the needs of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, and which is designed (through the frequency and timing of payments, for example) to provide maximum positive impact in supporting student success.

11. Progression
11.1. Mirroring the approach outlined above to improving student success outcomes, with a specific focus on embedding career thinking into WP activities through the student lifecycle, and ensuring opportunities and approaches associated with successful graduate outcomes (such as international mobility, internships, and embedding activities into the curriculum to support the transition to work) are genuinely accessible to students from underrepresented backgrounds.

12. Continuous Improvement
12.1. All the above activities – across all stages of the student lifecycle, and including financial support – must be underpinned by a rigorous approach to impact evaluation, embedded into each intervention. This will also mean the piloting of innovative projects and decisions taken on whether to stop, continue or upscale them based on the impact evaluation results. This requires the further development of an evaluation and evidence-based culture across the institution.

Recommendation: the above outline should form the basis of the School’s approach for widening access and participation

Targets

13. In A new approach to regulating access and participation in English higher education the OfS states “Providers will be expected to set a small number of outcomes-focused targets to capture the impact of their work. Some of these will be recommended by the OfS, and will align with our key performance measures and the targets the OfS has established as priorities for itself sector-wide, as appropriate to a provider’s context.”

14. The targets recommended by the OfS are the following measures:
14.1. Gap in access to SOAS between most and least represented groups
14.2. Gap in non-continuation between most and least represented groups
14.3. Gap in degree outcomes (1sts or 2:1s) between white students and black students
14.4. Gap in degree outcomes (1sts or 2:1s) between disabled students and non-disabled students

15. The exact formulation and package of targets will depend upon the results of ongoing work with the Planning team to rationalise and contextualise our existing evidence base. It should also take account of unexplained differences across the student lifecycle where SOAS would wish to make structural, cultural and institutional shifts to significantly impact measures. However, based on the
guidance from the OfS, a desire to share these targets as institutional KPIs, and the sharing of key targets which map across several agendas, an initial proposal for targets is for the following measures:

15.1. Gap in access to SOAS using the POLAR dataset
15.2. Gap in access to SOAS using the IMD dataset
15.3. Gap in non-continuation at SOAS using the IMD dataset
15.4. Gap in degree outcomes between black students and white students
15.5. Gap in degree outcomes between black students and white students incorporating the IMD dataset
15.6. Gap in degree outcomes between disabled students and non-disabled students
15.7. Gap in graduate outcomes between black students and white students incorporating the IMD dataset

**Recommendation:** the above suggestions should form the basis of the School’s targets in widening access and participation

**Next steps**

16. The APP lead and APP SG will be further developing the plan in response to the newly released guidance and in collaboration with the SOAS’ Students’ Union. Academic and Professional Service colleagues will be consulted with regarding its focus and content to ensure whole institutional buy-in.

17. The final plan will be submitted in late Spring following approval from Executive Board. Academic Board will receive the approved plan at its next meeting in the summer term.

**Marva de la Coudray**  
*Head of Widening Participation*

**Julien Boast**  
*Widening Participation Manager (Outreach & Progression)*

March 2019
Response to SIS review

AB is asked to consider SIS response to Review

Executive Summary
SIS welcomes the review as a balanced overview of SIS functions as well as some insights into possibilities for growth and intellectual entrepreneurship. SIS notes the findings in the report,
1. SIS’ strong economic base.
2. SIS’ Innovative economically efficient distance learning model, pioneered by CISD.
3. SIS’ strong recruitment in all constituent units.
4. SIS’ pedagogical innovation and research excellence.

Recommendations & Next Steps
1. Maintain SIS as it is with four constituent units, CISD, CGMC, CGS and CEDEP
2. Ensure financial stability, growth and surplus in the short term.
3. Develop into an interdisciplinary hub in the longer term. To do so, SIS will: a) start a staff brown bag lunch seminar series to showcase interdisciplinary research. The first will be held in March; b) build and/or sustain interdisciplinary networks, such as with LIDC and c) play a convening role in interdisciplinary research (and teaching) across SOAS.

Financial Impact
No adverse financial impact. SIS’ financial situation is robust and more growth is forecast with the introduction of media and gender distance learning in 2020/21.

Risks
1. Potential retraction of admin support via OPS proposals will hinder growth and impact performance.
2. Limited autonomy for SIS constituent units to use surplus despite restructuring vision.
3. Lack of institutional cooperation for interdisciplinary exchanges can hamper SIS plans to develop into interdisciplinary hub.

Equality implications
None

Consultations
SIS Management Group, Jan 7
SIS departmental meeting, Jan 9
SIS away day, Feb 8
Email consultations with colleagues
Comprehensive Departmental Review of Economics

Final report of the Comprehensive Departmental Review of Economics. Academic Board will be asked to **approve** the report.

**Executive Summary**

A Comprehensive Departmental Review was held for the Department of Economics on December 4, 2018. This report outlines the required and aspirational recommendations from that report. A response from the Department of Economics is also included for this AB meeting.

Steve Hopgood, Pro Director International

**Recommendations & Next Steps**

Many recommendations are listed within the report. Academic Board will be asked to **approve** the report.

**Financial Impact**

Successful implementation of the report’s recommendations ought to improve the financial performance of the department and thus improve the School’s finances. The opposite – continued poor financial performance and little increase in revenue – will continue to adversely affect the School’s financial viability.

**Risks**

Non-implementation of the report’s recommendations will adversely affect the School's performance and thus the continued viability of the Department of Economics.

**Equality implications**

*All School activities have potential equality implications which need to be carefully monitored e.g., around savings decisions, staffing, portfolio review etc.*

*(Further advice is available from the Diversity Advisor if required)*

**Consultations**

This report has been the result of extensive consultations with all relevant stakeholders. A Department response is also included alongside it.
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1. Panel members and attendees

1.1 Panel members

Stephen Hopgood, Pro-Director (International) (chair)
David Spencer, external
Ron Smith, external
Kathryn Lynn, student rep
Megan Conville, student rep

1.2 In attendance from the School

Sally Johnson, representing the Director of Student and Academic Support
Chloe Weenie, Secretary nominated by QA
Deborah Johnston, Pro-Director (Learning & Teaching)
Andrea Cornwall, Pro-Director (Research & Enterprise)

1.3 In attendance from the Department

Ulrich Volz, Head of Department
Catherine Farinhas-Gray, Department Manager
Satoshi Miyamura, Director of Learning & Teaching (Curriculum & QA)
Costas Lapavitsas, Director of Learning & Teaching (Student Experience & engagement)
Ourania Dimakou, UG programme convenor
Gregor Semieniuk, UG Admissions Tutor
Luca Tasciotti, UG Year 1 Tutor
Massoud Karshenas, Research Committee Chair
Elisa van Waeyenberge, UG Year 2 tutor, Research Tutor
2. Overall performance of the department (Session 1)

2.1 Key concerns of the panel

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

- **Vision**: What is the department’s vision? In what ways is it distinct from other Economics departments, nationally and internationally?

- **Curriculum**: How can the quality of the offering to students be improved? How can the curriculum be developed to better reflect the demands of employers? Is the balance between qualitative and quantitative or generic and specific/regional teaching right?

- **Student recruitment**: UG recruitment is a major concern: while Overseas recruitment was 1 FTE above target for 2018-19, EU was 4 under and Home recruitment is forecasted to be only 37.5 FTE (target 50). PGT enrolments fell by 32% between 2012/13 and 2016/17.

- **Financial performance**: The department is forecast to make a deficit as a percentage of income of -16% in 2021/22, down from a deficit of -13% in 2017/18, largely due to a fall in undergraduate student numbers. In certain areas (e.g. space) the department has costs that are comparably higher to other departments. Is the department financially sustainable in the medium to longer term?

- **Financial viability of teaching model**: The department has a large number of programmes and modules, many of which have low enrolments. Of 27 UG programmes in 2017-18, for example, only 9 had 10 students or more.

- **Student experience**: Economics shows a decline on all NSS sections this year (2018). This has resulted in it being below the sector average in every single metric. All three TEF metrics have dropped. League table positions have declined. Also, the NSS feedback has generally placed the Department high in sectoral comparison, and efforts at improving the contents and delivery of programmes and modules and enrich the student experience were reflected in improvements in NSS scores. However, the NSS results for the Department in 2017 and 2018 were highly disappointing and out of line from the trend of recent improvements, and the Department has made significant efforts to address this issue. Also, the Department of Economics was awarded Silver in the TEF Pilot Subject Level Submission in 2018.

- **Relationship with other departments**: The department appears to have teaching and research in common with other departments, in particular SFM, Politics and International Studies, and Development...
Studies. Are these commonalities productive synergies or areas of inefficient overlap? Is there scope for more shared teaching across departments, particularly at UG level?

2.2 Opening remarks from the department

The Head of Department explained that the department is not an average Economics department teaching mainstream economics: it contains heterodox scholars, has a strong emphasis on pluralism in the teaching of economics, considerable regional expertise and specialises in development, emerging economics and global challenges. The department is conscious of its identity relative to competitors.

The timing of the review, the Head suggested, is suboptimal, given the department is currently conducting a comprehensive curriculum review that follows up on two strategy away-days in July 2018. This internal review will result in new curriculum proposals shaped with departmental identity and student needs in mind.

In explanation of low recruitment, the department acknowledged that there is a problem at UG level: the lowering of entry tariffs by the School, following over-ambitious targets in previous years, has had an adverse effect on the department’s league table position. This position must be regained by standing firm on entry tariffs and improving NSS results. Poor NSS performance in recent years, it was suggested, has been caused by factors beyond the department’s control, e.g. the SU-led boycott of NSS and the fractional strike in 2017.

3. Undergraduate programmes (Session 2)

3.1 Competitors and market

The department noted that its UG market is primarily domestic: 2018-19 enrolment numbers are 37.5 Home, 6 EU and 11 Overseas. The Home market is principally affected by league table position. Many current UG students want to study economics in London but did not get into King’s, LSE or UCL. The department cannot compare in size or league table position to these institutions.

Other competitors with a more pluralist profile identified in discussion were Queen Mary, Westminster, Greenwich, Kingston and UWE. The panel suggested that SOAS should be capable of competing better with these institutions and worried whether the Department’s programmes were adequately marketed. The Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) noted that while league tables remain important to recruitment, students are increasingly attracted by outcomes as well: improving the quality of the offer to students will have a positive impact on recruitment.
3.2 Curriculum reform

The panel asked the department to explain its plans for UG curriculum reform, with a view to raising UG recruitment and improving the offering to students. Should the department offer more generic modules, e.g. in British economy, alongside its more unique and regionally-focused offerings? Is the existing UG offering financially sustainable, when delivery costs and module enrolment numbers are taken into account?

The department noted that its internal curriculum review was ongoing, so providing definitive answers was difficult. It recognised a need to improve the financial viability of the teaching offering while protecting areas of specialism. The number of open option modules is restricted to the value of 30 credits during the first two years of UG study, it was noted. Among the 3rd year options, all regional modules are jointly taught with UG and PGT students in the same lecture, with two separate tutorials, which helps reduce delivery costs. Student feedback on this UG-PGT co-teaching has been positive. The Academic Board exercise to review modules with fewer than 20 students identified 15 “small” modules offered by the department, of which one was an ISP, two were already withdrawn or hibernated, and one was offered jointly with Development Studies whose student numbers should be counted on top.

The department noted that its fractional budget is £140k, 9% of academic staff costs. Total academic staff costs have been reduced since last year, as have fractional staff costs. The streamlining of teaching provision will help further reduce these costs in the future. The planned new PPE programme (taught jointly with Politics and HRP) should impact positively on recruitment. Discussions are also ongoing with Law regarding a new BA Politics, Economics and Law (PEL) programme.

3.3 Student experience and non-continuation

The department explained that it has identified areas for improvement based on NSS results, particularly regarding assessment and feedback. The department has taken part in an inclusive assessment exercise at UG level, looking at UG provision by programme, not by module, considering the student journey and learning outcomes. An emphasis has been placed on diversifying assessment methods, particularly in modules with higher failure rates. More generally, the department stressed that NSS response rates were low in 2016-17 and 2017-18 because of the SU-led boycott of NSS and fractional strike in 2017.

The panel noted that while non-continuation rates are on par with the School average, they remain a concern. Does the department do enough for weaker students? The department responded that following the introduction of the new academic advisor system this year, it has a better awareness and control over class attendance. New initiatives have been introduced to help struggling students, e.g. a Maths clinic. In the longer term, the streamlining of module choice is expected to help progression.
The Pro-Director (Learning and Teaching) urged the department to consider internship / placement experiences for students and to work on improving conversion rates from UG to PGT. The department highlighted that it was working with Careers on placement schemes.

4. REF and research (Session 3)

The department provided an overview of its REF preparation: most staff have outputs graded at 3 or 4 stars; two impact case studies are being developed, one with excellent potential and the other with good potential. The department has also been successful in attracting several high-profile research grants including a successful bid for £6m from DFID to lead an Anti-Corruption Evidence consortium under the directorship of professor Mushtaq Khan. REF submission will be to the same UoA as Development Studies and SFM. When questioned about its method for grading REF outputs, the department noted that, unlike Development Studies and SFM, it bases its initial assessments on the ABS ranking and impact factors, with parts of the pieces having been read and assessed internally. The panel questioned this accuracy of this approach as the REF panel does not take ABS rankings into account. The Pro-Director (Research and Enterprise) detailed a plan to use reading week in term 2 for the reading of potential REF outputs across the School. Performance at the last REF was much worse than expected. Given the School's investment in new support and processes, much better outcomes should be anticipated in REF 2021. The two externals on the panel confirmed that Economics staff should contribute to the Development UoA, rather than being submitted to the Economics UoA.

Concerns were raised by the department about staff workloads and their impact on research: Can excellent research be expected given teaching and administrative loads? The research grants awarded to some colleagues have increased teaching and administrative loads on others, and may be impacting negatively on departmental finances. The Pro-Director (Research and Enterprise) explained that the School is developing a workload model that should address these concerns. Changes to the RAM may also be required so that research is not penalised.

The panel noted that the department's income from consultancy is low, although in line with other Departments. Are some colleagues undertaking consultancy and not declaring it to the School? The department responded that historically the School’s enterprise policies have not incentivised staff. Current enterprise arrangements are more attractive; more support from Enterprise Office is required.

Following scrutiny it became clear that not all department research income was captured in the data provided to the panel. Unspent research overheads may be allocated to administration, short-term posts or fractional posts to address some of the workload concerns raised.
5. PGR Programmes (Session 4)

The department noted that it recruits 10-15 PGR students each year across its three PGR pathways, producing a total PGR student body of about 40. It offers research training during the first year of PGR and seminars for all PGR students. The department has tried but not always succeeded in involving PGR students in its research clusters. Research funding totalling £5k per year is available to PGR students. The expectation is that all academic staff should take on PGR supervision, but distribution of students is uneven.

To improvement recruitment, it was suggested, better processes are required, in particular to convert offers to confirmations. This might involve speaking to all offer holders on the phone or Skype. The department does not as a general rule formally interview candidates and should consider this approach. Doctoral School processes need improving.

External members of the panel suggested that cultural change might be required so that PGR students are considered important to research culture and REF preparations of the department. The department noted that most PGR students are self-funded. Very few scholarships are available from the School. Unlike other institutions, e.g. UCL, SOAS cannot guarantee PGR students part-time teaching contracts.

6. PGT programmes (Session 5)

The panel asked the department why its PGT recruitment figures had decreased so substantially. In response, the panel noted its concerns about marketing (see section 8 below), plus the impact of Brexit on EU recruitment. In contrast to some institutions, the department insists that PGT students have an UG economics degree or similar qualification, which it considers important for reputation and quality.

The department was asked to explain the large number of programmes it offers at PGT level and how it justifies this delivery model, in terms of cost and quality. The department explained that it decided in 2017 to withdraw its four MSc Economics programmes focused on particular regions, with last intake in 2018-19. This will allow it more flexibility in determining which PGT modules to run each year. The student representatives on the panel expressed concern that further curriculum reform, including reduction in the number of optional modules offered to PGT students, may reduce the attractiveness of programmes. The Department also highlighted that it had already agreed on reform of the MSc Programmes “International Finance and Development” and “Economics and Environment” and that the Department was currently looking at how to further strengthen and market these programmes. The Department also highlighted that all MSc programmes drew on the same core modules, which means that the incremental cost of offering each MSc was relatively low.
The Department was currently considering the launch of an MSc Climate Change and Sustainable Finance. One suggestion made was for new specialised MScs, e.g. in anti-corruption or the political economy of gender. Other members of the department suggested that greater generalisation rather than specialisation was required. Opinion was split on whether or not, in light of UG recruitment problems, the department should concentrate more heavily on PGT.

The department noted that it should collaborate more closely with other SOAS departments, particularly Development Studies. Where there is overlap, e.g., with SFM, it should be removed; only Economics should teach Economics modules. The relationship with ‘Finance’ as a subject needed clarifying as a result given finance is taught in both Economics and SFM.

7. Voice (Session 6)

The department raised concerns about staff retention and turnover: since 2014, according to the department, 9.5FTE have left and only 5FTE have joined, a net reduction of 4.5 FTE. In addition, two senior staff members have moved into central roles in the School. Concerns were also expressed about the distribution of workload between junior and senior staff: lecturers and senior lecturers, it was suggested by department members, work considerably harder on average than professors, with respect to administration, teaching and PhD supervision; the discussion of these concerns within the department has led to some disagreement and division. Regarding probation and promotion, processes need to be more strategic and take a structured approach to HEA fellowship.

The student representatives on the panel commented on the SU-led boycott of NSS and the channels available for student feedback to the department. Better communication is required, it was suggested, so that all students are aware of their student representatives and feed concerns into department level student-staff forums.

8. Infrastructure (Session 7)

The department suggested that if administrative support resources cannot be increased, they must be deployed more effectively. One major frustration for students is problems with module sign up – which require improvements in process and IT systems. More could be done in terms of outreach and WP activity, the department suggested, if capacity was available. Facilities are an issue, the department noted, in particular the lack of teaching space, white boards, computer lab space, and PG study spaces.

The department felt strongly that the School should be doing more to market Economics programmes and social sciences more generally as SOAS was still widely seen by the wider public as a university offering only languages and cultural studies. This should include better-publicised open days (which
might lead to better staff attendance) and international recruitment events (e.g. in South Asia) for UG and PGT, plus more extensive use of alumni networks, an improved website and social media. Some of the ways in which the department is trying to make itself more visible were explained: podcasts, videos, social media.

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

In its concluding comments, the department emphasised the following suggestions and proposals for the future:

- The focus of the department should remain on UG and PGT teaching and learning; UG student numbers can be increased again.
- The number of programmes and modules offered should be consolidated. The emphasis should be on using resources effectively without losing what makes the department distinct. All economics modules across SOAS should be taught by the department.
- Further efforts should be made to improve all aspects of the student journey, thereby reducing non-continuation rates and improving student satisfaction.
- The department requires a more sophisticated workload model alongside cultural change to ensure the fairer distribution of work among staff and urges the School to push ahead with the implementation of a School-wide workload model.
- Better marketing of the department and its programmes is essential, and this will require better support from Marketing.
- Administrative support and systems must be improved.

The Head of Department thanked members of the panel, in particular the student representatives and externals.

10. Conclusions and recommendations of the panel

The panel noted that in spite of the challenges that it currently faces, the department retains a strong international reputation in the fields of heterodox economics, political economy and development economics. It continues to offer something distinctive to students and to produce innovative and impactful research. The panel was impressed by the department’s preparations for the review and the engagement of its staff. Among more junior staff, in particular, there is a recognition that the department must adapt to meet the challenges that it faces and an appetite to deliver that change.

The challenges that the department faces are serious, however. It is unclear at this stage whether or not the proposals made by the department will be sufficient to arrest falling recruitment levels, student satisfaction and league table positions; to improve the quality of the department’s teaching and learning; and to return the department to financial sustainability within the
timeframe required by the School. In other words, everyone’s good efforts might still leave the department in deficit.

The following recommendations were agreed:

(R = required; A = advised)

1. **Teaching and learning (UG and PGT)**
   1.1 The department’s programmes and modules should be further simplified, without the department losing its core identity and regional expertise. This may include the discontinuation of programmes; the withdrawal of modules, particularly options; and the re-design of programmes so that they share a common core. (R)
   1.2 The introduction of any new programmes requires very careful consideration: new programmes, e.g. in PPE, should only be introduced if there is a clear positive financial return, based on market analysis. The department should seek clarity about who its competitors are and ensure that this market intelligence is used in curriculum design. In addition, how will the revenue share work between the three departments involved in the PPE programme? (R)
   1.3 Teaching overlaps with other departments should be further considered and, wherever possible, resolved. This is a priority. (R)
   1.4 A plan must be urgently developed to address student satisfaction concerns and the issue of non-continuation. This should include consideration of teaching quality, assessment, feedback, and the wider student experience. The department should further develop its student support and academic adviser systems to help weaker students and improve retention. The department should also consider testing via Moodle to identify students in need of further maths support. (R)
   1.5 Graduate employability must be prioritised in further curriculum reform and student experience initiatives, through for example the development of internships and placements. (R)
   1.6 The department should develop a new student recruitment strategy. This should include consideration of marketing and entry tariffs: can current higher tariff scores and PG entry requirements be retained, given the present market for economics degrees and current league table positions? (R)
   1.7 The department should develop initiatives to raise continuation rates from UG to PGT. (A)

2. **PGR**
   2.1 PGR recruitment processes should be improved, in liaison with the Doctoral School. This may include interviewing candidates and regular informal discussions with offer holders. (A)
   2.2 PGR scholarships should be made available where possible; internal and external PGR funding opportunities should be better
advertised; the possibility of guaranteeing PGR students a certain number of teaching hours should be explored. (A)

2.3 PGR supervision should be fairly allocated across the department’s academic staff; staff should be encouraged to view PGR supervision as integral to their role and important to the department’s research culture. (A)

3. REF and research

3.1 The department should continue its preparations for submission of staff to the Development UoA; possible outputs should be read by internal and external reviewers rather than reliance on ABS scores. (R)

3.2 Consultancy activity should be promoted among staff, as a possible source of department income; remaining administrative or policy hurdles to institutional consultancy should be removed and all staff should ensure that their consultancy activities are declared. (R)

4. Voice

4.1 The department should continue to engage with the School-wide introduction of an academic workload model. Concerns about the unfair allocation of workload between junior and senior staff should be addressed. (R)

4.2 The concerns of department staff regarding probation, promotion and support should be subject to further consideration. (A)

4.3 The department should consider rotating staff administrative roles more frequently to increase development opportunities for staff and share workloads more equitably. (A)

4.4 Communication between students, student reps and staff should be improved to help deliver changes in teaching, learning and student experience. (A)

5. Infrastructure

5.1 The department should work closely with Marketing to address its concerns over the marketing and visibility of its programmes. (A)

5.2 The department should liaise with the relevant Professional Service units to deliver required improvements in estates and facilities, IT services, the website, the RAM, student support, and PGR student data and processes. If School-wide engagement or agreement is required to make progress on aspects of the above, the department should consider submitting proposals to the relevant committees, e.g. EB, AB, TELSOC. (A)

6. Overall

6.1 The department has a clear and widely shared vision of itself, the importance of its work, and of its role at SOAS, but there is a non-negligible risk that it will remain in deficit for the foreseeable future. In the event that the plans contained here do not show a marked improvement in the trajectory of its finances within the next 6-9 months, it will be important that more radical contingency planning has taken place to safeguard the teaching of Economics in some
form at SOAS. This must include the possibility of integrating into one department staff from the several departments who teach in the general area of economics – in Economics, the School of Finance and Management and even, potentially, who teach development economics in Development Studies. Other staffing economies will also need to be considered to help ensure the department’s financial sustainability and therefore survival (R)
**Department of Economics Response to CDR Report**

AB is asked to **note** the following response:

### Executive Summary

The Department endorses most of the recommendations of the CDR Report; it objects, however, recommendation 6.1. The Department would like to emphasise that it is determined to work pro-actively and constructively with the School on improving its performance in all areas. It needs to be highlighted that while some actions lie primarily within the Department, other require support from the School.

### Recommendations & Next Steps

AB is asked to take note.

### Financial Impact

The Department is committed to improving its financial position. The CDR shall contribute to this.

### Risks

Lack up support from the School to implement the recommendations.

### Equality implications

No equality implications.

### Consultations

Consultations have taken place within the Department of Economics.
Response of the Department of Economics to the Comprehensive Departmental Review (CDR) Final Report

The Department has welcomed the CDR process as an opportunity to receive constructive feedback that will help it address the challenges it is facing. The Department would like to thank the members of the CDR panel, especially the external and student members, for their engagement and advice.

While the Department by no means wants to downplay the difficult financial situation it is in and the underlying problems, it is concerned that the summary of the discussions in the report are not reflective of the discussions on the day. In this context, the Department wants to highlight that the minutes from the CDR meetings were not shared with Department which contravenes CDR guidance.

The report gives the impression that the Department is unclear about its future course of action and slow in responding to pressures. The Department objects to such a depiction. First, the Department continues to review its undergraduate and postgraduate portfolios. This includes annual coordination meetings to address coherence across the curriculum and to ensure good quality delivery throughout our programmes. It also includes ongoing discussions on how to consolidate our offerings across both our UG and PG programmes and make programmes more attractive. Second, the Department has revamped its administrative procedures especially in relation to students. It proactively responds to student feedback and works closely with alumni and the careers service. Third, it is working hard to address retention issues, including by offering additional support in terms of quantitative techniques (via a Maths Clinic) and close follow-up on non-attendance of students at tutorials. Fourth, the Department is proactively engaged in new initiatives, including the School-level initiative on diversifying teaching and assessment methods (via the HE Inclusive Assessment Lab). The Department has also started to pilot online modules with CISD. Fifth, the Department is successfully generating income from large research projects. These efforts are despite the acute loss of several permanent members of academic staff.

The Department believes that the CDR fails to acknowledge sufficiently the drive and commitment it continues to show in addressing the challenges it faces. It also believes that the report’s narrative around recruitment fails to acknowledge sufficiently the failures of previous School strategies that resulted in large UG recruitment when tariffs were heavily discounted during clearing which resulted in increases of UG Economics enrolments of 44 percent (almost twice the sector’s rate) between 12/13 and 16/17. It also fails to acknowledge strong performance in OS PG recruitment, increasing by more than a third between 14/15 and 18/19.

Turning to the recommendations, the Department endorses most of the recommendations stipulated in headings 1 to 5, and would like to emphasise that the Department has been working on these over the last years, despite severe resource constraints and a difficult environment (of continuous restructuring). We want to object, however, to recommendation 6.1. We engage with each recommendation in more detail below. It needs to be highlighted that while some actions lie primarily within the Department, other – 1.3, 5.1, 5.2 in particular – require support from the School.
1. Teaching and learning (UG and PGT)

1.1 “The department’s programmes and modules should be further simplified, without the department losing its core identity and regional expertise. This may include the discontinuation of programmes; the withdrawal of modules, particularly options; and the re-design of programmes so that they share a common core. (R)”

The Department has formally agreed on a broad set of reforms to its UG and PG curriculum at a Department Meeting in December 2018, following an internal curriculum review initiated at two Strategy Away Days in July 2018. The module and programme amendment forms were submitted to and approved by CQAC in January 2019. The spirit of these changes is to reduce the number of core modules, turn two-term modules into single-term modules, and provide more flexibility regarding the number of modules the Department needs to offer, in line with student numbers. These amendments were guided by student feedback and a vision of what SOAS Economics is. These changes will simplify programmes and save resources. We are aware that further rationalisation of courses needs to be considered.

It should be noted that the Department’s MSc programmes already share common core modules, with all MSc programmes having only one or two programme-specific modules (which are available as options to students on other programmes as well).

The Department will continue to develop its curriculum and improve programme structures.

1.2 “The introduction of any new programmes requires very careful consideration: new programmes, e.g. in PPE, should only be introduced if there is a clear positive financial return, based on market analysis. The department should seek clarity about who its competitors are and ensure that this market intelligence is used in curriculum design. In addition, how will the revenue share work between the three departments involved in the PPE programme? (R)”

All new programmes need to be approved by EB, and the Department will ensure that proposals for new programmes have a strong business case, with solid analysis of market potential and competitor programmes. We welcome support from the School in this context.

It should be noted that Economics will not create any new modules for the envisaged BSc PPE and BSc Law, Economy, Politics (LEP) programmes. Convening fees for PPE are likely to go to Politics, which has taken the lead on this, while convening fees for LEP shall go to Law. Economics shall receive fees for Economics modules on these programmes.

1.3 “Teaching overlaps with other departments should be further considered and, wherever possible, resolved. This is a priority. (R) [WU5]

The Department strongly welcomes this recommendation. It has for long highlighted the problem that other departments have started to offer economics modules, some of which are identical to modules offered by the Department of Economics. Not only does this lead to inefficiencies across the School, it also reduces our income. To realise efficiency savings, we propose that the School immediately addresses the problem of overlap in teaching across departments. This would have significant, positive impact on the Department of Economics. To realise savings, the Department proposes that, as a principle, economics
modules across the School are taught by Economics (with exceptions as appropriate). This will bring staff savings to other Departments (SFAM in particular) and reduce the overall number of modules offered across the School. In particular, the following modules could be replaced by identical or similar modules offered already by Economics:¹

**Economics modules taught by School of Finance and Management:**

- Contemporary issues in the Chinese economy (151030014)
- Contemporary Issues in the Japanese and Korean Economies (151030020)
- Contemporary Issues in the Middle Eastern and North African Economies (151030019)
- Topics in the Chinese economy (15PFMC075)
- Econometric Principles and Data Analysis (15PFMC096)

**Economics modules taught by CISD:**

- International Economics (15PFFC004)
- International Economics (Online)

**Economics modules taught by Department of Development Studies:**

- Introduction to Political Economy of Development (151010048)
- Principles of Marxist Political Economy (153401005)

This would not only improve the financial sustainability of the Department but also allow it to offer a range of modules that make it distinct – a point that was highlighted by the student panel members.

It needs to be noted that realising such School-wide efficiency gains will require School-level decisions as other Departments have thus far not been willing to cooperate on this. In the past, concerns by the Department were ignored when other Departments introduced similar programmes or modules. As an example, it should be noted that one economics module, Principles of Marxist Political Economy, was recently transferred to the Department of Development Studies against the explicit will of the Department of Economics.

1.4 “A plan must be urgently developed to address student satisfaction concerns and the issue of non-continuation. This should include consideration of teaching quality, assessment, feedback, and the wider student experience. The department should further develop its student support and academic adviser systems to help weaker students and improve retention. The department should also consider testing via Moodle to identify students in need of further maths support. (R)”

The Department is committed to improve student retention and satisfaction. The Department’s commitment to excellence in teaching was recognised by a Silver award in the TEF Pilot Subject Level Submission in 2018. Also, the NSS feedback has generally placed the Department high in sectoral comparison, and efforts at improving the contents and delivery of programmes and modules to enrich the student experience were reflected in improvements in NSS scores. However, the NSS results for the Department in 2017 and 2018 were highly disappointing and out of line from the trend of recent improvements.

¹ This list is not comprehensive, and there are further modules that across the School with significant economic policy components.
Results in both years were arguably affected by negative self-selection as a result of the NSS boycott campaign. Results in 2017 were also affected by a fractional strike, while the 2018 NSS was also affected by the pension strike.

Four measures have been implemented to improve progression rates, and the Department will increase its efforts in making these effective. Firstly, the Department is monitoring non-attendance of tutorials closely and contacting students who do not attend regularly, requesting to meet and offering support. Secondly, regular meetings with Academic Advisors shall help to identify students that are struggling academically or in other ways and develop adequate support, either by the Department or by Student Wellbeing. Thirdly, the Department has introduced a range of diverse assessment methods to reduce the weighting of exams, which historically counted for between 70 and 100 percent of the final mark. Fourthly, the Department introduced additional support sessions for students struggling with quantitative materials to prevent repeat of high non-continuation especially in Year 1 undergraduates and the Graduate Diploma. The Department is also making increasing use of online resources to support students in their learning. The Department will also strengthen feedback channels to help a continuous improvement in learning and teaching arrangements and student satisfaction (cf. 4.4 below).

1.5 “Graduate employability must be prioritised in further curriculum reform and student experience initiatives, through for example the development of internships and placements. (R)”

The Department is working closely with Careers and will intensify its efforts to develop placement schemes and capstone projects. It should be noted, however, that the Department’s track record in graduate employability has been excellent, as reflected, for instance, in the large number of graduates that have won ODI Fellowships.

1.6 “The department should develop a new student recruitment strategy. This should include consideration of marketing and entry tariffs: can current higher tariff scores and PG entry requirements be retained, given the present market for economics degrees and current league table positions? (R)”

The Department is facing a very challenging environment for student recruitment. While student numbers expanded substantially over several years, the expansion in UG student recruitment came at the expense of lowering tariffs, with adverse effects on our league table rankings. The decision taken during Confirmation and Clearing in 2017 to hold firm on entry tariffs, which was reaffirmed in 2018, has resulted in a significant drop of UG recruitment while the estimated entry tariff has risen again somewhat. It will take time to rebuild our league table positions, which are very important for UG student recruitment and also impact on PG recruitment. To this end, we need to stay firm on UG entry tariffs. To help recruitment, we are working with Marketing to boost application numbers and conversion rates (cf. 5.1). As mentioned, the Department is also working with Politics, HRP and Law on the new PPE and LEP programmes, which could recruit well if properly marketed.

1.7 “The department should develop initiatives to raise continuation rates from UG to PGT. (A)”
The Department is considering to offer a 20% reduction in tuition fees to its UG and Diploma students to incentivise a continuation of PG studies in the Department. The Department will also provide information on the opportunities for PG study at SOAS to UG finalists.

2. PGR

2.1 “PGR recruitment processes should be improved, in liaison with the Doctoral School. This may include interviewing candidates and regular informal discussions with offer holders. (A)”

Most academic staff do conduct informal (Skype or telephone) interviews with PhD applicants before accepting them. The Research Tutors encourage potential supervisors to closely consider candidates suitability for PhD research before accepting them. Before the start of 2018/19, the Department introduced a buddying scheme to all MPhil/PhD offer-holders, offering to put them in touch with current PhD students in the department. Following the success of this, these efforts will be replicated in the 2019/20.

2.2 “PGR scholarships should be made available where possible; internal and external PGR funding opportunities should be better advertised; the possibility of guaranteeing PGR students a certain number of teaching hours should be explored. (A)”

The Department will strengthen its efforts to make available more PhD scholarships and bursaries. We would like to note that over the last two years three academic staff have been successful at securing UBEL-ESRC and UBEL-collaborative and Bloomsbury Scholarships and that these have been advertised broadly. We shall also explore the possibility of guaranteeing PGR students a certain number of teaching hours, although this conflicts with demands from the School to reduce fractional teaching expenses. Furthermore, it may be difficult to achieve in practice given that we require very specific skills sets for most modules, which do not always match the profiles of our research students.

2.3 “PGR supervision should be fairly allocated across the department’s academic staff; staff should be encouraged to view PGR supervision as integral to their role and important to the department’s research culture. (A)”

PGR supervision will be adequately accounted for in the new workload model (cf. 4.1), increasing the incentive to accept PhD students. The Department will also continue to communicate its expectations regarding PhD supervision to all academics eligible to supervise. It would be good if the school could support this by clearly stating what expectations of professorial staff are in terms of PhD supervision.

3. REF and research

3.1 “The department should continue its preparations for submission of staff to the Development UoA; possible outputs should be read by internal and external reviewers rather than reliance on ABS scores. (R)”

The Department’s REF Coordinator has already initiated a second round of output assessment, and publications have been sent to external reviewers.
3.2 “Consultancy activity should be promoted among staff, as a possible source of department income; remaining administrative or policy hurdles to institutional consultancy should be removed and all staff should ensure that their consultancy activities are declared. (R)”

The Department will encourage academic staff to apply for consultancy opportunities and make sure all staff are aware of the School's policies regarding consultancies and abide to it. The Department hopes that Enterprise Office will prove to be more supportive, going forward.

4. Voice

4.1 “The department should continue to engage with the School-wide introduction of an academic workload model. Concerns about the unfair allocation of workload between junior and senior staff should be addressed. (R)”

The Department has been engaged in and tried to push the introduction of a School-wide academic workload planning tool since 2017, and it has been one of the departments that volunteered to pilot the new workload software. The Department hopes that this can be sorted soon, so that the software can be implemented asap and used for the teaching and admin allocation for 2019/20.

4.2 “The concerns of department staff regarding probation, promotion and support should be subject to further consideration. (A)”

The Department is committed to continue supporting all staff in their development through mentoring and targeted support. Over the last two years, the Department has successfully nominated three colleagues for the AURORA Women’s Leadership Development Programme that aims to develop future leaders for higher education, while two colleagues have been nominated for UK Research and Innovation Future Leaders Fellowships, and one for the Philip Leverhulme Prize.

4.3 “The department should consider rotating staff administrative roles more frequently to increase development opportunities for staff and share workloads more equitably. (A)”

The Department has started to do so.

4.4 “Communication between students, student reps and staff should be improved to help deliver changes in teaching, learning and student experience. (A)”

The Department will strengthen feedback channels to help a continuous improvement in learning and teaching arrangements. A growing number of staff have started to use anonymous online surveys to solicit student feedback mid-term. The Department will also continue its systematic review of the feedback from Student Evaluation of Modules and seek to strengthen engagement with student reps.
5. **Infrastructure**

5.1 “The department should work closely with Marketing to address its concerns over the marketing and visibility of its programmes. (A)”

Student recruitment will be helped by a better SOAS-wide marketing strategy that showcases more than before the School’s strengths in the social sciences, including economics. The Department is continuing its efforts to increase its visibility with contents marketing, including dissemination of its podcast series and video features through its own Facebook and Twitter accounts. The Department is currently working with the new Head of Marketing on developing a new social media campaign to market its programmes and boost the conversion rate in the current recruitment cycle. Furthermore, the Department has started to work on a comprehensive Marketing Strategy and will seek the support of Marketing.

5.2 “The department should liaise with the relevant Professional Service units to deliver required improvements in estates and facilities, IT services, the website, the RAM, student support, and PGR student data and processes. If School-wide engagement or agreement is required to make progress on aspects of the above, the department should consider submitting proposals to the relevant committees, e.g. EB, AB, TELSOC. (A)”

The Department will continue to engage with Professional Services and hopes that these will be fully functional and operational soon. It will be crucial that basic services, especially those having a direct impact on student satisfaction, function smoothly.

6. **Overall**

6.1 “The department has a clear and widely shared vision of itself, the importance of its work, and of its role at SOAS, but there is a non-negligible risk that it will remain in deficit for the foreseeable future. In the event that the plans contained here do not show a marked improvement in the trajectory of its finances within the next 6-9 months, it will be important that more radical contingency planning has taken place to safeguard the teaching of Economics in some form at SOAS. This must include the possibility of integrating into one department staff from the several departments who teach in the general area of economics – in Economics, the School of Finance and Management and even, potentially, who teach development economics in Development Studies. Other staffing economies will also need to be considered to help ensure the department’s financial sustainability and therefore survival (R)”

The Department is deeply concerned with regard to recommendation 6.1. First the recommendation has little connection to the arguments and observations of the report. Second, the recommendation does not address the main weaknesses of the Department, which is student recruitment. Why would integrating with other departments that “teach in the general area of economics” solve the problem of recruitment at undergraduate – or indeed at any – level? As explained under 1.3, the Department has long pointed to problems of overlap in teaching, without much support from the School. The external panel members emphasised that at their institutions it would be unthinkable that a Department other than Economics would teach economics modules. The Department hopes that the CDR panel’s recommendation made under 1.3 can be implemented with the support of the School.
In closing, the Department would like to emphasise that it is determined to work pro-actively and constructively with the School on improving its performance in all areas.
Executive Summary
Following the establishment of a joint SU-SOAS group to work on the racial attainment gap at SOAS, an Attainment Gap Action Plan was approved by Academic Board in January 2018. This report has three aims:

- sets out progress against the action plan
- to detail other relevant actions that are taking place
- to report the most recent attainment gap data

Overall while SOAS benchmarks well in terms of the UK and London institutions, the uneven outcomes at department level need close attention and the mandatory nature of the planned Inclusive Teaching intervention should be supported in practice.

DEBORAH JOHNSTON

Recommendations & Next Steps
TELSOC makes the following recommendations to AB:

- to support new more challenging proposals for the KPI
- Attach timescales and clearer ownership to each of the actions in the present Action Plan. Edit present actions in manner suggested.
- Appoint the ProDirector (Learning and Teaching) as an overall accountable officer for the plan. TELSOC will then make regular reports to Academic Board.
- Through a joint SOAS-SU working group, update the plan to reflect sector best practice emerging from the OFS and joint NUS/UUK projects. The revised plan will be presented to Academic Board for approval in October 2019.
- Continue with current actions in the attainment gap action plan.
- At the same time, the Inclusive Teaching intervention is about to be launched within SOAS. Over two days per department, this includes three combined activities: unconscious bias training; discussion of decolonised curricula and reflection on the Decolonising toolkit; and the Inclusive Assessment labs. The priority departments for the inclusive teaching at SOAS intervention have been identified as: Anthropology, School of Arts, East Asian Languages and Cultures, Languages Cultures and Linguistics, and School of Finance and Management.

NEXT STEPS:
- If approved, to set up a task and finish group with SU to revise the Action Plan, including wider student consultation.

Risks
- Without a challenging KPI, it is possible that both academic and PS teams could reduce their efforts in this area.
- The provision of data needs be routinised so that we can benchmark ourselves regularly.
- This data and our actions against the action plan need to be shared widely so that we can generate a debate about updating the action plan. Any revised plan needs support from the SU and student body generally.
**Equality implications**

This speaks centrally to issues of differential student experience and attainment. The recommendations here intend to keep momentum in place to eliminate racial attainment gaps.

**Consultations**

TELsoc, EB, Head of CILT, AD Learning environment and student outcomes, AD Student Welfare, Director of student and academic engagement, and ADs TQ (both UG and PGT).
SOAS’s attainment gap action plan progress and latest data,

Academic Board March 2019

1. OVERVIEW OF THE PAPER

Following the establishment of a joint SU-SOAS group to work on the racial attainment gap at SOAS, an Attainment Gap Action Plan was approved by Academic Board in January 2018. This report has three aims:

- sets out progress against the action plan
- to detail other relevant actions that are taking place
- to report the most recent attainment gap data

Overall this report makes two overarching conclusions:

- that while SOAS benchmarks well in terms of the UK and London institutions, the uneven outcomes at department level need close attention and the planned Inclusive Teaching intervention should be based on this evidence.
- that the attainment gap action plan should be re-written to include emerging best practice from across the sector. This re-writing should be done jointly with the SU and must be agreed by Academic Board.

2. PROGRESS AGAINST ATTAINMENT GAP ACTION PLAN AND OTHER RELEVANT ACTIONS

The Attainment Gap Action Plan that was adopted by Academic Board in January 2018 is shown in Annex 1, which also reports progress against the agreed actions. There are several conclusions on progress:

- Most importantly the KPI on achievement has already been reached (when measured by the standard data on average qualifiers between SOAS and London non-specialist institutions) and this suggests that we must urgently choose a new KPI.
- It suggests that there has been good progress on the provision of data.
- Some learning and teaching actions are making good progress, such as the inclusive teaching intervention and anonymous marking.
- Other interventions are have more mixed progress – for example unconscious bias training, or the archive project.

The action plan has several weaknesses:

- it does not include all relevant activities. For example, it does not include: all relevant WP activities; decolonising activities (e.g. the decolonising toolkit, and creation of the Academic Lead for Decolonising work, 0.2 FTE); and partnership with African Leadership University (e.g. summer school, mentoring).
- Some activities are in need of revision in various ways (e.g. ‘blind’ marking should be changed to anonymous marking; changes to the wording in the SEM have been suggested; there are suggested changes to the ‘improve study skills section’.
- It needs clear timescales and a revision of the relevant owners, and an overall owner who will ensure progress targets are met.
• It may not include sector best practice in two senses. First, evidence from Kingston is that a clear overarching framework ensured a rapid coordination of activities to reduce their attainment gap. Second, both the OFS and UUK/NUS are compiling evidence on best practice activities which may go beyond what is included in our plan.

Our recommendations are:

• Urgently produce proposals for a more challenging KPI
• Attach timescales and clearer ownership to each of the actions in the present Action Plan. Edit present actions in manner suggested in Annex 1.
• Appoint an overall accountable officer for the plan, with our proposal being the ProDirector (Learning and Teaching) who already reports progress to TELSOC on the teaching and learning components. TELSOC will then make regular reports to Academic Board.
• Through a joint SOAS-SU working group, update the plan to reflect sector best practice emerging from the OFS and joint NUS/UUK projects. The revised plan will be presented to Academic Board for approval in October 2019.

2. DATA SUMMARY

The data for undergraduates (Annex 2) suggests that the attainment gap (measured as a percentage of qualifying students that get good degrees, i.e. firsts or 2:1s) is lower than the UK average gap for both BME students as a whole and for black students in particular. The data also suggest that, after a rise, the size of the gap has been declining.

We are also lower than the London average. However, we should benchmark ourselves to sector leaders, and we can see that institutions like Kingston and Birmingham are significantly better than us. We have a great deal to learn from both.

However, the picture by department suggests some significant divergence in attainment gaps and several areas for concern. While this is for one year only and suffers from small student numbers in some cases, this picture is supported by the regression analysis that controls for student characteristics (including A'level tariff, SEC and commuter student status). Overall the regression analysis illustrates that attainment gaps by ethnicity cannot be explained by student characteristics and ethnicity has a particularly significant impact in certain departments. At the same time, cohort analysis suggests that black students have higher non-continuation rate and course switch rates.

The data on the postgraduate taught (PGT) students also suggests an attainment gap. This gap cannot be nationally benchmarked (as there are no national benchmarks as yet). While we don’t currently have full historical data about trends over time for black students, it does appear that for BME students as a group, the attainment gap is declining. The attainment gap for black PGT students varies substantially by department.

Despite some findings then that suggest a lower gap than elsewhere, and a declining gap, overall the data suggest that SOAS still has a great deal of work to do:

• Many of the actions that are being undertaken currently are outlined in a the attainment gap action plan (Annex 1).
• At the same time, the Inclusive Teaching intervention is about to be launched within SOAS. Over two days per department, this includes three combined activities:
unconscious bias training; discussion of decolonised curricula and reflection on the Decolonising toolkit; and the Inclusive Assessment labs. The priority departments for the inclusive teaching at SOAS intervention have been identified as: Anthropology, School of Arts, East Asian Languages and Cultures, Languages Cultures and Linguistics, and School of Finance and Management.

DEBORAH JOHNSTON, OMAR CERON, ANGUS LOCKYER, SUSAN CLUCAS
### ANNEX 1: PROGRESS against Attainment Gap Action Plan (Agreed January 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Status/Priority</th>
<th>Progress and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** Adopt KPIs which focus on BME students | Agree and monitor the following KPIs:  
  a) Percentage difference between the proportion of undergraduate black and white students achieving a first class degree  
  b) Percentage difference between the proportion of postgraduate black and white students achieving a distinction  
  c) Percentage difference in non-continuation rates between black and white students | Equality & Diversity Committee/Board of Trustees/ADC | High |  
  Green  
  This has been completed, but we need to institute an annual process of data provision. The ug indicator should be changed to ‘good degrees’ to reflect national measures so that we can benchmark. The pgt indicator should then also be ‘distinction/merit’. We suggest that TELSOC should own this, and report regularly to AB and BoT. |
| **2.** Public commitment | Chairs of attainment gap working group to draft acknowledging the racial attainment gap at SOAS and committing to reduce it to no higher than the London\(^1\) median within three years | Director | High |  
  Green/Amber  
  The initial action plan did not refer to the standard measurement (which uses average rather than median). Using the nationally available data on London institutions, we have met this KPI and so need to |

---

\(^1\) ‘London’ is defined here as LSE, UCL, KCL, Imperial, Queen Mary, Royal Holloway, Kingston, Goldsmiths, Westminster, City and Greenwich. The median black-white gap for first class degrees was 17 percentage points in 2016, compared with a SOAS gap of 30 percentage points (Wonkhe).
<p>|   | Improved training for staff | a) Mandatory unconscious bias training as a requirement for successful completion of probation; b) Mandatory refresher course in unconscious bias for all staff every three years | Staff development/HR | High. | Red | Unconscious bias training is compulsory for recruitment. However, we have not yet made it a requirement for probation nor set up a mandatory refresher course. This is urgent. We have included unconscious bias training in our Inclusive Teaching intervention which is mandatory by dept grouping – but would exclude PS staff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Provide information to departments on the size of the gap | (a) departments expected to discuss the issue at a departmental meeting (a representative of the working group will be happy to speak to the issues) (b) circulate information on the gap to HoDs on an annual basis (c) collect data on postgraduate attainment gap | HoDs (b) Head of Equality and Diversity/Planning (c) Planning | (a)(b)(c) Green (d) Amber | All departments have had their undergraduate data and all new data is currently being circulated. All departments will discuss their data as part of the Inclusive Teaching intervention. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approval Level</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ensure greater awareness of differences in marks by race at module level</td>
<td>Provide module marks by race to module convenors</td>
<td>Academic Development Committee</td>
<td>Red – We need to consider how to establish this data in an accessible way (as we have 1,500 modules). We propose looking at divergences from averages and including as part of APR and Comprehensive Review. We need further work with Planning to devise a feasible approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6    | Produce research/archive on SOAS’s colonial legacy | (a) commission research  
(b) create film archive | Decolonization working group | Medium  
Unclear – with this lies with the Decolonising Group |
| 7    | Monitor student perceptions of teaching | Introduce additional questions on to the SOAS module evaluation form as follows:  
(a) The curriculum appropriately reflected the views of non-white male writers;  
(b) The teachers on my course were sensitive to the needs and backgrounds of BME students when leading classroom discussion | Academic Development Committee | High  
These questions have been included in the SEM. However, there are suggestions for better wording that should be considered. |
| 8 | Promote inclusive assessment of modules | (a) Blind marking of all assignments (School Learning and Teaching Committees to investigate feasibility)  
(b) Implement the recommendations of the Inclusive Assessment Working Group | Prodirector for Learning and Teaching; Academic Development Committee | High | Green  
Blind marking has been renamed anonymous and is on track.  
The conclusions of the Inclusive Assessment Working Group were approved and are on track. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | Improve study skills | (a) Introduction of study skills component into all first year degree programmes Departmental learning and teaching committee to consider how to make this operational  
(b) All module outlines to include information on (i) the module's aims and objectives and (ii) the requirements for obtaining a II.1 or First on that module  
(c) Better publicize academic support available for mature students | Departmental Learning and Teaching coordinators  
Learning and Teaching Quality Committee | High | Red  
This work needs to be taken forward through the new CILT. |
| 10 | Review the SOAS complaints procedure | (a) Undertake an audit and make an annual report to be made to Academic Board  
(b) Consider introducing a specific appeals process for decisions in respect of mitigating circumstances | Head of Governance and Compliance | Medium | Green  
A review of the complaints procedure is underway. |
| 11 | Improve non-academic support for BME students | Tailored support for BME students | Head of Student Advice and Well-Being | High | Amber  
A discussion of tailored support for BME students and for WP students has |
|   | Improve student academic support | (a) BME mentoring  
(b) All departments to have a designated BME tutor  
(c) Ensure office hours are adhered to  
(d) Produce comprehensive guide to academic, welfare and administrative support for students | (a) Director of Academic Services/Students' Union  
(b) HoDs  
(c) HoDs  
(d) Director of Academic Services/Head of Student Advice and Well-Being Oversight for all these to lie with Academic Development Committee | (a) already underway. Consider extending beyond first year students)  
(b) High  
(c) High  
(d) Medium\(^2\) | begun but is not yet completed.  
a) Green  
b) Red/Amber  
c) Amber  
d) Amber  
BME mentoring scheme is underway for a second year and is being evaluated. The discussion of the BME tutor has been widened to a discussion of a student welfare tutor and needs to be presented to TELSOC and AB. The new departmental system keeps closer attention to office hours but we need to monitor its impact through NSS. A guide to academic advising has been produced but we need similar guides to welfare and administrative support. Owner should be TELSOC.\
\(^2\) Only listed as medium priority because it is probably not feasible to put together a guide until Professional Service Restructuring is agreed ie we will probably not be able to have a guide in place for the start of the 2018/19 academic year
ANNEX 2: LATEST DATA ON RACIAL ATTAINMENT GAP AT SOAS

A.1 THE UNDERGRADUATE ATTAINMENT GAP

In the national debate on the impact of ethnicity on attainment, the data focuses on UK domiciled students only and on ‘good degree’ (1/2:1) completions. The most robust measures of the impact of ethnicity on student attainment control for a range of factors, including: tariff points on entry, socioeconomic classification, index of multiple deprivation and term-time commuting. Drawing on best practice from the Kingston commuter student project, Planning has conducted a regression analysis (using a sample of approximately 2,000 students) who graduated between 2013/2014 and 2017/2018.

A.2 THE ROLE OF ETHNICITY AND OTHER STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The headline finding is that black students are 45% as likely to graduate with a good degree as white students when other characteristics, such as department, tariff points, background and commuting status, are controlled for, i.e. if we compare students who are otherwise similar in terms of their A ‘level attainment, their socioeconomic background and their term-time accommodation.

There is as yet no national or other institutional data to which to compare this finding. However, as results from the London Commuter Project are released, we might find comparable data.

The same data was used to look at the impact by department, and this analysis investigated the relationship between ethnicity, other characteristics and degree outcomes for all BME groups. This suggested that the following interactions between Department-Ethnicity are significantly less likely to achieve a Good Honours Degree than their POL/White counterparts: School of Arts for students identifying as Other/Mixed; East Asian Languages and Cultures for students identifying as Black, Other/Mixed; School of Finance and Management for students identifying as Asian; and the Law department for students identifying as Asian and Other.

A.3 ANNUAL DATA FOR THE UNDERGRADUATE ATTAINMENT GAP

Snapshot data shows the data for any one year and does not account for A ‘level tariff or other factors that might influence attainment. The advantage is that it can tell us something about trends over time and can be benchmarked against other institutions.

The most recent data is for 2017/18 and it shows a 15 percentage point difference between the percentage of black students and white students obtaining a good degree (i.e. a first or 2:1). For BME students, this is an 8 percentage point difference. The trends in the BME attainment gap shows are clearly reducing up over time (table 2). The trends in the black attainment gap have varied over time but have been falling in recent years (table 1).
Table 1: Undergraduate Qualifiers Analysis: Percentage of students obtaining a good degree (first and 2:1) for black and white student groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point difference</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Undergraduate Qualifiers Analysis: Percentage of students obtaining a good degree (first and 2:1) for BME and white student groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage point difference</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison to the UK: national data for the UK is available publicly for 2016/17 (see fig 1). This shows that for the BME students as a whole, the attainment gap is 14%. The same data for SOAS for BME students for 2016/17 (table 2) suggests an attainment gap of 9%.

If we focus on black students, the UK data for 2016/17 suggests an attainment gap of 24%. For the same year at SOAS, the attainment gap for black students compared to white students was 17%.

Fig1: Student attainment across ethnic groups, UK 2016/17
Comparison to other institutions: In 2016/17, the SOAS attainment gap of -17% for Black students compares to a gap of -3% at Birmingham, and -8% at Kingston. (It should be noted, however, that the average black attainment gap for London HEIs excluding specialist providers was -34%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Difference</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Birmingham and Kingston have made considerable progress in addressing their black attainment gaps over the past seven years. For example, Kingston had a black attainment gap of 35% in 2011/12, however this has improved year on year to -8% in 2016/17.

Birmingham:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Difference</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+7%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kingston:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Difference</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.4 DETAILED UNDERGRADUATE DEPARTMENT DATA

The data here focuses on the good degree outcomes of black and white UK-domiciled students for particular years. Again this suffers from the problem of not accounting for differences in student characteristics. There is substantial variation by departments in the profile of awarding of good degrees at the undergraduate level.

From table 3, it is clear that there are pockets of good practice and areas where both reflection and active intervention is urgently needed.

Table 3: Undergraduate Qualifiers Analysis by department 2017/18: Percentage of students obtaining a good degree (first and 2:1) for black and white student groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Percentage of students obtaining good degree</th>
<th>Attainment gap</th>
<th>(Number of black)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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A.5 POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT DATA

We have this data for UK domiciled-students only for 2017/18. There is no national standard for the assessment of attainment gaps at PGT. This analysis focuses mostly on the comparison of black and white students. Again the simple annual data does not allow us to consider the impact of other student characteristics.

Overall for SOAS:

- we see that 43% of white students obtain a distinction compared to only 13% of black students. This is an attainment gap of 30 percentage points.
- If we look at the wider category (distinction/merit), 80% of black achieve this compared to 96% of white students. This is an attainment gap of 16 percentage points.

We can only analyse trends for BME students. Comparison between Table 6 and Fig 2 suggests a stable gap at the distinction level and a declining gap for the broader category. Fig 2 focuses on completers only and suggests that on average, 2011/12-2015/16, there was an attainment gap at distinction level of 15% for BME students. In 2017/18, this gap was 15 percentage points. Looking at the broader category (distinction/merit), for 2011/12-2015/16, there was a 16 percentage point gap. By 2017/18, this had become a 13% point gap.
**Detail department data** Table 7 shows detailed data by department, for both the distinction category and for the combined distinction/merit category. While sample sizes are small, it suggests that the departments with the largest attainment gaps at PGT level are School of Arts and Development Studies. No student characteristics data is available for this analysis. There are also worrying issues with distinction gaps for Economics, Interdisciplinary, LCL and Politics. Anthropology is borderline, while Law and FIM show strongest performance. Finally, it should be noted that neither EALC nor HRP had black students completing PGT studies in 2017/18.
Table 7: PGT Qualifiers Analysis by department 2017/18: Percentage of students obtaining a distinction or distinction/merit for black and white student groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Percentage of students obtaining distinction</th>
<th>Distinction Attainment gap</th>
<th>Percentage of students obtaining distinction/merit</th>
<th>Attainment gap</th>
<th>(Number of black students, FTE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EALC*</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP*</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*no black students completing PGT programmes in 2017/18
A.6 Conclusion:

Although the patterns of racialised disadvantage differ by the measures used and by the level of study analysed, there are important areas for urgent improvement at SOAS. This is true despite the headline finding that the gap at undergraduate level at SOAS is smaller than the national and London average.

This document should be read alongside the accompanying report on progress on the Attainment Gap Action Plan (Annex 1). However, here it can be noted, that the priority departments for the inclusive teaching at SOAS intervention in 2018/19 have been identified as: Anthropology, School of Arts, East Asian Languages and Cultures, Languages Cultures and Linguistics, and School of Finance and Management. This intervention will be delivered to all departments by end 2019/20.
Executive Summary

The Students' Union establish six strategic priorities every 3 years which are voted on via a Referendum (which is open to all students). These are formulated into a strategic plan to be presented at the following Union General Meeting (UGM). Thereafter, the progress of the strategic priorities is monitored, reviewed and enacted yearly.

The last referendum in January 2016 identified these strategic priorities, voted for in this order:

1. Education: Curriculum Development
2. Education: Decolonising the Curriculum
3. Employability
4. Welfare: Mental Health
5. Welfare: Accommodation

In addition, each academic session the new Co-Presidents agree a number of yearly educational and non-educational priorities (altogether more than six). These may match/correspond to the strategic ones, or be variants of other important concerns - and they certainly derive from the platforms on which the Co-Presidents were elected on. These will also be focussed on during their time in office.

The educational priorities are:

1. Reform academic pastoral support
2. Improve Postgrad Student Experience
3. BME Attainment Gap
4. Decolonising the Curriculum
5. Deconstructing the 'OA' of SOAS

The SU have also focussed on reviewing and reforming Governance and Democracy at SOAS SU, though this hasn’t

This report summaries the progress against each of the academic priorities, the outstanding concerns against priorities and requests for support or recommendation in further addressing the priorities.

Recommendations

The recommendations are outlined in the third column of the report.

Financial Impact

There are several requests for funding and human resources within the priorities report.
1. Ensure the 50-50 financial agreement the School holds with SU for training reps is upheld each year as a matter of course.
2. Helping to train the full-time post of Black Students’ Pastoral Coordinator, which in its initial stage will be a post paid for by SU.
3. Commit to funding archives projects, or opening out existing opportunities already in place in the Library to students (as per the conversation that is being had with Library).
4. Help with advertising the Student Development Fund, volunteers for the panel (tba) and assistance with securing longevity of this fund.
5. Assist SU in following through UGM motion of ‘Allow students to access the content of the S. U’s meetings with SOAS management’. Employment of a secretary or minute-taker may be necessary.

Risks

The risks and the concerns of the Students’ Union are outlined in the second column of the report.

Equality implications

All SU priorities support the advancement of equality for all students.

Consultation

- Student feedback from Union democratic structures e.g. Exec Committee, Trustees and mechanisms e.g. UGMs, Referenda and their surrounding debates, to date.
- Advice from Sally Priddle.
## SOAS SU Educational Strategic Priorities report - for presentation at Academic Board, 13 March 2019

Written by Tam Hau-Yu (Co-President Democracy & Education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>What Students’ Union have done</th>
<th>SU’s outstanding concerns</th>
<th>What SU need support with/ Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reform academic pastoral support | - **Academic Advisors** - surveyed students in Term 1 to slightly mixed results - roughly 57:43 student awareness of AAs (response rate 147 students). Worked on handbook with AAWG. Poster awareness and continual verbal updates to students.  
- **Student Reps**: trained just shy of 100, constant comms and listening to reports. Meetings around OPS showed dire need for more regular and more inclusive comms and opportunities for dialogue and negotiation. SU have progressed casework | - Ensuring from our side comms is clear around **Anonymous Marking** - and that we are prepared as SU to answer confusions students may face (this will likely require a briefing, a point of contact).  
- **SU-School reps 50-50 matched funding** agreement needs financial recommitment. Apparently each year the SU has to bid for the funding?  
- **Complaints** - (1) what is the outcome of the Clements review? (2) How do we increase pool of potential investigators - how to incentivise, because it is not fair to students, some of whom have complaints which have gone on for years? If there is no resolution, they cannot be kept in individualising and dehumanising limbo while School, disconnected from students, focus on improving our ‘visions’ and ‘strategy’? As much as working to national and international guidelines IS important. (3) making training for the handling of complaints mandatory. (4) Clear-as-day comms and guidance - I only just found out | - Academic advisors - comms and being regularly updated, meaning Depts committed to.  
- Monitoring and being fast working with School as well as challenging if need be, with any concerns arising on **Anonymous Marking**, which is a welcome roll-out.  
- **Reps: School to clarify on matching SU for funding going forwards.**  
- If all staff will sit mandatory unconscious bias and anti-racist teaching training, SU want to be involved and weigh in on the design of these - particularly as we are looking to train Academic Advisors more rigorously, also as students want such workshops on these topics to be mandatory (in much the same ways as Consent). |
and facilitating and promoting campaigns.

- **SU** helped in the design or decision of certain initiatives e.g. ACU scholarships, WP fund, UG Journal - highly interesting and informative for our own work.
- Worked on ‘warmer’ and less punitive-sounding comms for students who are being emailed by Registry, Fees(?), Mit Circs. Mit Circs evidence can now also be supplied by SU.

the other day that student reps and other staff can also sit on appeals panels!

- **Academic Regs** - I am concerned that having not received training on regs, that here I am not as strong an advocate for students as the SU needs.
- **New BA Foundation year students** - reassurance on welfare and academic support.
- **LEP discontinuation and comms around this.** It doesn’t seem convincing that the School are drawing away from providing these ‘satellite’ courses, when they are core to our image and popular perception. Students and visitors often comment we could do more in our power to make such programmes attractive - as language courses could potentially be good earners.
- **Vast array of modules we offer (~1600?) and sustainability of the School as well as service to the students.** How to preserve identity of the School going forwards, including taking a public stand where it matters e.g NSS, Languages and specialist subjects being cut.
- **Concerns with deadlines miscommunications and module sign-up confusions in departments - Development and Anthropology was brought to our attention this term.**
- **BLE - revocation of access.** Monika Nangia has stated that School are writing this out of regs or reforming it - would need

- **PGR Supervision difficulties** - both how to improve the experience in the interim so the researchers’ welfare and education does not suffer and is not prolonged
- **Review and from School on working together on representing students.** On Reps, getting a rough calendar so we know academic pinch points, when dept meetings are taking place, and can thus support our students better. This also means HODs and LTCs and Union reps meeting with SU early in the year, before the new Academic year commences.
- **We have been invited to be involved in work on BA Fdn year students,** which is appreciated, and we shall continue discussing!
- **LEP review and Languages strategy.** Pilot schemes possible.
- **Library - assurance of future, we are monitoring this.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve Postgrad Student Experience</th>
<th>confirmation here? See Student UGM motion: 'Stop the Registry (fees &amp; scholarships team) sanctioning late payment by blocking access to BLE and learning resources'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>PGR:</strong> Priority scholarships for Black British students and Global South students - passed in AB. PGR Fund which was cut by £5k to save on the DS budget, has by UGM policy been passed to be topped up by SU now. Complaints committee. Sally Priddle working with Kira Brenner on improving RSA governance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● PGR Journal - been in communications, but this is an autonomous group, they are an SU society. They have huge concerns with labour and support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>PGTs last year and this year complain about the delay in their graduation.</strong> This especially affects international students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● As per the resolution of a student complaint from Term 1, the SU and School have been advised by that investigator to look into the delay of UG and PGT Final exams - if the student is sick for example, they have to wait 1 year to resit. This especially affects international students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● That the School work to build better partnership with the Doctoral School, as problem solution can be slow, until escalated by Sabbatical Officers. (Kira Brenner, Alfredo Saad Filho, Andrea Cornwall could give better update).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The School commit to helping SU to build a PGT Society analogous to the RSA (at the time of writing, this would be funded by SU) - in terms of governance, and information on academic regs, calendar etc - as PGT are a time-sensitive group, and hence much of the concerns with this society would not only be representation, community and welfare -- but also careers &amp; employability, research and study skills, better understanding of international students’ issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME Attainment Gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received regular updates from School, also recently had the report issued from Deborah Johnston.</td>
<td>The Co-President Democracy &amp; Education and Co-President Equality &amp; Liberation are jointly responsible for this priority. It would be useful if they were involved in the same board or working group to deal with this specifically. Pro-Director LT suggestion to revive Attainment working group, however informally, is welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led projects work independently of SU Exec, yet they are being facilitated by student members, and that work informs the WP and Retention strategies, and some depts more particularly i.e. Law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decolonising the Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SU sits on and supports the invaluable work of the Decolonising WG and DOM Society.  
*Student Development Fund* aims to redress some of these issues, | The current system where the Sabbatical Officers sit on multiple boards and working groups, keeping atop of so many priorities and updates at levels from local to international, is unsustainable, inefficient, exhausting, and simply does not work. It puts a heavy load on the full and part-time officers who sit on the Boards, and even | Concurrently to points on review of how School boards work, perhaps School could commit to assist SU (but SU to take lead) to improve representation on board structures including the possible creation of |  |
<p>| Deconstructing the 'OA' of SOAS | Organised archives tour of SOAS, met with positive feedback from Pro-Director RE. | We talk about putting the A (back) in SOAS, but we don’t spend as much time deconstructing the Oriental. Here are some of our concerns altogether: Eastern Asian students’ participation in student democracy, following up complaints and representations and consciousness of their liberation on campus; African and African diaspora student experiences of teaching being riddled with racisms and imperialisms, and handling of cases being slow and not transparent. | Commitment from the School to facing our own history and dealing with it - having a conversation about funding archives projects - this could tie into other priorities in the School as well as boost our image as a School. Work-based learning modules - can a certain proportion be based in-house too - namely History students. |
| being prioritised for BME and WP students and initially thought to be tied into the Decolonising priority. | heavier load on the many, many students who don’t see a way in to input as to this incredibly important discussion. What we see on some boards and WGs is student voice and representation. Reviewing the whole structure, in fact student voice and representation is very poor, and this cannot be mitigated by the individual qualities of those who sit. | working groups and committees in the SU, in order that we can say with more and more confidence, that the student voice is actually being represented and heard at the higher levels. |
|  |  | • Possibly a comprehensive review/survey among students with Decolonising WG on progress of Toolkit usage and other items related - discuss with Decol WG. |  |
|  |  | • Help with advertising the Student Development Fund, volunteers for the panel (tba) and assistance with securing longevity of this fund. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance and Democracy at SOAS</th>
<th>Doing modules that are SOAS Archive projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Initiating Governance reform this term, which is in student consultation stage, with initial help from Sally P. This is being handed over to next year's Sabbs.</td>
<td>• At the last Library Forum meeting, Oliver Urquhart Irvine approved of idea of more student collaboration in library-external org projects. SU wishes to get clear commitment from School on this (verbal update may be necessary here).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High staff turnover in some places, and staff staying for years and years in others, including in SU - means knowledge transfer, holding of power (for knowledge is power) subsequently also rigorous handover and training - remains problematic.</td>
<td>• School commit to reviewing this with SU, listening to our recommendations, and working together to make changes for better representation for students next year - at least in terms of board representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conversation has been initiated about tightening operations and trust between School and SU in order to make clear what is part of the duties of being a Full-time officer (mandatory and essential).</td>
<td>• Conversation around how to enact this UGM motion of ‘Allow students to access the content of the S. U’s meetings with SOAS management’. Employment of a secretary or minute-taker may be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UGM motion passed: Allow students to access the content of the S. U’s meetings with SOAS management.</td>
<td>• SU to gain a more rigorous and transparent understanding of School finances and expenditure (which we have asked, but not pushed for in Term 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Development and enhancement of curriculum content to ensure attractiveness and distinctiveness of the SOAS 'offer'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Collate and assess module marks by race and other protected characteristics to (1) Present at TELSOC &amp; (2) Share with module conveyors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Include racial attainment gap data as part of the APR and as part of the comprehensive curriculum review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
<td>Reinstate the stipulation that all students must discuss and gain approval of module selections with/from programme convenor or personal tutor prior to sign up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red</strong></td>
<td>All module outlines to include information on (i) the module's aims and objectives and (ii) requirements for obtaining a 2.1 or 1st on that module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red</strong></td>
<td>Identify how to introduce study skill component into all first-year degree programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td><strong>Amber</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blind marking implementation</strong></td>
<td>All aspects and practicalities of implementation have not yet been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft and agree public statement committing SOAS to reduce its racial attainment gap to no higher than the London median within three years.</strong></td>
<td>A final decision on KPIs has not yet been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Produce research/archive on SOAS' colonial legacy.</strong></td>
<td>The process for developing this has not yet been formalised. Discussions have been had to propose funding student led projects to deliver this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority training- unconscious bias training</strong></td>
<td>Discussions have been held with the union to implement unconscious bias training but a timeframe for implementation has not been agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embed analysis of departmental racial attainment gaps into the annual data cycle.</strong></td>
<td>It has not been clear whether the School has the appropriate data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of peer observation of teaching (1st Year Modules)</strong></td>
<td>Scope of review and recommendations to be reported Summer 2018. The scope of the project needs to be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent and high quality Academic advising</strong></td>
<td>The process was identified as inconsistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement of marking turnaround time. 2017/18 targets set at dept. level in range 80-100%; 100%</strong></td>
<td>The manual process is in place however it is not an efficient use of time and the longer-term aim is to have an automatic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A unique and fulfilling Student Experience</td>
<td><strong>Red</strong> Develop multi faith advisory service and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC WORKLOAD MODEL

AB is asked to approve the establishment of the School's new academic workload model and related documents, namely:

1. The workload policy
2. The workload tasks and tariffs
3. The related role descriptions for new and revised departmental roles
4. The process specification and implementation plan

Executive Summary

Academic Board and Executive Board have previously endorsed the launch of an academic workload model in the School. Since November, work to develop the model has been led by Professor Tom Ormerod of the University of Sussex and a workload working group which has built upon previous efforts to develop and launch a School-wide workload model (2017-18). The model is now ready for launch. AB is therefore asked to approve its establishment and the related policy, tasks and tariffs, role descriptions, process specification and implementation plan.

Following approval, the model will be launched. Heads of Department, Department Managers and other staff will receive training permitting them to use the model for the planning of academic workloads for next session (2019-20).

AB sponsor: Andrea Cornwall

Recommendations

It is recommended that AB approves the establishment of the model and the related policy, tasks and tariffs, role descriptions, process specification and implementation plan.

Financial Impact

The introduction of the model will have a positive long-term financial impact in clarifying and permitting comparison of the allocation of staff time within and across departments.

The platform chosen – a spreadsheet – will enable the School to cancel its current WAMS contract with Simitive when it is up for renewal in July, with modest annual cost saving.

Risks

Users of the model will require training and support to ensure effective use. This is included in the implementation plan. The timeline is tight if departments are to use the model in planning 2019-20 workloads. Significant delays in implementation would jeopardise this.

Some activities and tariffs in the model will need revising in light of experience. The School panel will monitor the use of the Workload Model, collecting data on average departmental workloads, and also commentary from staff and submissions for changes to tariffs and weightings. These will be subjected to a systematic evaluation at panel meetings in July and December.
Equality Implications

The introduction of the Workload Model will have positive equality implications in facilitating transparency and fairness in the allocation of staff workloads irrespective of gender, ethnicity, disability or any other protected characteristics.

Consultation

- Executive Board
- Academic Board
- Workload Working Group (including Pro-Directors, Head of Department, Associate Director of Research, Chair of Senate, Department Managers and UCU reps)
- Dedicated UCU meeting
- Informal discussion with HoDs, academic and PS staff
SOAS Academic Workload Allocation Policy

1. Introduction
1.1 This policy provides staff with a framework for the operation of the School’s Workload Model. It is intended for Heads of Department and staff in academic departments who will be allocated workloads through the Workload Model, along with Professional Services colleagues responsible for supporting its operation. It should be read in conjunction with other School policies and procedures.

2. Purpose and aims
2.1 The purpose of the Workload Model is to support the fair allocation of academic staff workloads within and between academic departments of the School. While permitting departments flexibility in workload planning, the Workload Model aims to:
   - Facilitate transparency and fairness in the allocation of staff workloads irrespective of gender, ethnicity, disability or any other protected characteristics;
   - Support the reasonable allocation of staff time to teaching, research, administration, and service, and to tasks within each of these main areas of activity, as appropriate;
   - Support the identification and, where applicable, removal of inconsistencies in workload allocations between different types of staff, including academic, permanent teaching-only and fixed-term teaching-only staff;
   - Help staff to achieve a good work-life balance;
   - Provide departments with a better basis for allocating resources and planning activities;
   - Facilitate cross-department and interdisciplinary working;
   - Enhance the student experience, supporting departments and staff in the delivery of improvements in teaching, learning and support for students;
   - Encourage and reward innovation within the School;
   - Promote fairness in staff promotion procedures;
   - Support the School’s attainment of Athena Swan accreditation.

2.2 The key principles that inform the operation of the Workload Model, and which it seeks to promote across the School, are transparency and fairness. Through the transparent and fair allocation of workloads, the model aims to facilitate positive cultural change.

2.3 The purpose of the Workload Model is to provide a measure of actual activity workloads. It is not an incentivisation tool to prioritise some activities over others by inflating their tariffs. Nor is it a performance management system for rewarding productivity or dealing with under-performance by changing allocated loads according to activity outcome.

3. Overview of the model
3.1 The Workload Model spreadsheet is a tool through which Heads of Department allocate workloads to their staff, who have the opportunity to view, accept and query allocations. Workloads are assigned to staff through specified activities, with each activity allocated a numerical value in hours.

3.2 The Workload Model spreadsheet should be used to plan workloads in advance of an academic year and revisited and updated at different stages of the year thereafter, to take into account changes in activities and adjustments to the data on which calculations are made (e.g. module enrolments).

4. Hours-based calculation
4.1. The tariff attributed to each activity is measured in terms of the hours necessary to undertake the activity. The hours attributed to each activity will be validated by a
School-level panel and are described in the accompanying tasks and tariffs document. They can be revised in the light of experience by submitting a case to the School panel. The hours assigned for each individual’s record include elements of ‘hidden’ workload (for meetings, untimetabled student contact, email, etc.) under teaching and administration categories. The aim of the tariff document is to capture the time taken to undertake activities to within 10% accuracy.

4.2. Four main kinds of workload are identified: Research, Teaching (UG and PGT, including preparation, delivery, marking and student out-of-class contact), Administration, and Service (including PhD supervision, ad-hoc recruitment and marketing activities, etc).

4.3. The model aims to capture all activities in pursuit of core School business that are in principle assigned to an individual by a line manager (typically the head of department). It does not routinely capture activities that an individual assigns to themselves (e.g., reviewing, editing, society administration, conference committee or chair). Exceptions can be made by negotiation with heads of department and confirmation by the School panel chair to add externally generated activities to the workload model where these are deemed to be core to the School’s business goals.

4.4. To ensure that all academic staff with contracts that include a research component are able to be research-active, all receive a fixed allocation of time (for 100% FTE T&R staff, 616 hours, equivalent to 40% of available time) to undertake research, regardless of previous or predicted future REF entry, research income or other research productivity indicator.

4.5. Allocations of hours for teaching, admin and service are made on the basis of the specific activities assigned to individuals. For teaching activities, differential tariffs will capture whether material is prepared for the first time or repeated.

5. Balancing activity loads across staff

5.1. The Workload Model aims to achieve a maximum activity load of 1524 hours for each 100% FTE member of academic staff (pro-rata for fractional contracts). This equates to 44 weeks at 35 hours per week per annum. The typical proportions of time allocated to teaching, research administration and service set out in this policy are not intended to apply to every week or month of the academic year. It is recognised that staff will likely contribute a greater proportion of their time to teaching and administration during term time, for example, than outside of it. The typical proportions are intended to be achieved across the longer time periods indicated.

5.2. The Workload Model should be managed to balance overall department workload, and to maintain an appropriate balance of research, teaching, administration and service activities for academic staff. The total activity load is shared across all department academic staff, such that an individual’s annual activity load will be a function of the total load and the number of academics in the department sharing that load. Thus a key goal for the School executive board and for heads of department is to endeavour to minimise the total activity load each year through efficient activity management.

5.3. Ratios of activities for each member of staff will vary by contract and role (Head of Department, coordinators), and approximate to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>3 (i.e., approx. 1.5 days per week for a 100% FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4 (i.e., approx. 2 days per week for a 100% FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2 (i.e., approx. 1 day per week for a 100% FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1 (i.e., approx. 0.5 days per week for a 100% FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Scholarship refers to undertaking research or further study to enhance/develop teaching practice.
To enable part-time academic staff on T&R contracts (of 0.8 FTE or less) to take on significant managerial and other activities that may influence promotion prospects, they may choose to a ratio similar to Coordinators. The typical allocation of 40% of academic staff time to research is not a contractual entitlement and may be varied at the discretion of Heads of Department, taking into account factors including departmental and School resources, career stages, career pathways and the contributions that members of staff are making to the institution’s research.

5.4. The ratios reflect how an effective activity distribution model should come to operate in departments over time. To achieve the proposed ratios will require careful management, both of creation and removal of activities from departmental activities, and of fair distribution of activities across individuals. The model should be managed by Heads of Department in assigning activities on an annual basis to maintain the appropriate ratio for each member of academic staff.

5.5. Staff with a contract component paid for by external agencies, or with external funding that pays a proportion of salary and on-costs, will have a pro-rata adjustment to expected load across all activity types, according to the formula described below.

5.6. Where an individual has a load under one activity heading that is more than one standard deviation above the mean load for the department, their load should where possible be adjusted down. Over- or under-loadings are not carried over into the following year’s model. Adjustments (e.g., by shifting marking loads between individuals) should be made in-year wherever possible at one of the three census dates. However, adjustments should be made to the following year’s model to compensate for any unresolved over-loading of more than one standard deviation under any heading in the previous year.

5.7. In order to facilitate the setting up of research and teaching activities, new members of staff of grade 8 or lower and/or those within a probationary period who are due to transition to indefinite contracts will have an expected teaching and administration load that is reduced relative to established members of staff, via the following activity ratios:

On the spreadsheet it is shown under the Service heading.
Teaching and Research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching and Scholarship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8. Individuals returning from periods of maternity or paternity leave, or long-term sickness leave will have a phased return to full workload, in which the six months following return to work will have a 25% reduction in teaching and admin load (equivalent to an annual ratio of 5:2.5:1.5:1 for T & R staff, and 5:1.5:2.5:1 for T&S staff).

5.9. To recognise the contribution that greater experience of senior staff makes to efficient working, staff on grade 8 or lower who are not during a probationary period carry a reduced administration load, giving ratios of 4.5:3:1.5:1 for R, T, A and S activities.

6. Staff categories

6.1 Members of staff in academic departments in the following categories will be allocated workloads through the model:

- Academic (Teaching and Research)
- Teaching-only (Teaching and Scholarship)

Staff on Research-only contracts are not included in the model since their workload activities are typically project-specific.

7. Process: Allocation of Workload

7.1 Heads of Department are responsible for the allocation of workloads to staff in their departments in a manner consistent with the purposes and aims above.

7.2 Before publishing workloads to staff, Heads should ensure that necessary discussions have been held with affected staff, particularly where a change is anticipated in an individual’s workload. The model should not be used to allocate substantial new tasks to individuals without prior discussion having taken place. Heads should ensure that they are accessible to any member of staff who wishes to discuss concerns about their workload.

7.3 Workloads will be set and balanced at three annual census points, corresponding to initiation of planning cycle (early summer), entry of known student loads (late autumn) and addition of supervision loads (early spring). HoDs will endeavour to modify extreme (> 1 standard deviation under any one category) within an academic year.

8. Acceptance of Workload

8.1 Staff within departments are responsible for considering and accepting the workloads allocated to them, by responding (e.g. by email) to the allocations provided to them, as required.

8.2 Queries about workload allocations should be made to Heads of Department. Where a member of staff has concerns over workload, they should in the first instance discuss these concerns with their Head. Discussions over workload allocations should be conducted professionally and in a spirit of cooperation. If these discussions do not
resolve the problem, another senior member of staff may, exceptionally, be asked to help identify a satisfactory solution.

8.3 Changes to workload tariffs and policies are made by the School-level panel.

9. Existing School policies and obligations
9.1 Workload allocations made by Heads of Department must be consistent with existing School policies and contractual obligations. With this in mind, the model will not be used to increase staff hours beyond their contracted number, to reduce opportunities for flexible working, to change employee leave entitlements, or to otherwise affect rights and obligations specified in existing policies and procedures.

9.2 To ensure that existing School policies and contractual obligations are observed, Heads of Department are reminded of the following (though each of these policies is hard-wired into the model via appropriate tariffs and role weightings):

- Reduced teaching loads for new academic staff on probation are specified in the School’s Probation Procedure for New Academic (Teaching & Research) Staff and should be observed.
- The activities allocated to hourly-paid teaching staff (fractionals) and the hourly values attached to them must be consistent with fractional contracts and agreed rates of pay (‘Fractional Teachers Pay’).
- Private consultancy, as defined in the School’s External Professional Activity Policy, should not be included in the model. Under the terms of the policy, it is undertaken in a member of staff’s own time.
- Holders of School academic leadership roles are contractually expected to devote specified proportions of their time to the roles. For example, the Associate Director of Research / Learning & Teaching roles are 0.5 FTE (762 hours per year), which must be reflected in the model. This is effectively a secondment.

9.3 Any substantial changes to academic workload arising from the use of the model will be subject to consultation with staff and the relevant campus trade union (UCU).

10. Other School-wide norms and expectations
10.1 In addition to ensuring compliance with existing School policies and obligations, Heads of Department should keep in mind the following School-wide norms and expectations when allocating workloads:

- The values (hours) allocated to activities should be realistic and reasonable. Discrepancies in the values attached to the same or similar activities undertaken by two or more members of staff should not relate to staff categories and should be clearly justifiable in other ways.
- Workload allocations relating to teaching should take into account both on-campus and distance learning provision.
- Data on teaching contact hours in the model should be manually adjusted by departments to take into account practices not recognised in existing systems, like the sharing of a lecture between two different modules that is common when undergraduates and postgraduates are co-taught in a classroom. In existing data systems, a one-hour lecture delivered to students on two different modules may appear as two contact hours. This should be manually adjusted so that contact hours in the model are consistent with actual hours taught, i.e. one hour in the example given.
- All workload allocations to individual staff should be sensitive to their professional and, where possible, personal circumstances. These may include different stages of career, health or caring responsibilities (consistent with relevant legal frameworks and School policies).
10.2 The recording and reporting of data in the Workload Model will facilitate the identification and analysis of differences in activities and values in use across departments of the School, with the expectation that over time other School-wide norms and expectations will be agreed.

11. Service requests
11.1 If a Head of Department wishes a member of staff in another department to undertake some work (e.g. teaching) in their department, they may submit a ‘service request’ to the Head of the other department. It is the responsibility of Heads receiving service requests to give them full consideration and to accept them subject to discussion with the relevant colleague whenever they can be reasonably accommodated.

12. Staff with joint appointments
12.1 Some staff hold joint appointments across two departments. In these instances, the member of staff’s workload can be managed in each department according to the proportion of FTE assigned to each department.

13. Staff with School-level responsibilities
13.1 Staff in departments often hold School-level roles or responsibilities – for example as an Associate Director of Research or Learning & Teaching, or an appointment to a School-level committee. Where the decision has been taken at School-level to appoint an individual to a School-level role or responsibility, Heads of Department must ensure that this is reflected in their workload allocation.

14. Transparency and privacy
14.1 Workload Model data will be retained for a period consistent with the School’s record retention policy in compliance with current Data Protection and Freedom of Information legislation.
14.2 Compliance with GDPR limits the extent to which the models can be entirely transparent. Each member of academic staff will be able to inspect each element of their recorded workload in detail, and will be able to see how their workload compares with departmental means. The head of department, department manager and a nominated individual with responsibility for ensuring Equality, Diversity and Inclusion will have access to the full model data. Summary data will be made available outside each department as required, but GDPR precludes sharing named data.
14.3 The School will use high-level data from the model to monitor workload allocations against protected characteristics including gender, ethnicity and disability, and to compare workload allocations within and across departments.

15. Equality and diversity
15.1 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.
15.2 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 its Public Sector Equality responsibilities to:
   • Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct that is 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.
15.3. If you have any queries regarding this policy, or its application in relation to issues of equality and diversity, please contact the Human Resources Equality Adviser.

16. **Training and support**

16.1 The School will ensure that all users of the Workload Model receive sufficient training to use the model effectively. It is expected that Heads will be supported in using the model by their departmental administrators. Higher level support will be provided by Workload Model administrators.

17. **Monitoring and Review**

17.1 Departments will monitor the operation of the model on an ongoing basis, with the support of Workload Model administrators.

17.2 A School panel chaired by one of the Pro-Directors will meet regularly to provide overall oversight of the model. The panel will monitor the use of the Workload Model, collecting data on average departmental workloads, feedback from staff and requests for changes to tariffs and weightings. It will periodically review this policy and report to Executive Board as required.
Background

The Workload allocation working group has built upon work conducted to date, seeking only to change tasks and tariffs where opportunities for clarification, correction, organisation and increased efficiency were available.

This tasks and tariffs document embodies the proposed ratios for task activities. A notional 40:30:20:10 ratio was used to guide task and tariff specification, defined using 40% for research (to include all matters to do with doctoral student supervision) as a starting point and allocating the remaining 60% to activities of ‘teaching’, ‘administration’ and ‘service’, following as closely as possible the suggested allocations of the original WAMS working group. This amounts, effectively, to an allocation of at least 40% for research-related activity.

Our approach in allocating Teaching activity was: 1) to follow as closely as possible the agreements made with our Fractional staff; 2) to specify as closely as possible the full range of tasks associated with teaching, rather than to use contact hours as the principal measure. SOAS faculty are currently spending many more contact hours teaching than is optimal, and the continued use of contact hours as a measure of time allocation for teaching drives perverse incentives. By closer specification of the tasks associated with teaching, the group hopes both to ensure that work is more fairly distributed and that more account can be taken of ways in which teaching hours might be more effectively spent.

In determining Administrative tasks, two key approaches were taken: 1) to organise tasks into ‘director sets’, thereby providing both a task management structure, a concentration of administrative roles under single headings (to avoid proliferation of admin roles and enable the possibility of freeing up staff for periods that are admin-free), and a removal of overlapping roles; 2) to analyse the actual hours required for each task using a Hierarchical Task Analysis methodology. Our work suggests that a large number of admin roles (25+) can simply be removed under the proposed structure, vastly simplifying the Workload Model itself and the management of departments.

In determining Service tasks, we identified four main categories: 1) School-level roles, 2) PhD supervision, 3) ‘Other’ activities associated with HoD-assigned tasks. We omitted 3rd supervisor tariffs, embodying a recommendation that the 3rd supervisor is an inefficient and ineffective use of staff workload. The admin roles were subjected to additional analysis by departmental managers, who examined which department actually has each role. There is wide variety across departments, with some roles in all departments, and others in only one or two departments. It is suggested that the organisation of roles within director sets allows the efficient distribution (and often removal) of many of these admin roles.

Key principles
1. Administrative tasks are organised into the following sets:
   a. Management
   b. Teaching and Learning (T&L)
   c. Research (RES)
   d. Student Experience (SE)
   e. Doctoral Studies (DS)
   f. Recruitment, Admissions & Marketing (R&M)

2. This document captures only tasks – it does not adjust loadings according to the personal circumstances of individuals (sabbaticals, maternity/paternity, new/probationary staff, staff returning from illness, etc). This is done in the workload spreadsheet implementation, following the ratios for each role/circumstance proposed in the accompanying policy document.

3. Tasks and tariffs reflect the hours required to do each task role, but are organised to reflect the fact that HoDs have limited hours resource under each heading, depending on how many staff they have. For example, a department with 15 full-time faculty, where all are maximally available (e.g., no maternity/paternity, sabbaticals, etc), would have a maximum of 4560 hours that could be assigned to admin.

4. Three additional school-level coordinator roles for each department (SE, DS & R&M) are identified. These subsume existing departmental roles (i.e., they do not add to admin hours). The tariff for each of the coordinator roles is set at 200 hours, reflecting the fact that each coordinator should be taking on an admin load no greater than the equivalent of 1/3rd of that of the HoD.

5. All staff with a research-related contract should be allocated 40% research time. This should include HoDs, who currently have 50% admin allocation, which effectively precludes 40% research time. Addition of management coordinator roles is intended to enable HoDs to reduce the time spent on HoD admin to 40%, thereby allowing a more balanced portfolio.

6. Teaching & Learning tariffs have been largely inherited from the original tariff document without change, except for separating out teaching preparation of different types and repetitions. The first year of implementation will be used to collect data on the tariffs, with a systematic analysis and revision exercise after 12 months use.

7. Non-timetabled teaching (e.g., office hours, student emails, etc) is captured as 90 hours of “Non-scheduled T&L” under the Teaching heading, adjusted pro-rata according to FTE.

8. Ad-hoc admin that is not associated with specific roles (e.g., department meeting, student consultation committee, and other meeting/committee attendance, survey and data collection, etc.) is captured as 60 hours of “Non-scheduled admin” under the Admin heading, adjusted pro-rata according to FTE.
9. Meetings have not been added as a separate category, since the Hierarchical Task Analysis shows them to be an integral part of each admin role, or captured in an additional general admin allocation for each member of staff.

Role Weightings

Note that these are shown as 100% FTE: actual hours are proportional according to contract (all GTA hours are assigned to teaching, to include all preparation, delivery and assessment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;R Grade 7-8</td>
<td>647.7</td>
<td>495.3</td>
<td>228.6</td>
<td>152.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;R Grade 9+</td>
<td>609.6</td>
<td>457.2</td>
<td>304.8</td>
<td>152.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>609.6</td>
<td>304.8</td>
<td>457.2</td>
<td>152.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD</td>
<td>304.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>152.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>914.4</td>
<td>304.8</td>
<td>304.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportions</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;R Grade 7-8</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;R Grade 9+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative role tariffs

Each role is assigned to a Director group, coordinated by one of the Directors for Research (Res), Teaching & Learning (T&L), Student Experience (SE), Doctoral Studies (DS), and Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing (R&M). Where admin role tariffs are shown as zero, these are roles that are recommended to be subsumed within the new director roles. Where a HoD prefers to retain the role, the hours assigned to it should be deducted from those assigned to the relevant director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>TARIFF</th>
<th>DIRECTOR GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head of Department</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Teaching Director</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Director</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience Director</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Studies Director</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment, Admissions &amp; Marketing Director</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-allocated admin time</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Vetting Panel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR Admissions Tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR Programme Convenor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Colloquium Liaison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR Upgrade &amp; Award Committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental GTA Mentor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGR Research Tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Multiplier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Admissions Tutor</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Admissions Tutor</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Admissions Tutor (Deputy)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening Participation Tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Research Newsletter Editor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Student Exchange Coordinator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee &amp; Cake Co-ordinator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Abroad/student exchange Co-ordinator</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Coordinator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Day/Taster Day Co-ordinator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Paper series Coordinator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Research Seminar Series Lead</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Chairs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Progression Tutor/Welfare Tutor/Senior Tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Careers Tutor/ Careers Liaison Officer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Misconduct Tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students complaints/Senior Tutor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Consultation Committee members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Welfare Tutor (School)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Exam Board Chair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Deputy Exam Board Chair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Exam board chair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Deputy Exam Board Chair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Programme Convenor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>T&amp;L *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Programme Convenor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>T&amp;L *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG 1st year Tutor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Intermediate years Tutor/2nd year Tutor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Final year Tutor/3rd year Tutor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Deputy Programme Convenors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Specialism Convenors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Learning Co-Ordinator</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP Tutor/ISP Convenor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc Pre-sessional Coordinator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Pre-sessional coordinator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable Representative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>T&amp;L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The convenor roles include an additional 25 hours tariff for each additional 50 students registered above an initial cohort of 50.

**Teaching tariffs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 1.1 Teaching preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial preparation: New 15 credit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 credit Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial preparation: 15 credit delivered before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 credit Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online module preparation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture preparation (new)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Per hour lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture preparation (delivered before)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Per hour lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module convenor (15 credits)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Per module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module convenor (30 credits)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Per module</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2 Teaching delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus contact hours, per hour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per hour contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online contact hours, per hour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per hour contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-scheduled T&amp;L (inc. Office hours &amp; student emails) for faculty</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Per faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-scheduled T&amp;L (inc. Office hours &amp; student emails) for Fractionals</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Per teaching hour for fractional staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Marking / assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam Script Marking</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Coursework marking (less than 1499 worda)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Coursework marking (1500-4000 worda)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Coursework marking (More than 4001 worda)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Coursework check/moderation (less than 1499 worda)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Coursework check/ moderation (1500-4000 worda)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Coursework check/ moderation (More than 4001 worda)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Per script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking a postgraduate dissertation/UG ISP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking a presentation for a course taught by another teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Per module</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4 Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG ISP/dissertation supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT Dissertation supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Per advisee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture attendance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre fieldwork seminar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Per fieldwork trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post fieldwork seminar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Per fieldwork trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service tariffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hours</th>
<th>tariff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 3.1 School roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Centre</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Centre</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Institute</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy-Director of Institute</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Doctoral School</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Head of Online Learning</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School representative on BLE Steering Group</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of School-level committee</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of School level committee</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External School accreditation work e.g. Athena Swan</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SOAS School) Exam Board Chair</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS Deputy School Exam Board Chair</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of External committee related to School business (ie UoL L&amp;T committee)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School representative on UoL Military Education Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 PhD supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mphil/PhD first supervisor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mphil/PhD second supervisor</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal examiner (Mphil upgrade)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal examiner (PhD viva)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Per student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open days / evenings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Per half-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Per appraisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Per mentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer teaching observation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU rep</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Annual per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development/training activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per hour attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA/SFHEA/PFHEA application preparation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Per application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTP development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Per KTP (as agreed with HoD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy on behalf of school/dept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per hour delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD/short course development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Per hour delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD/short course delivery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per hour delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD/short course pre-delivery preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per hour delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deputy Head of Department
Role description

Working alongside the Head of Department and in close collaboration and consultation with other departmental colleagues, the primary responsibility of the Deputy Head of Department is to support and where necessary deputise for the Head of Department, providing leadership and support across a range of departmental activities. The Deputy Head will:

1. Contribute to the strategic leadership of the department, as a member of its leadership panel.

2. Support the Head of Department in providing academic leadership for, and line managing, the academic staff within the Department.

3. Support the Head of Department in all activities related to the department, including strategic planning, budget management, recruitment of staff, staff development and workload allocation.

4. Lead the department’s ongoing efforts to promote equality, diversion and inclusion across all areas of activity, including teaching, research and other aspects of staff and student support.

5. Support the Director of Learning and Teaching, the Director of Student Support and Experience and other departmental colleagues in delivering outstanding teaching, learning and student support.

6. Support the Director of Research and other departmental colleagues in promoting a positive research environment within the Department and high quality research, including the achievement of an excellent REF outcome.

7. Support the Director of Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing and other departmental colleagues in ongoing recruitment, admissions and marketing activities.

8. Support the Director of Doctoral Studies and other departmental colleagues in all matters relating to PGR provision.

9. Promote a positive collegial environment for all staff and students in the Department.

10. Represent the Department internally and externally, as required.

11. Act as a key communication channel between departmental leadership, departmental staff and the wider School, including academic and Professional Services colleagues.

12. Contribute to the department’s preparation for Comprehensive Departmental Reviews (CDR) and other evaluations.
Director of Learning and Teaching
Role description

Working alongside the Associate Directors of Learning and Teaching and in close collaboration and consultation with academic and Professional Services colleagues, the primary responsibility of the Director of Learning & Teaching is to provide leadership across the full range of learning and teaching activities in the department and foster learning and teaching excellence. The Director of Learning and Teaching will:

1. Advise the Head of Department on all teaching and learning issues.

2. Chair the Departmental/School learning and teaching panel and ensure communication with colleagues on learning and teaching matters.

3. Provide oversight of all learning and teaching activities in the department, liaising with the Director of Student Support and Experience, the Director of Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing and other colleagues.

4. Represent the Department/School at SOAS learning and teaching committees and working groups, as required.

5. Liaise as appropriate with the Associate Directors of Learning and Teaching, Professional Services colleagues and other SOAS role holders.

6. Oversee the development and operation of exciting, diverse, innovative and high quality degree programmes.

7. Lead the department’s curriculum reform initiatives and support wider innovation in learning and teaching.

8. Support programme convenors and other teaching staff in the delivery of high quality learning and teaching.

9. Support space and resources planning to deliver a high quality learning and teaching environment.

10. Lead the department’s preparation for internal and external reviews, including the Comprehensive Departmental Review (CDR) and TEF action plans.

11. Lead and support staff development activities to improve teaching and learning, including the attainment of relevant qualifications and fellowships.

12. Organise and participate in departmental exam boards, as required.

13. Liaise with the Head of Department and convenors in appointing fractional staff, and to interview applicants where necessary.

14. Ensure that adequate advice, support and guidance is available to fractional staff.
Director of Student Support and Experience
Role description

Working alongside the Associate Directors of Learning and Teaching and in close collaboration and consultation with academic and Professional Services colleagues, the Director of Student Support and Experience will provide leadership to the department in matters relating to student support and the delivery of an excellent student experience. The Director of Student Support and Experience will:

1. Advise the Head of Department on all student support and experience issues.

2. Provide oversight of all student support and experience activities in the department, liaising with the Director of Learning and Teaching, the Director of Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing and other departmental colleagues.

3. Chair the Departmental/School staff-student forums and ensure communication with colleagues on student support and experience matters.

4. Represent the Department/School at SOAS committees and working groups, as required.

5. Liaise as appropriate with the Associate Directors of Learning and Teaching, Professional Services colleagues and other SOAS role holders.

6. Lead the department’s initiatives to deliver an outstanding student experience, prioritising student retention, progression and outcomes.

7. Oversee the operation of effective personal tutor / academic adviser systems.

8. Respond effectively to student needs, requirements and concerns, ensuring the operation of effective mechanisms to support vulnerable and struggling students.

9. Contribute to the department’s preparation for internal and external reviews, including the Comprehensive Departmental Review (CDR) and TEF.

10. Coordinate the department’s NSS response and other student feedback.

11. Lead the department’s preparations for Welcome Week and other extra-curricular activities and events throughout the academic year cycle.

12. Oversee the delivery of pre- and in-sessional teaching and learning support for students, as required.

13. Ensure effective mechanisms are in place to support students studying abroad and engaged in other degree-related activities off-campus, e.g. internships and placements.

14. Be responsible for liaising between the Department and the Careers Service, supporting approaches that assist students to maximise informed choices for outcomes after graduation.

15. Give final approval to late enrolments and transfers between degree programmes.

16. Give final approval on module choice.
Director of Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing
Role description

Working in close collaboration and consultation with academic and Professional Services colleagues, including the Admissions, Student Recruitment and Marketing teams, the Director of Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing will lead the department in its student recruitment, admissions and marketing activities. The Director of Recruitment, Admissions and Marketing will:

1. Advise the Head of Department on all recruitment, admissions and marketing issues.

2. Provide oversight of all recruitment, admissions and marketing activities in the department, liaising with the Director of Learning and Teaching, the Director of Student Support and Experience and other colleagues.

3. Ensure the effective marketing of the department's programmes, in liaison with Marketing, and the publicising as appropriate of other departmental activities, e.g. research projects, events.

4. Oversee the department's recruitment and conversion activities and events both within and outside SOAS, throughout the academic cycle.

5. Represent the department at recruitment and conversion events.

6. Ensure communication with colleagues on recruitment, admissions and marketing matters.

7. Represent the Department/School at SOAS committees and working groups, as required.

8. Liaise as appropriate with the Associate Directors of Learning and Teaching, Professional Services colleagues and other SOAS role holders.

9. Ensure that the department's website and other publicity material provide accurate and up-to-date information, e.g. on modules and programmes.

10. Coordinate the department's wider marketing and communications activities, e.g. on YouTube, Social Media.

11. Coordinate the department's engagement in Widening Participation and Outreach activities and events.

12. Contribute to the department's preparation for Comprehensive Departmental Reviews (CDR) and other evaluations.

13. Ensure that relevant information about student recruitment and demand is incorporated into department curriculum reform activities.
Director of Research
Role Description

Working alongside the Associate Directors of Research and in close collaboration and consultation with the School’s Research and Enterprise Office, the primary responsibility of the Director of Research is to provide leadership across the full range of research activities in the School and foster research excellence. The Director of Research will:

1. Chair the Departmental/School research panel and ensure communication with colleagues on research matters.

2. Provide oversight of all research activities in the department, liaising with the REF Coordinator and Director of Doctoral Studies.

3. Represent the Department/School at SOAS research committees, as required.

4. Liaise as appropriate with the Associate Directors of Research, the Research and Enterprise Office, and other SOAS role holders.

5. Provide support to the collection of research and publication data in the Department/School, and provide SOAS-level committees and the Research and Enterprise Office with such reports when and as required.

6. Advise the Head of Department/School on research income targets and progress towards their attainment.

7. Oversee the production and annual updating of individual colleagues' personal research plans.

8. Support the development of external grant applications and coordinate the internal and external peer review of grant proposals and key outputs, as appropriate.

9. Oversee the establishment of a research mentoring scheme in the department, with a particular focus on Early Career Researchers.

10. Support the development of the Department/School’s research environment, including the organisation and convening of research seminars.

11. Facilitate research outreach activities across the School.

12. Support the planning and implementation of the SOAS-wide strategy on international research collaboration.

13. Contribute to the department’s preparation for Comprehensive Departmental Reviews (CDR) and other evaluations.
Director of Doctoral Studies
Role Description

Working closely with the Head of the Doctoral School and the Doctoral School administrative team, Directors of Doctoral Studies are the primary point of contact and oversight of doctoral training in departments/Schools. Directors of Doctoral Studies will:

1. Lead on improving and maintaining the quality of PGR supervision in their Department/School/pathway, including ensuring supervisory committees are in place and suitable provision for supervision is made where supervisors are on leave or have left.

2. Liaise with Doctoral School staff on a regular basis regarding applications, funding, academic and other requirements, emerging concerns, forms, PGR difficulties, interruptions or changes in supervisory committees.


4. Maintain regular contact with PGRs, and keep them informed of relevant issues (regulations, policies, funding opportunities, academic events, postdoctoral opportunities, job vacancies and so on, as appropriate).

5. In co-ordination with the Research Students’ Association and the Students’ Union, organise the election (or appointment) of one MPhil and one post-fieldwork PGR representative for each pathway. Meet regularly with these representatives to discuss any emerging issues of concern, and address them promptly, if necessary in co-ordination with the Doctoral School.

6. Ensure that supervisors are aware of and compliant with the relevant SOAS regulations, forms and procedures concerning PGR programmes.

7. Approve fieldwork and ethics forms, nominations of examiners and appointment of examination chairs when necessary. Bring any significant PGR-related ethical issues to the attention of the Head of the Doctoral School.

8. Contribute to the selection of doctoral scholarship awards and prizes as requested.

9. In co-ordination with the Doctoral School, oversee regular updates to relevant webpages, including programme descriptions and lists of current PGRs and their research titles.

10. Provide support and mediation if issues arise between supervisors and supervisees.

11. In co-ordination with supervisors, advise PGRs about risks in particular fieldwork locations, and ask for regular reports from students in volatile areas, and determine whether fieldwork should be abandoned for reasons of personal security.

12. Produce annual programme reports for their pathways upon request by the Doctoral School.

13. To contribute to the department’s preparation for Comprehensive Departmental Reviews (CDR) and other evaluations.
REF Coordinator
Job Description

Working alongside the Associate Directors of Research and in close collaboration and consultation with the University’s Research Excellence (REF) Manager and central REF Team in REO, the REF Coordinator will:

1. Act as a key point of contact in the REF planning process within their UoA, offering guidance and support to colleagues on research outputs and impact case studies for potential submission to REF2021.

2. Become active in a university-wide network of REF Coordinators in order to acquire, develop and disseminate to colleagues knowledge about REF submission requirements, as well as sharing best practice.

3. Working closely with the REF Manager and team, take the lead in the preparations for an annual review of research outputs within their UoA to feed back the status of ‘REF ready’ outputs to the REF Steering Group and the central REF Team according to a timetable agreed with the REF Steering Group.

4. Mentor staff in their UoA, offering guidance on where to publish their outputs in the context of their discipline, and, in collaboration with the central REF Team and appropriate staff in the Library, provide advice on Open Access requirements.

5. In collaboration with the Associate Director of Research (Impact & Engagement) and Impact Officer, encourage best practice amongst colleagues in recording impact for their UoA and collating corroboratory evidence.

6. In collaboration with the chair of the REF Steering Group working group on environment, review environment data annually, and assist with the production of environment statements required for submission to the REF.

7. In collaboration with the chair of the REF Panel working group on equalities, review equalities data annually, and assist with the production of equalities statements required for submission to the REF.

8. Be proactive in ensuring strategic decisions regarding cross school transfer/collective UoA submissions take place in a timely manner.

9. Working in liaison with the Research Excellence Manager, Chair of the REF Steering Group and Associate Directors of Research, review the final content and wording of the REF submission for their UoA, and participate in selecting the highest-quality outputs and suite of impact case studies for submission to the REF.
SOAS Workload Model

Process Specification

Scope

- Each department will use the Workload Model to plan and record staff workloads.
- The purpose of the model is to provide a measure of actual activity workloads.
- Workloads are measured in terms of activities and tariffs (hours).
- The Workload Model should capture all activities that are assigned to an individual by the Head of Department. It does not routinely capture activities that an individual assigns to themselves (e.g., reviewing, editing, society administration, conference committee or chair).
- Four main kinds of workload are identified: Research, Teaching, Administration and Service.
- All Academic (Teaching and Research) and Teaching-only (Teaching and Scholarship) staff in departments will be assigned workloads in the model.
- The model takes the form of a specially designed spreadsheet.

Roles and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>Allocation of workloads to staff in departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion of workloads with staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Managers</td>
<td>Populating and maintenance of workload spreadsheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model administrator</td>
<td>Oversight of operation of model. Ownership of template spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Populating of model with data from other systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revising of model (e.g. activities and tariffs) following panel decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT helpdesk</td>
<td>Support for technical issues arising with platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Director</td>
<td>Chair of Workload Panel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Import of programme and module data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Import of staff data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February-March</td>
<td>Adjustment of current year workloads following confirmation of supervisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-June</td>
<td>Allocation of workloads for following academic session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Meeting of Workload Panel: adjustment of activities and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Import of staff data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Adjustment of workloads following confirmation of student numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Meeting of Workload Panel: adjustment of activities and tariffs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workload Panel**

The Workload Panel will meet twice per year (see maintenance schedule) to review the operation of the model. Its remit will include the revision of activities and tariffs in the light of experience. Requests to change activities or tariffs should be sent to the panel secretary.

The panel will consist of the following members:

- Pro-Director (chair)
- Head of Department
- Department Manager
- Senior academic (Professor or Senior Lecturer)
- Junior academic (Lecturer)
- UCU representative – academic staff
- UCU representative – fractional staff
- Online Learning representative

**Use of Workload Model data**

Each member of academic staff will be able to inspect each element of their recorded workload in detail, and will be able to see how their workload compares with departmental means. The head of department, department manager and a nominated individual with responsibility for ensuring Equality, Diversity and Inclusion will have access to the full model data. Summary data will be made available outside each department as required, but GDPR precludes sharing named data.

At School level, data in the model will be used for purposes including preparing the TRAC financial model, studying the distribution and cost effectiveness of departmental activities, including teaching, and promoting equality, diversity and inclusion.
SOAS Workload Model
Implementation Plan

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 March 2019</td>
<td>Model approved at Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Platform made available to departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March / April 2019</td>
<td>Training of Heads of Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March / April 2019</td>
<td>Training of Department Managers and other PS colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March / April 2019</td>
<td>Open session for staff – Academic and Professional Services: introduction to the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Model populated with current (2018-19) data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-June 2019</td>
<td>Model used by Heads of Department to plan 2019-20 workloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>Meeting of Workload Panel – tariff refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 2019</td>
<td>Model launch complete; roll-over into 2019-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation group

Andrea Cornwall - Pro-Director
Deborah Johnston – Pro-Director
Paul O’Connell – Associate Director of Research
Mark Laffey – Head of Department
Meera Sabaratnam – Chair of Senate and Senior Lecturer
Elizabeth Hull – UCU rep and Senior Lecturer
Feyzi Ismail – UCU rep and Senior Teaching Fellow
Maxine Brown – Department Manager
Catherine Farinhas-Gray – Department Manager
Tom Ormerod - Consultant
Robert Ivermee – project support
### Executive Summary

The Safeguarding Steering Group agreed that the School needed to develop an Under 18s Policy to outline the School’s approach to supporting students under 18 and to guide staff on their responsibilities in these cases.

A draft policy has been developed from sector guidance and best practice across the sector. Whilst developing the policy it became apparent that the School need to consider aspects of their approach and how they would like to approach particular aspects of the student life, e.g. accommodation.

### Recommendations & Next Steps

1. Approve policy.

### Financial Impact

N/A

### Risks

1. The School should have a clear position on the support for Under 18s and guidance to staff on any additional responsibilities. Without this guidance students under the age of 18 could be inconsistently or ineffectively supported.

### Equality Implications

If there is ineffective guidance to students or staff then students under the age of 18 could have a worse student experience to those over the age of 18.

### Consultation

The policy was reviewed by the Safeguarding Steering Group and Student Experience and Engagement Committee.
Under 18s Policy

Introduction

A small number of Students may start their journey at SOAS under the age of 18. SOAS is an adult environment and treats all its students as independent, mature individuals and students who are under the age of 18 years will be treated in the same way. Students are expected to have the necessary skills to study and live independently alongside people from a wide variety of backgrounds. This can be particularly challenging for younger students. The usual personal and academic support arrangements will apply to students who are under 18 years.

The School will not take on the usual rights, responsibilities and authority that parents have in relation to a child, and it will not act in loco parentis in relation to students who are under the age of 18 years. For this reason, if a student’s parents are not resident in the UK, it will be necessary for them to appoint a guardian in the UK and provide contact details for this person and their informed consent to acting in this capacity.

Contracts

A person under the age of 18 has the legal right to enter into the necessary contracts for education and accommodation and will be liable for fees and charges payable under those contracts. However until their 18th birthday will not be legally competent to enter into all legal contracts. In circumstances where a person has to be aged 18 or over to be legally competent to enter into a contract the School requires a student’s parent, guardian or UK based nominated guardian to honour all obligations that the student enters into prior to their 18th birthday.

Student accommodation

SOAS does not own its own students’ accommodation. Special arrangements cannot be made for students who are under the age of 18 years old. The accommodation priority policies will be applied to them.

Alcohol

It is illegal for alcohol to be sold to or bought by students who are under the age of 18 years. The School will take reasonable steps to seek to ensure that the law is not broken in relation to licensed premises under the School’s control but cannot undertake to supervise any individual student. The Students’ Union is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements are in place for its own licensed premises.

Relationships with staff

Under the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act 2000, it is a criminal offence for any person in a position of trust (which may include members of University staff) to engage in sexual activity with someone who is under 18 years.

Field Trips

Courses may involve compulsory or optional field trips, excursions or other periods of study away from the School. The School is not able to take any additional responsibility for a
student who is under the age of 18 years in relation to such activities. Unless indicated otherwise, by signing the enclosed pro-forma, parents give consent for the student to take part in these activities on that basis.

**Emergency contact**

Appropriate first aid and minor illness treatment is available to students at the School however all students are encouraged to register with local health services. Students who are 16 or over have the legal capacity to consent to medical treatment. Parents/guardians must be aware that the School cannot provide any consent for emergency medical treatment for a student.

Students who under the age of 18 can have their refusal of medical treatment overridden by parents.

**Child Protection**

As a matter of law, a person under the age of 18 years is a child. The School has a responsibility to protect those under the age of 18 years from abuse and will report any suspicions or allegations of abuse of children to the appropriate Social Services officer. Any such suspicions or allegations will be reported to the Deputy COO (Student Advice and Welfare) who will contact the appropriate authorities.

Relevant student facing support staff will be DBS checked. A network of staff from across the School will undertake Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) training to ensure there is a robust network of support for students.

Minimum expectations:

- There will be 1 DSL in IFCELS
- There will be 1 DSL in Student Advice and Wellbeing
- There will be 1 DSL in academic support services
- There will be 1 DSL representing the Foundation Year provision

**Parental involvement**

The School's usual policy is to deal directly with the students (with whom it has a contractual relationship) and not with parents. This approach will also apply to students who are under the age of 18 years. The School will therefore correspond with students, not parents.

**Notification**

All department managers will be notified when students under the age of 18 will be registering with their department. The department manager will ensure that the personal tutors and heads of department are aware.

**Communication with staff**

All staff will be made aware of the policy via school wide circulation. All staff will also be made aware of the School’s safeguarding policy. Whole school training will be held annually.

**Students Union**
Registry will share a list of students under the age of 18 with the Students’ Union at the start of each academic session. The Students Union will contact all under 18s to outline the activities they are unable to participate in due to age restrictions.

Students who are under the age of 18 are unable to hold office, for example they may not be a secretary or treasurer to a society or other students’ association.

**What the School will do:**

- Registry will inform the department manager of the names and number of students under 18.
- The department manager will arrange a meeting with the student to discuss support and services available.
- The department manager will confirm with programme and module conveners if there are under 18s on their programmes.
- Registry will inform student advice and wellbeing of the number of Under 18 students.
- Academic Advisors will be asked to meet with the student at least twice a term to provide additional support.
- No staff members will enter a relationship with any students Under 18.

**What the Student will do:**

- The student will be responsible for disclosing their age to fellow students and staff members. Especially prior to any relationships.
- It is the student’s responsibility to abide by the law whilst attending SOAS, for example not drinking alcohol at School or department events.
- The student will be expected to attend all lectures, seminars and academic advisor meetings.