

<b>Academic Board</b>	
<b>Meeting date</b>	10 December 2018
<b>Paper reference</b>	AB-19-02-06-03.2
<b>Status</b>	Confirmed
<b>Access</b>	Members and senior executives
<b>FOI release</b>	Following approval by Academic Board
<b>FOI exemption</b>	None, subject to redaction for commercial interest or personal data

## Minutes

<b>Date</b>	10 December, 14.00
<b>Location</b>	Great Hall, Strand Campus

Composition		Members Present (Apologies noted as 'A')		
<i>Ex officio</i>	<b>President &amp; Principal (Chair of Academic Board)</b>		Professor Edward Byrne	
	<b>Senior Vice Presidents</b>	Quality, Strategy & Innovation	Mr Chris Mottershead	
		Operations	Dr Ian Tebbett	
	<b>Senior Vice Presidents / Provosts</b>	Health	Professor Sir Robert Lechler	
		Arts & Sciences	Professor Evelyn Welch	
	<b>Vice Presidents &amp; Vice-Principals</b>	Education	Professor Nicola Phillips	
		International	Dr 'Funmi Olonisakin (A)	
		Research	Professor Reza Razavi	
		Service	Professor Jonathan Grant	
		London	Baroness Bull	
	Assistant Principal	Academic Performance	Professor Ian Norman	
	<b>The Reverend the Dean</b>		The Revd Canon Professor Richard A. Burridge A	
	<b>Deans of Faculty</b>	Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care		Professor Louise Barriball (nominee of Prof Ian Norman) (A)
		Social Science and Public Policy		Professor Frans Berkhout
		Dickson Poon School of Law		Professor Gillian Douglas (A)
		Arts and Humanities		Professor Marion Thain
		Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience		Professor Ian Everall (A)
		King's Business School		Professor Stephen Bach
		Natural and Mathematical Sciences		Professor Michael Luck
		Life Sciences & Medicine		Professor Richard Trembath
Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences		Professor Mike Curtis (A)		
<b>The President of the Students' Union</b>		Mr Ahad Mahmood (A)		
<b>Dean for Doctoral Studies</b>		Professor Rebecca Oakey (A)		
<b>Director of Students and Education</b>		Tessa Harrison (A)		
<b>Operations Director (Research and Researchers)</b>		Dr Martin Kirk		
<b>Chairs or Deputies of Academic Board sub-committees who are not ex-officio Members</b>	College Assessment & Standards Committee		Dr Michael Escudier (A)	
<i>Students</i>	Arts & Sciences Faculties	Undergraduate	Emma Rouviere	
		Postgraduate	Asad Tanveer	
	Health Faculties	Undergraduate	Emma Bohea (A)	
		Postgraduate (volunteer)	Pavan Pankhania	
<i>Faculty</i>	Arts and Humanities	elected senior	Professor Kate Crosby (A)	
		elected junior	Dr Jessica Leech	
		appointed	Professor Rivkah Zim	
	Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences	elected senior	Dr Barry Quinn	
		elected junior	Dr David Moyes	
		appointed	Professor Mark Woolford (A)	
	Dickson Poon School of Law	elected senior	Professor John Tasioulas	
		elected junior	Dr Megan Bowman (A)	
		appointed	Dr Leslie Turano-Taylor (A)	

King's Business School	elected senior	Crawford Spence (A)
	elected junior	Dr Chiara Benassi
	appointed	Professor Riccardo Peccei (A)
Life Sciences & Medicine	elected senior	Professor Michael Malim
	elected junior	Dr Samantha Terry
	appointed	Dr Ian McFadzean
Natural and Mathematical Sciences	elected senior	Dr Chris Lorenz
	elected junior	Dr Andrew Coles (A)
	appointed	Professor Nikolaos Mavromatos
Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care	elected senior	Dr Janet Anderson
	elected junior	Ian Noonan (A)
	appointed	Professor Jackie Sturt (A)
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience	elected senior	Professor John Marsden
	elected junior	Dr Sandrine Thuret
	appointed	Dr Susan Duty (A)
Social Science and Public Policy	elected senior	Professor Kerry Brown (A)
	elected junior	Rebekka Friedman
	appointed	Vacancy

#### **In attendance:**

Mr Hannan Badar (KCLSU Vice-President for Education (Health Faculties) - permanent invitee)  
 Mr Mohamed Salhi (KCLSU Vice-President for Education (Arts & Sciences) – permanent invitee)  
 Ms Jessica Oshodin (KCLSU Vice-President for Postgraduate – permanent invitee)  
 Professor Peter Heather (Vice Dean) in place of Professor Rebecca Oakey  
 Ms Lynne Barker (Associate Director, Quality Standards & Enhancement)  
 Professor Timothy Macklem, Professor of Jurisprudence, Member, Academic Board Review Working Group  
 Mr Andrew Summers, Council Member, Member, Academic Board Review Working Group  
 Ms Sarah Guerra, Director of Diversity & Inclusion  
 The Rev'd Dr Keith Riglin (in place of The Dean)

#### **Secretariat:**

Ms Irene Birrell (College Secretary)  
 Ms Joanna Brown (Governance Manager)  
 Mr Paul Mould (Director of Business Assurance)

---

#### **1>Welcome, apologies and notices**

The Chair welcomed the following new members of the Board to their first meeting:  
 Professor Marion Thain, Dean of Arts and Humanities  
 Asad Tanveer, student member from the Arts & Sciences Faculties (PG)  
 Emma Rouvier, student member from the Arts & Sciences Faculties (UG)  
 Professor David Burns, Natural & Mathematical Sciences – appointed member

The Chair also welcomed two members of the Academic Board Review Group (who are not Academic Board Members) to the meeting for the discussion on the Academic Board Review White Paper: Professor Tim Macklem and Mr Andrew Summers.

---

#### **2/Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

---

#### **3/Unanimous Consent Agenda (including Minutes of the Previous Meeting) [AB-18-12-10-03]**

##### **Decision**

That the reports on the Unanimous Consent Agenda be taken as read and noted or approved.

---

#### **4/Matters Arising from the Minutes**

No matters arising.

---

#### **5/Report of the Chairman**

##### *Items for Consideration*

- a) Verbal report on any matters arising from the Chair  
 None that were not covered elsewhere on the Agenda.

---

b) Academic Board Review - White paper [AB-18-12-10-05b]

The Senior Vice President (Quality, Strategy & Innovation) presented the White Paper. The Green Paper had been debated at the previous meeting of the Academic Board, and the comments from that discussion had all been taken into consideration within the White Paper. Academic Board was asked to agree the comments it would like to present to Council in January on the proposals within the White Paper. It was noted that the proposals were to be recommended to Council from its Governance and Nominations Committee and Council would wish to consider the views of the Academic Board when making its final decisions, as well as the diversity of views collected from the King's community.

The emerging proposals defined the role of Academic Board as being responsible for academic quality, education and research and providing critical advice on strategic development, and it was hoped that they would help the university community to think of the Academic Board as an empowered body.

There were six recommendations set out within the report requiring Academic Board comment.

***Recommendation 1– Mandate of the Academic Board***

In discussion the following views were noted:

- The critical roles of the Academic Board were:
  - to provide assurance to Council on matters of academic quality and compliance in education and research;
  - to communicate the views of the academic community to Council to inform decision-making; and
  - to communicate developments impacting academic strategy from Council and the Executive to the community.
- There was a separation of proper accountability and oversight of academic quality. Case studies had demonstrated that it was usually obvious which the responsibility was.
- Academic quality was the preserve of the Academic Board, but the Board had the right to make comment on or advise on anything else by direction either from the academic community or from the Council.

**Decision**

That it be proposed to Council that the mandate of the Academic Board be recast as set out in the White Paper in order to more clearly and fully articulate its key responsibilities.

***Recommendation 2– Chair of the Academic Board***

In discussion the following views were noted:

- This had been one of the more contentious issues. The feedback showed a broad difference in opinion between the community and the executive, with the executive more in favour of combining the roles of President & Principal and Chair of the Academic Board. However, views were wide-ranging, and, it was stressed, were not unanimous in either of these groups.
- The President & Principal had seen both models work well, and with sensible management an independent Chair could strengthen the academic voice. He had no view on which option to propose to Council, but was of the opinion that if the Chair of the Academic Board was a senior member of academic staff rather than the President & Principal, this person should sit alongside the senior team, attend all of the senior meetings, and be given time off academic duties in order to dedicate time to the chairing role. He also supported the proposal that should this be the decision taken, this person should also be an informed voice for the Academic Board on Council.
- A Member noted that since the last meeting she had changed her mind on this issue, and proposed that if a consensus could not be reached, the question be returned to Academic Board next year, to be reconsidered once the new recommendations had been introduced, rather than defer the decision to Council.
- Council Member, Andrew Summers, noted that there was no doubt that the President & Principal would remain the senior academic officer whichever option was agreed. He also highlighted that part of the recommendation was that the Chair of the Academic Board be an ex-officio member of Council, and on behalf of Council, welcomed that proposal. He stated that an independent Chair would need to be respectful of: the academic community and the Council as well as being integrated into the management team.

- 
- There was broad agreement that the Academic Board should take a clear recommendation to Council on this issue.
  - There should also be a conversation about the Vice Chair of the Academic Board when this item was next discussed by the Board.

#### **Decision**

That a decision regarding the Chair of the Academic Board be deferred for further Academic Board input, with more detail provided to the Academic Board on the contradictory views, and on what the proposal would look like.

#### ***Recommendation 3– Composition of the Academic Board***

In discussion the following views were noted:

- The intent was to move to 50% representation of the academic community as well as increasing the number of students on the Board.
- The White Paper proposed that there be 3-4 academic staff members from each faculty depending on the size of the academic staff, and with at least one from each faculty to be a Head of Department. It was clarified that the smaller faculties, such as law and dentistry be represented by three members and the larger faculties such as the Faculty of Life Sciences & Medicine be represented by four members.
- There had been a debate about student representation on the Board, and while the current student members welcomed more student representation on the Academic Board, there remained uncertainty on whether these representatives should come from the sabbatical officers or from the wider student body. The students had concerns about how student representatives would be supported and whether they would be remunerated, as representation was more than just being present, it was about being an effective participant. It was also noted that had been no reference to the review of student representation currently underway.

#### **Decision**

That it be proposed to Council that the Composition of the Academic Board be amended, as attached in Annex 1 to the report, in order to allow for the full range of community voices to be heard and more effectively engaged in academic decision-making, while noting that the discussion on student representation on the Academic Board was ongoing.

#### ***Recommendation 4– Reporting Structure***

In discussion the following views were noted:

- The subcommittee structure currently in place had grown unwieldy and a streamlined structure was proposed at Annex 2 to the report with new terms of reference for the College Education Committee (CEC) and its subcommittees shown at Annex 3.
- The proposed reporting structure had received the endorsement of the CEC and if the Academic Board approved it it would be put in place immediately.

#### **Decision**

That the Academic Board standing subcommittee structure be streamlined, as set out in Annex 2 to the report, and become advisory to the strategically-focused Vice-Presidents/Principals while continuing to report to the Academic Board for major issues, particularly those requiring Academic Board approval or agreement to recommend to Council.

#### ***Recommendation 5– Meeting Content and Style***

In discussion the following views were noted:

- The meeting style should be facilitative and a range of engagement processes would be used to run the Academic Board as required. Varying the style would help to add energy to the Board's work.

#### **Decision**

That it be proposed to Council that the recommendations as set out in the report, in relation to meeting content and style, be agreed.

#### ***Recommendation 6– Communication***

---

---

In discussion the following views were noted:

- There should be a two way communication channel between Council and the Academic Board
- It was suggested that papers should be made publically available, and published on the web, including the White Paper.

#### **Decision**

That it be proposed to Council that the Academic Board agendas, papers and minutes should be made more widely available to the university community. [Secretary's note: unless marked confidential, as with, for example, the Subject-level TEF paper on this meeting's agenda].

#### c) Academic Board Membership [AB-18-12-10-05c]

The College Secretary presented the report. Academic Board was asked to approve, as a one-off process, the proposal from the KCLSU that a volunteer be sought from the Health Faculty to fill the vacant position for a postgraduate student member from the health faculties, as no candidates had stood for the position in the elections conducted by the KCLSU.

#### **Decision**

That the KCLSU be requested to seek a volunteer from the KCLSU health faculty representatives to fill the vacant position for a postgraduate student member from the health faculties.

---

### **(Report of the President & Principal**

#### *Items for Consideration*

#### a) Summary Report on Key Issues [AB-18-12-10-06a].

Academic Board considered the Principal's Report. The following key matters were summarised in the written report: Brexit; Pay and Pensions, Cleaners; Freedom of Expression Standing Advisory Group; Research Grant Performance; London Centre for Nanotechnology, with appendices providing further detail on other issues.

Updates and questions arising from the report included:

- Universities UK had now also endorsed the JEP report, which was now with the Trustees and the regulators. The key issue remained how to split the risk between the insurer and the sector.
- Regarding bringing the cleaners and security staff in-house at the end of their current contracts, the majority of contracts ended in 2019. However the contracts with PFI did not expire until 2024. This was a small group of the overall number of cleaners. The SVP (QS&I) endeavoured to find an estimated number, but stressed that there would not be the same precision as with contracts that were controlled by the university. The cleaning of the PFI buildings was not purchased as a separate item. The university could ensure the London Living Wage but could not otherwise interfere.
- Freedom of Expression – recent events had gone well.
- The number of applicants to King's had been going up year by year and for the first time had exceeded 100,000.
- It was noted that Times Higher Education ratings showed that King's was 5<sup>th</sup> for clinical, 6<sup>th</sup> in Computer Science and 10<sup>th</sup> in the UK for Physical Science. It was the first time that Physical Science had appeared in the THE ratings. Congratulations were passed to the Dean of the Faculty of Natural and Mathematical Sciences.

---

#### b) Diversity & Inclusion [AB-18-12-10-06b]

The Director of Diversity & Inclusion presented her report and set out the key areas and priorities that her team had been working on, which included: King's-wide D&I strategy and delivery model proposal; technical compliance; governance; inclusive culture and the "it stops here" campaign; disability inclusion; education, awareness and training; and external recognition (SWANN).

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- The university had a responsibility under the Equalities Act to undertake the compliance process through the lense of equality and inclusion.
  - The D&I team had issued a Green Paper, a key aim of which was clear accountability and how to escalate an issue.
  - The It Stops Here project had been expanded from the initial sexual harassment focus, in close collaboration with the KCLSU, to include bullying and harassment and religious based hate crime. This had been done with the support of funding from the Office for Students.
  - The D&I team would be interested to hear from staff members of the Academic Board with feedback about disability inclusion, including accessibility and usability of the estate. To date the focus had been on students. A member
-

---

commented that she worked in a building that was very inaccessible. The Director of D&I responded that the older estate was problematic, but there was nevertheless a number of things that could be done to make improvements.

- Regarding awareness and development, systemic issues were being addressed and all members of the Senior Management Team had signed up for structural inequalities training, and Academic Board members were urged to take the Diversity Matters training for managers programme. It was noted that there was a clear gender divide in the take up of training, and that although it was mandatory for the SMT and for anyone serving on an appointment panel to undertake D&I training, this had not been well enough enforced. The Principal noted this as a reminder for SMT to revisit how mandatory training was implemented.
- For the first time King's had taken part in the Stonewall workplace equality index. The results were not known yet but the exercise had been pivotal in identifying issues.
- A lot of work had been done in the last year on the renewal of the Bronze-level Race Equality Chartermark. The submission would be finalised in January and submitted in February. After that the focus would be on Athena SWANN and obtaining silver at an institutional level.
- A member asked what could be done about bringing a better balance of diversity across senior staff. He noted the impact of there being no mandatory retirement age, and was interested to know what best practice was in the sector. It was acknowledged that the turnover of the academic body was very low, at 2% per year and the Principal suggested that a series of approaches be collected for discussion in a more structured way. The Director of D&I noted that there was also a lot of analysis that could be done on what populations had been attracted to job advertisements and who had been hired. She thought that there could be issues around the selection processes.

---

c) Subject-Level TEF [AB-18-12-10-06c] CONFIDENTIAL ITEM

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

d) Curriculum 2029 [AB-18-12-10-06d]

The Vice President & Vice-Principal (Education) presented the progress report on Curriculum 2029. This was a significant and wide-ranging project and there would be an update at every meeting. The paper provided preliminary information on the major review to be undertaken of King's portfolio of modules and programmes, and set out the rationale for this undertaking and the principles which would guide the process and decision making. The KCLSU had welcomed the principles.

It was an ambitious undertaking to reduce the overall complexity of the current portfolio of programmes and modules. The VP (Education) emphasised that this was not just an exercise in reducing modules, and should be taken as an opportunity to review department portfolios and consider academic goals for the future. Full proposals on the parameters, criteria and process for the curriculum review as well as the new curriculum architecture would be brought to the February meeting of Academic Board. It was critical that academics took ownership of changes. A steering group had now been expanded to incorporate wider academic participation.

There were some examples in the university of where this process was already underway. The Dean of the Business School was invited to summarise the process at the Business School where the undergraduate programme was being reviewed alongside the Education Strategy. The strategic ambition had been defined, in terms of what a premier academic program meant, and a project steering group had been set up that had already worked on a number of strands and innovative proposals, including: having both depth and breadth in the program, diversity of teaching modes and course length.

There would be a conference in February, once the Academic Board had been further consulted. Academic Board members were also encouraged to feed their views in off-line.

---

## 7 Reports of Committees

a) Report of College Education Committee (CEC) [AB-18-12-10-07a]

The Chair of CEC presented one item for approval. The remaining items were on the Consent Agenda.

(i) Transitional First Year Proposals (for approval)

The background to this proposal was a recognition of the challenges faced by students. It fed into the mental health agenda. It was also common practice elsewhere in the sector and brought King's in line with the vast majority of its peers. The proposal had not been wholly supported during discussion of the education strategy but the balance of opinion was in its favour. It was emphasised that a change to a transitional first year would not mean that the first year 'didn't count'. To the contrary, the greater support that students received to achieve in the first year had a strong influence on the rest of their academic career. Although marks would not be incorporated into the degree algorithm they would still appear on the transcript, and students would still need to achieve their credit requirements in order to progress to their second year. There would be no compromise on academic standards nor on what was needed to achieve a degree.

During discussion, the following issues were raised:

- A concern was raised about those students studying abroad, in that this proposal would allow students to get a degree from King's College London based on just three semesters' work. This point was acknowledged as an area needing further examination in order to determine how best to accommodate these students. The VP (Education) reminded the Board that the approval being requested was in principle only, and that all issues that still needed to be addressed would come back to the Board.
- It was clarified that this was a completely different proposition to an accelerated degree, which was not being proposed. King's academics needed the full calendar year for their research.
- In response to a query as to whether there was any impact from discussions around grade inflation, the VP (Education) responded that this was a political issue but a full section investigation was not expected, although there would undoubtedly be increased scrutiny of the sector by the OfS. It was noted that King's was not one of the institutions that was seen to be an issue.
- An Academic Board member re-emphasised that King's was an outlier regarding a transitional first year and that there was much to be learned from other universities on how to make this work well.

---

**Decision:**

That the proposal that from 2020<sup>1</sup>, the first year of an undergraduate degree becomes a transitional year, with the undergraduate degree classification algorithm calculated from the marks attained from the second year (level 5) onwards, be approved in principle.

---

**Items on Consent (all noted) [AB-18-12-10-07a]**

Meeting of 3 October

- (ii) Governance Review
- (iii) Education Strategy: 2018/19 Implementation Plan
- (iv) 2018 NSS/PTES
- (v) Annual Provider Review for 2018/19
- (vi) Module Evaluations
- (vii) Destination of Leavers in Higher Education
- (viii) Industrial Action
- (ix) Transition & Retention Strategy
- (x) Student Mental Health & Wellbeing Strategy
- (xi) Taught Module Educational Research
- (xii) KCLSU Update
- (xiii) College Assessment and Standards Committee report
- (xiv) Programme Development & Approval Committee report

Meeting of 28 November

- (xv) Subject-Level TEF
  - (xvi) Student Outcomes and Attainment Gaps
  - (xvii) Programme Architecture Proposal
  - (xviii) KBS first year pilot: timeline and milestones
  - (xix) Education Operations
  - (xx) Timetabling Policy
  - (xxi) Teaching Excellence Awards
  - (xxii) Welcome Week report
  - (xxiii) King's Academy Update
  - (xxiv) King's Online Personal Tutoring
  - (xxv) College Assessment and Standards Committee report
  - (xxvi) Programme Development & Approval Committee report
- 

**b) Report of College Assessment and Standards Committee (CASC) [AB-18-12-10-07b]**

The Vice President & Vice-Principal (Education) presented one item for approval on behalf of the Chair of CASC. The remaining items were on the Consent Agenda.

**(i) External Examiner Overview Report [AB-18-12-10-07b]**

Academic Board considered a report from the College Assessment and Standards Committee that detailed the main issues highlighted by external examiners in their annual reports with a focus made on academic standards within King's.

**Decision:**

That the following be approved:

1. The College continues to keep under review the awarding of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2:1 degrees to ensure grade inflation is not being experienced.
  2. Faculty Assessment Board/Sub-Assessment Board chairs continue to communicate to all markers the need to ensure consistency in marking annotation, use of the full range of marks, and that feedback should reflect the mark awarded.
- 

<sup>1</sup> 2019 for King's Business School programmes



- 
3. A review of the external examiners report template is conducted with consideration of revising the requirement to separate concerns into “monitor” and “critical”.

*Items on Consent* [AB-18-12-10-07b]

- (ii) Schedule of Business
- (iii) Governance Review
- (iv) Programme Review and Professional Statutory Bodies Report
- (v) External examiners nomination process
- (vi) King’s Sport: TASS accreditation scheme
- (vii) Academic Regulations – midyear review
- (viii) KCLSU Update
- (ix) College Marking Framework
- (x) Exemptions from regulations report
- (xi) Revocations report
- (xii) RADA Marking Scheme
- (xiii) Mark Translation Scheme for English and Law LLB
- (xiv) Study Abroad and Short Course Assessment Board minutes
- (xv) King’s Online Managed Programmes (KOMP) Module Assessment Boards minutes
- (xvi) Issues raised at assessment board meetings

- 
- c) Report of the Programme Development and Approval Committee (PDAC) [AB-18-12-10-07c]

*Items on Consent (all noted)*

- (i) Chair’s Action taken since PDAC last met
- (ii) List of new programmes approved since PDAC last met
- (iii) Review of new programmes considered in 2017/18

- 
- d) Report of the College Research Committee (CRC) [AB-18-12-10-07d]

*Items on Consent (all noted)*

- (i) Support for postdocs and research staff
- (ii) Research integrity
- (iii) Research Excellence Framework
- (iv) KPIs for research performance evaluation

- 
- e) Report of the College Innovation Committee (CInnovC) [AB-18-12-10-07e]

*Items on Consent (all noted)*

- (i) Service strategic framework
- (ii) Refreshing the university’s cultural strategy - update
- (iii) Information Sharing

---

**8 Report of the KCLSU President** [AB-18-12-10-08]

The KCLSU Vice-President (PG) presented the report on behalf of the KCLSU President, and expressed how much the working relationships being developed between the KCLSU and the Senior Management Team was valued. The Principal commended the report, and praised the strategic progress being made due to the hard work of the sabbatical officers.

---

**9 Report of The Acting Dean** [AB-18-12-10-09]

*Item for Consideration*

- a) Report of the Acting Dean [AB-18-10-10-09a]  
The report was noted.

*Items on Consent*

- a) Election of Associates of King’s College [AB-18-12-10-09b]

**Decision:**

Academic Board elected as Associates of King’s College those students and staff listed in the report.

---

**11 Any Other Business**

There was none.

---

**Irene Birrell**  
College Secretary  
December 2018