

<b>Academic Board</b>	
<b>Meeting date</b>	6 February 2019
<b>Paper reference</b>	AB-19-05-01-03.2
<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>	6 February, 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 (A)	
	<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 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
		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 (A)
Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences		Professor Mike Curtis (A)		
<b>The President of the Students' Union</b>		Mr Ahad Mahmood		
<b>Dean, Centre for Doctoral Studies</b>		Professor Rebecca Oakey		
<b>Director of Students and Education</b>		Ms Tessa Harrison		
<b>Operations Director (Research and Researchers)</b>		Dr Martin Kirk		
<i>Students</i>	Arts & Sciences Faculties	Undergraduate	Ms Emma Rouviere	
		Postgraduate	Mr Asad Tanveer	
	Health Faculties	Undergraduate	Ms Emma Bohea (A)	
		Postgraduate	Ms Pavan Pankhania (A)	
<i>Faculty</i>	Arts and Humanities	elected senior	Professor Kate Crosby	
		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 Kim Piper (A)	
	Dickson Poon School of Law	elected senior	Professor John Tasioulas	
		elected junior	Dr Megan Bowman	
		appointed	Dr Leslie Turano-Taylor (A)	
King's Business School	elected senior	Mr Crawford Spence		
	elected junior	Dr Chiara Benassi (A)		
	appointed	Professor Riccardo Peccei		

Life Sciences & Medicine	elected senior	Professor Michael Malim (A)
	elected junior	Dr Samantha Terry (A)
	appointed	Dr Ian McFadzean
Natural and Mathematical Sciences	elected senior	Dr Chris Lorenz
	elected junior	Dr Andrew Coles (A)
	appointed	Professor David Burns (A)
Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care	elected senior	Dr Janet Anderson
	elected junior	Mr Ian Noonan (A)
	appointed	Professor Jackie Sturt (A)
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience	elected senior	<i>Vacant</i>
	elected junior	<i>Vacant</i>
	appointed	Dr Susan Duty
Social Science and Public Policy	elected senior	Professor Kerry Brown (A)
	elected junior	Dr Rebekka Friedman (A)
	appointed	<i>Vacant</i>

**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)  
 Ms Lynne Barker (Associate Director, Quality Standards & Enhancement)  
 Dr Markshiel (Head of Department of Film Studies)  
 Professor Samjid Mannan (Head of Education, Department of Physics)

**Secretariat:**

Ms Irene Birrell (College Secretary)  
 Ms Joanna Brown (Governance Manager)  
 Ms Xan Kite (Director of Governance Services)

**1 Welcome, apologies and notices**

A number of members' term of membership on the Academic Board had come to an end, and the Chair thanked them for their contributions to Academic Board:

Professor Kate Crosby  
 Professor Michael Malim  
 Dr Ian McFadzean  
 Dr Barry Quinn  
 Mr Ian Noonan  
 Dr Susan Duty

**2 Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**3 Unanimous Consent Agenda (including Minutes of the Previous Meeting) [AB-19-02-13-03]**

**Decision**

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

**4 Matters Arising from the Minutes – Retirement Policy Review Update**

A late paper had been circulated on the retirement policy review, requested at the previous meeting of the Academic Board. This paper provided a brief update on progress so far with respect to the retirement policy and how this influences issues of diversity and inclusion, and members were asked to note the call for volunteers to participate in workshops in March and April.

**5 Report of the Chairman**

*Items for Consideration*

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

5.2 Academic Board Review – Report from Council [AB-18-12-10-05.2]  
 The Senior Vice President (Quality, Strategy & Innovation) introduced the report. Following the previous meeting, where Academic Board had had a discussion on the Academic Board Review White Paper recommendations, both the Governance and Nominations Committee and the Council had reviewed the

---

White Paper and the issue was returned to Academic Board for further advice before a final decision by Council. The SVP (QS&I) reviewed the four issues raised by Council:

- Council wanted more understanding on the mandate of the Board and how it related to Council.
- Council particularly wanted feedback on the size of the Board. Council were concerned that the membership of Academic Board was too large to be effective
- Council were concerned that, under the new proposals, executive members of the College responsible for implementing decisions of the Board would be largely excluded from the membership.
- Council suggested that the Academic Board elect from among its elected members three staff members to Council in order to increase the connectivity between the Academic Board and the Council.

It was pointed out that the membership sentiments were contradictory in that including all the Vice Presidents in the new proposals would further increase the size of the Board. It was noted that data from other Russell Group universities showed that King's Academic Board was actually smaller than most, and there was therefore an argument for expansion.

In discussion the following views were noted:

- That there was generally a high attendance level of Executive Deans at the Academic Board meetings, that engagement from the Executive Deans should be encouraged, and that they should therefore remain ex-officio members of the Board. In light of this, the expansion of membership was favoured.
- A larger membership was more reflective of the university community, and it also made sense that those leaders who needed to listen to the university community were present at Academic Board meetings.
- The suggestion that Academic Board propose three staff members to Council from its membership was to be refined by the Governance and Nominations Committee. The current thinking was one senior academic, one junior academic and one professional services member.
- It was noted that the current ex-officio Academic Board members who also sat on Council were:
  - The President & Principal (ex-officio Council member)
  - The Senior Vice President (Operations) (staff Council member)
  - The Senior Vice-President/Provost (Arts & Humanities) (staff Council member)The other Senior Vice Presidents were in-attendance. It was noted that following the wider governance review, there was a proposal to make the Provosts and the Senior Vice President (Operations) ex-officio members of Council.

There was broad endorsement for an increase in the size of Academic Board in order that all Executive Deans plus the Provosts serve on the Academic Board; and the proposal that Academic Board propose three of its elected staff members for Council membership was agreed by show of hands.

### 5.3 Standing Committees – membership and terms of reference [AB-18-12-10-05.3]

The College Secretary presented the report which proposed changes to the Academic Board standing committee arrangements in order to reflect the five pillars of the university's Vision 2029 strategy.

#### **Decision**

That the following be approved:

- (i) establishment and terms of reference of a new Committee, the College London Committee;
- (ii) dissolution of the College Innovation Committee and establishment and terms of reference for the College Service Committee; and
- (iii) revisions to the terms of reference for the College Research Committee and College International Committee.

### 5.4 Academic Calendar for King's Online Managed Programmes [AB-18-12-10-05.4]

*(Item agreed on the Consent Agenda)*

#### **Decision**

---

That the academic calendar for King's Online Managed programmes be approved.

---

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

### *Items for Consideration*

#### 6.1 Summary Report on Key Issues [AB-19-02-13-06.1].

Academic Board considered the Principal's Report. The following key matters were summarised in the written report: Brexit; Trade Union Activity; Augar Review; USS Pension Update; Times Higher Education Subject Rankings; Pedestrianisation of the Strand, with appendices providing further detail on other issues.

Updates arising from the report included:

- Planning was being carried out for a worst-case scenario Brexit. Any additional suggestions would be welcomed, and the Principal encouraged support of affected colleagues.
- Since the industrial action last year, management had been engaged in a large number of activities to improve relationships with staff, and progress was being seen. In a recent meeting with trade union members on the Education Strategy, discussion had been focussed on educational concepts rather than industrial relations.
- The Principal had been meeting with parliamentarians regarding the Augar review. It was expected that the review's recommendations could have a difficult passage through parliament, and were not expected to be implemented until 2021. The Principal encouraged anyone who could to lobby now on the potential impact on universities.
- Regarding pensions, the Principal updated the Board that Universities UK had received a request from the Trustees to come up with options for shared risk. This would need further consultation in the sector.
- The Pedestrianisation of the Strand proposals were currently in consultation and were on display at KCL, 171 Strand. There were two drop-in consultation events, providing an opportunity to talk to the Westminster team, on Saturday, 9 February at St. Mary le Strand Church; and Tuesday, 12 February, at 171 Strand.
- King's Health Partners – there had been a press release on the chairmanship of King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust. Sir Hugh Taylor had been asked to take on this position alongside his existing role as chair of Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust. This was viewed as a positive move that would bring closer collaboration between these two organisations.
- Admissions – The Principal had no further updates but welcomed the large number of qualified undergraduate and postgraduate applications received as an indicator of the ongoing development to King's reputation, while noting that, as always, there were stronger and weaker areas of demand. He also noted the high quality of staff applications.

---

#### 6.2 Portfolio Simplification [AB-19-02-13-06.2]

The Vice President and Vice-Principal (Education) presented the report for discussion, which provided preliminary information on the major review to be undertaken of King's portfolio of modules and programmes, with the aim of reducing the overall size and complexity of the current portfolio, while maintaining academic strengths, meeting current and future needs of students and staff, and being sustainable. An addendum had been circulated prior to the meeting, which provided a summary of the feedback from the faculty staff who would be involved in leading the Portfolio Simplification process. The overall tone of the feedback had been constructive, and it was noted that many of the issues raised were both predictable and understandable in that it should be expected there be anxieties in relation to significant change within an organisation the size of King's. The responses had been summarised and presented to the Curriculum Commission, which had made several changes based on the feedback, as set out in the addendum.

The first part of the documentation had been seen by Academic Board at its previous meeting, and Council had endorsed the paper unanimously at its last meeting. The VP (Education) re-emphasised the principles contained within the document which would guide the process. Models from universities around the world provided top-down approaches. However, a view had been taken as an institution that the process for decision-making for King's review be bottom-up: in order for a robust set of outcomes that would reflect the values set out in Vision 2029, it was considered necessary that there be academic ownership of the outcomes, with departments and faculties to lead the process of reviewing the curriculum, followed by review from the Curriculum Commission, and final sign-off by the Academic Board. There would be a robust continuous programme of engagement. Participation of students to date had been exemplary.

During discussion, the following questions and points were raised:

- The "scope" section of the document set out that different expectations and considerations applied to undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) level programmes and modules and yet it was suggested by a

---

Board member that the difference in thresholds did not seem consistent with the difference in pedagogical approaches and expectations. The Vice-Principal (Education) explained that the decision to favour an approach which maximised simplicity was made after comprehensive discussions and research. Thresholds were a way of defining the scope in this review and should not be taken to indicate future minimum expectations of class-size. The thresholds in the document were at quite high levels in order to capture all of the courses that should be discussed. Substantive discussions would take place in the subject areas.

- A query was raised over the challenge to the assumption that teaching in very small class sizes always delivered a better experience and better teaching for students, and exactly how that would be challenged. It was explained that this would differ by faculty. Challenges were quite different in different faculties, and therefore responses were expected to be different, just as UG and PG responses were expected to be different. A lot of faculties and departments were already contending with teaching large groups as student numbers increased and teaching evolved. What would be a change in teaching culture in some parts of the university was already the norm in other parts, and that expertise should be harnessed. It was clarified that moving to fewer classes of four students did not necessarily mean more classes of 100 students.
- A member referred to the “impact on staff” section of the addendum document and suggested that the paragraph designed to reassure staff would not do so, and enquired about what else would be done to reassure staff that the exercise was not about staffing levels. The VP (Education) stated clearly that the portfolio simplification process was not about the size of the academic workforce and it was not about redundancies. Several models had been explored around the world which had shown it was possible to undertake a curriculum review on a large scale without significant impact on staffing. She reiterated that the reassurance message was sincere and genuine, with no hidden agenda. The Principal agreed, and added that the process was however about reducing academic staff workloads and improving pedagogy for students.
- It was acknowledged that this was a massive task, and that it was time for a review, but there was concern that a significant reduction in the number of modules would backfire. For example the wide variety of modules offered within Arts & Humanities, which had always been a foundational part of King’s, was a chief attraction to high-fee paying students, and both complemented and reflected King’s location in a vibrant area for London’s theatre, culture and history. It was asked if management was absolutely confident there was no risk of destabilising King’s position. The Provost stated that there was no intention of damaging valuable assets, and that if it was seen that a programme was attracting a diverse student body then it would continue to be offered. Although it was not sought to maintain the current level of small class sizes, having larger groups in some areas would make it possible to have groups of four to five elsewhere.
- There was also an element of transparency required in the process in order to see what each Faculty was doing. An argument for maintaining small numbers would need to be made to the entire community.
- The portfolio simplification process was also about evolving and making space for new attractive modules, and was therefore an opportunity to think innovatively, dynamically and flexibly to refresh the sense of what the university did.

---

### 6.3 Curriculum 2029 [AB-19-02-13-06.2]

The Vice President and Vice-Principal (Education) presented the report, which included three items:

- Programme Architecture (to note)
- Curriculum Management (to discuss)
- Curriculum Innovation (to note)

It was expected that the principles would be familiar to Board members. The paper had deliberately been circulated alongside the Portfolio Simplification paper as the academic strategy had to advance in tandem with the operational strategy. It was felt important that Academic Board saw the detail at this early stage.

The Director of Education set out that the clarity of Vision 2029 helped to drive consistency. There were challenges in designing Curriculum 2029 and the document contained a list of what needed to be addressed in order to operationalise the Vision 2029 proposals. Critical to operationalisation was the curriculum management system. The current system would be replaced with a modern system, fit for purpose, and current compliance processes would be simplified. There had been good conversations among faculty programme managers around how best to align programmes and processes at faculty level. The next step was to engage in a process-mapping exercise. There would soon be a communication to the College community regarding what activities were going to be stopped in order to create space for new activities.

During discussion, the following views were raised:

---

- That Curriculum 2029 was an opportunity to overcome barriers between faculties, for example if the university took the decision that Wednesday morning was for cross-faculty programmes that would be more efficient than faculties making separate decisions.
- That now was the time to unpick operational and curriculum policy and to look at them afresh in the context of Curriculum 2029.
- It was noted that there was not an issue of not having enough resources, but rather of bringing expertise together. For example across the university there were 100 FTEs who worked on timetabling. Once there was an academic policy on timetabling, much better use could be made of this resource.
- The support of both technology and the Estates team when there were challenges would be crucial.
- The VP (Education) had made a commitment that no student would be academically disadvantaged by the Curriculum 2029 process, and that students would be engaged at every step.
- Changes would not be implemented quickly. It was expected that decisions would be made by October 2019, but the implementation would take some time. It might be that some programmes run until the last student graduates. Likewise it would take time to design new programmes.
- It was confirmed that there had been no discussion of, and there was no intention of extending the working day or the working week. However any questions on research days should be directed to the relevant Executive Dean.
- Curriculum 2029 would be a standing item at Academic Board for some time to come.

---

## 7 Reports of Committees

### 7.1 Report of College Education Committee (CEC) [AB-19-02-13-07.1]

*Items on Consent (all noted)*

- (i) Chair's Report
- (ii) Director's Report
- (iii) Student voice and student engagement
- (iv) C2029 Portfolio Review
- (v) C2029 Programme Architecture Operationalisation
- (vi) PACT Programme Definition
- (vii) Student Representation Review
- (viii) NSS/PTES 2019
- (ix) English Language Centre
- (x) CEC Terms of Reference
- (xi) C2029 Curriculum Innovation Competition
- (xii) C2029 Programme Architecture
- (xiii) Fair Admissions Policy
- (xiv) Programme Review and PSRB Report
- (xv) King's Academy Update
- (xvi) Report of PDAC

### 7.2 Report of College Research Committee (CRC) [AB-19-02-13-07.2]

*Items on Consent (and had been agreed at item 5.3- Standing Committees terms of reference)*

- (i) CRC Updated Terms of Reference

### 7.3 Report of the College International Committee (CInnovC) [AB-19-02-13-07.3]

*Items on Consent (all noted)*

- (i) College International Strategy Refresh
- (ii) Ethical and reputational risk management and due diligence

---

## 8 Quinquennial Reviews

### 8.1 Department of Film Studies Quinquennial Review [AB-19-02-13-08.1]

The Provost/Senior Vice President (Arts & Sciences) introduced the report supported by the Head of Department of Film Studies. The Provost commended the report and the commitment to diversity and inclusion in the curriculum as a good example of what could be done with deep and thoughtful curriculum review. The Senior Vice President (Quality, Strategy & Innovation) had chaired the review board. It had been a positive experience. The issues had been around infrastructure, and were all solveable. Referring to the Provost's comments, the Head of Department spoke of the department's rich diversity. The department had



---

been working on diversity issues for years and the decision that 10% of the syllabus would reflect diversity had been well received. The focus was now on widening participation in the student body. Another area that needed attention was building up research grants, and growth. The range and depth of curriculum was strong, but in order to continue to be competitive it would be desirable to offer creative film-making practice, which would be appropriate with the proximity to the West End. Technology support and investment would be needed for this. The Executive Dean of the Faculty echoed support for this proposal, stating there was enormous potential for digital creativity and network initiatives and for collaboration with the creative industries.

---

#### 8.2 Department of Physics Quinquennial Review [AB-19-02-13-08.2]

The Provost/Senior Vice President (Arts & Sciences) introduced the report supported by the Head of Education, Department of Physics. The Provost stated that staff had received some tough comments seriously and had responded constructively. She invited the Vice Principal and Vice-President (Education), who had chaired the physics review panel, to comment. The VP (Education) stated there had been extremely productive conversations over a number of difficult future challenges, and that there was a huge amount to commend. Teaching and research were equal joint priorities in the department culture, and diversity and inclusion was strong among both students and staff. They were diversity champions, receiving the equivalent of a Silver Athena SWAN. The Department faced challenges of space and facilities, for both research and teaching, and needed to work constructively with the Estates Department on future provision in that area. The Head of Education for the Department added that, partly in response to the review, a management committee had been formed and a committee structure developed to share responsibilities. Regarding admissions, the number of applications was extremely healthy, particularly in the number of international students. However, the department had not received the funding it had hoped for funding PhD students. A student member of the Board stated his personal experience of the positive change in culture and stated his strong support for the Department.

The Senior Vice President (Quality, Strategy & Innovation) made an observation from considering the two reviews together. Compared to typical physics funding, the funding that the Film Studies Department required for its future plans highlighted the different perception of value-added within the different departments.

---

#### 9 **Report of the KCLSU President** [AB-19-02-13-09]

The KCLSU President presented his report. The KCLSU sabbatical officers had worked on a wide variety of projects and looked forward to these being carried on by their successors.

During discussion, further detail was provided on succession arrangements. There was a month-long crossover which included building in processes to carry projects forward to future years and 1-2-1 handover arrangements as well as meetings with the new team to find out what they were particularly interested in in order to facilitate introductions to relevant connections in the College.

The KCLSU had consulted key stakeholders on the academic representation proposals and recommendations would be brought to the College Education Committee in due course.

---

#### 10 **Report of The Acting Dean** [AB-19-02-13-10]

*Item for Consideration*

##### a) **Report of the Acting Dean** [AB-18-10-10-10a]

The Assistant Dean was present to introduce the report. Progress on the AKC continued and was commended to all. The AKC was open to staff as well as students, and members were encouraged to spread the word.

*Items on Consent*

##### a) **Election of Associates of King's College** [AB-18-12-10-10b]

##### **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, February 2019

---