

Academic Board
Meeting date 9 March 2022

Paper reference AB-22-03-09-03.2

Status Confirmed

Approved Minutes
Date 9 March 2022, 14.00

Location Remote Meeting held by MS Teams

Composition		Members	Attendance 20210-21				
			03.11.21	08.12.21	09.03.22	20.04.22	29.06.22
Ex officio	Chair of Academic Board, President & Principal	Professor Shitij Kapur	P	P	P		
	Senior Vice	SVP Academic (interim)	Professor Mike Curtis	P	P	P	
	Presidents & Vice Principals	SVP Service, People & Planning	Professor Evelyn Welch	P	P	P	
		SVP Health & Life Sciences	Professor Richard Trembath	P	P	P	
		VP Education (interim)	Professor Adam Fagan	P	P	P	
		VP Research	Professor Reza Razavi	P	P	P	
		VP Global Engagement	Professor 'Funmi Olonisakin	P	P	A	
		VP Communities & National Engagement	Baroness Bull	P	P	A	
	The Reverend the Dean		Rev'd Canon Dr Ellen Clark-King	P	P	P	
	The President of the Students' Union		Zahra Syed	P	P	A	
	KCLSU Vice Presidents Education	Vice President for Education (Arts & Sciences)	Hamza Lone	P	P	A	
		Vice President for Education (Health)	Fatimah Patel	P	A	P	
		Vice President for Postgraduate	Rebecca Seling	P	P	A	
	Executive Deans of Faculty	Arts and Humanities	Professor Marion Thain	A	P	P	
		Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences (Interim)	Professor Michael Escudier	P	P	P	
		Dickson Poon School of Law (Interim)	Professor Alex Türk	P	P	P	
		King's Business School	Professor Stephen Bach	A	P	P	
		Life Sciences & Medicine	Professor Ajay Shah	P	P	A	
		Natural, Mathematical & Engineering Sciences	Professor Bashir Al-Hashimi	A	P	A	
		Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care	Professor Irene Higginson	P	P	P	
Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience		Professor Ian Everall	A	P	P		
Dean for Doctoral Studies		Professor Linda McKie	P	P	P		
Dean for Doctoral Studies		Professor Rebecca Oakey	A	P	P		
Executive Director: King's School of Professional & Continuing Education		Nina McDermott	P	P	P		
Elected Students	One student from each faculty, split equally across UG/PGT/PGR	Arts and Humanities	Claude Lynch	P	A	A	
		Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences	Varsha Rajkumar Lalwani	P	P	A	
		Dickson Poon School of Law	Chriso Panayi	P	P	P	
		King's Business School	William Shiue	P	P	P	
		Life Sciences & Medicine	Amy Lock	P	P	A	
		Natural, Mathematical and Engineering Sciences	<i>Vacancy</i>	-	-	-	
		Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care	Yathave Ugaraj	A	A	A	
		Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience	S'thembile Thusini	P	P	P	
Social Science and Public Policy		Hassan Faouz	A	P	P		

Elected Staff	Four academic staff members from each faculty (and five in the case of larger faculties) elected by and from the staff of each faculty.	Arts & Humanities (5 members, including HOD equivalent)	Professor Anna Snaith	P	P	P			
			Dr Simon Sleight	A	P	P			
			Professor Mark Textor	A	A	P			
			Professor Matthew Head	P	P	P			
			Dr Hannah Crawforth	P	P	P			
		Dentistry, Oral & Craniofacial Sciences (4 members, including HOD equivalent)	Professor Kim Piper	P	P	P			
			Dr Anitha Bartlett	P	P	P			
			Dr Ana Angelova	P	P	P			
			Professor Jeremy Green	P	P	P			
		Dickson Poon School of Law (4 members, including HOD equivalent)	Professor Alison Jones	P	P	A			
			Professor Federico Ortino	P	P	P			
			Dr Ewan McGaughey	P	P	A			
			Professor Satvinder Juss	P	P	P			
		King's Business School (4 members, including HOD equivalent)	<i>Vacancy (HoD)</i>	-	-	-			
			Dr Jack Fosten	P	P	P			
			Dr Juan Baeza	P	P	A			
			Dr Daniele Massacci	P	A	A			
		Life Sciences & Medicine (5 members, including HOD equivalent)	Dr Alison Snape	P	P	P			
			Professor Maddy Parsons	P	A	P			
			Dr Baljinder Mankoo	P	P	A			
			Dr Susan Cox	P	P	A			
			Dr Manasi Nandi	P	P	A			
		Natural, Mathematical and Engineering Sciences (4 members, including HOD equivalent)	Professor Paula Booth	P	P	P			
			Professor David Burns	A	A	A			
			Professor Michael Kölling	P	P	P			
			Professor Sameer Murthy	P	P	A			
		Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care (4 members, including HOD equivalent)	Dr Tommy Dickinson	P	P	A			
			Dr Julia Philippou	P	P	P			
			Irene Zeller	P	P	A			
			Dr Jocelyn Cornish	P	A	P			
		Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience (5 members, including HOD equivalent)	Professor Guy Tear	P	P	A			
			Dr Marija Petrinovic	P	P	P			
			Dr Yannis Paloyelis	P	P	A			
			Dr Eamonn Walsh	P	P	P			
			Professor Robert Hindges	P	P	P			
		Social Science and Public Policy (5 members, including HOD equivalent)	Professor Alfredo Saad-Filho	P	P	P			
			Dr Ye Liu	P	A	P			
			Dr Jane Catford	P	P	P			
			Dr Sunil Mitra Kumar	P	P	A			
			Dr Hillary Briffa	P	P	P			
		Three professional staff	Education Support	Syreeta Allen	P	P	P		
			Research Support	James Gagen	P	P	P		
			Service Support	Kat Thorne	P	P	P		
		Two academic staff on research-only contracts	Arts and Sciences Faculties	Dr Harriet Boulding	P	A	P		
			Health Faculties	Dr Moritz Herle	A	P	P		

v= vacant post

In attendance:

Darren Wallis, Executive Director, SED (Standing attendee)

Lynne Barker, Associate Director, Quality Standards & Enhancement (Standing attendee)

For item 5 (Research Strategy Refresh)

Mark Pelling (Professor of Geography)

Kawal Rhode (Professor of Biomedical Engineering)

Group discussion coordinators: Declan Mulkeen, Tom Foulkes, Maria Rabanser, Jone De Roode Jauregui, Lauren Cracknell

For item 6.1

(Principal's Report)

Steve Large, Senior Vice President (Operations)

Annabel Chalker, Director of Corporate Communications

Secretariat:

Irene Birrell (College Secretary)

Joanna Brown (Governance Manager)

1 Welcome, apologies and notices

The Chair welcomed new members and guests in attendance to the meeting. This was the last meeting for Professor Ian Everall as IoPPN Executive Dean. An announcement would be made soon about who would step into the role as an interim.

2 Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

3 Unanimous Consent Agenda (including Minutes of the Previous Meeting) [AB-22-03-09-03]

The Principal reported that Academic Board member, Dr Ewan McGaughey, had proposed some amendments to the draft minutes of the 8 December 2021 Academic Board meeting. The College Secretary reported that the proposed amendments had been reviewed against staff notes and given due consideration with respect to the Secretariat's regular practices for minutes. A note had been sent to Dr McGaughey responding to each proposed amendment as several of the proposed changes did not align with Secretariat notes or practices, along with a revised set of minutes including the amendments that did align. As Dr McGaughey did not agree with the College Secretary's response, the minutes had been removed from the consent agenda and Academic Board members had been sent the revised set of minutes to consider for approval, along with Dr McGaughey's original proposals and the College Secretary's summary note to Dr McGaughey in response to each amendment.

The Principal proposed (i) the amended minutes before the Board for approval with the option for Dr McGaughey to raise his concerns under Matters Arising at the next meeting; and (ii) that the Academic Board Operations Committee be requested to review the larger question of switching to a verbatim recording of proceedings with all names and interactions recorded, versus continuing with appropriate brevity and synthesis. [ACTION]

No objections were raised to taking the revised version of the 8 December 2021 minutes, as prepared by the College Secretary, as approved.

Decisions

- (i) That the revised version of the 8 December 2021 minutes prepared by the College Secretary be approved, with the option for Dr McGaughey to raise his proposals with respect to additional amendments under Matters Arising at the next meeting;
 - (ii) That the Academic Board Operations Committee be requested to review the format of minutes, and report back to the Academic Board; and
 - (iii) That the reports on the Unanimous Consent Agenda (UAC) be taken as read and noted or approved.
-

4 Matters Arising from the Minutes [AB-22-03-09-04]**The Service, People & Planning Portfolio**

Following the new senior leadership team restructure, the Senior Vice President (Service, People & Planning) had been asked to provide the Academic Board with a broad description of her new role and portfolio. The report outlined the new portfolio, its key priorities and its engagement with the Strategy refresh. During discussion of the report points raised included:

- Workload: this was a huge issue affecting many staff. The SVP (SPP) confirmed that as part of the Strategy refresh it was top of the agenda, along with pay and performance. Data revealed (with a number of exceptions) that, for the most part, staff/student ratios had not changed but in many cases the type of work had changed, meaning that individuals were not always able to do the work that provided the greatest job satisfaction because of work pressures in other areas. The workload
-

issue was about balance as well as about the amount of work. The aim was to focus on looking for ways forward, which would involve developing a better understanding of how work across the higher education sector was changing and what could be done to respond to that.

- The Principal reported on Universities UK (UUK) and Russell Group meetings, and confirmed that the sense of workload was pervasive within the higher education system.
- A member commented on efficiency and reported scepticism from colleagues about the development of multiple roles in the central administration, and the added complexity this seemed to present. The Principal noted that King's sat in the middle of its peers with respect to the number of senior, central roles. However, the notion of central versus faculty costs was more nuanced. For example, at King's the largest increases in costs were related to estates and were paid centrally. However, the largest users of the estate were the Faculties. He had committed to the Executive Deans that there would be a much deeper discussion of this through the next business planning round. The SVP (SSP) added that her report had not provided a clear enough sense of the extraordinary amount of work done by everybody on the senior team every day for the sake of collective responsibility and accountability.

5 Research Strategy Refresh [*STRATEGIC DISCUSSION*] [AB-22-03-09-05]

The Vice President (Research) introduced the discussion session. Academic Board received two presentations on Environment and Sustainability (**Annex 1**) and Research Enhanced Education (**Annex 2**). The Board were invited to contribute to the Strategy Refresh through group discussion and feedback.

Environment and Sustainability feedback (groups one to three):

- An interest in connecting sustainability across the College and whether there were effective models for bringing various initiatives and practices together.
 - Success would involve integrating environment and sustainability into the formal syllabus and connecting research and education with service and beyond to create a sense of a community of action.
 - It's important to take into account the extent of engagement in sustainability and environment research across all partners. For example, the new Circle U international partnership has a strong focus on climate change.
 - Not all departments would readily see where they could contribute but that could be addressed case by case. For example, members of the Department of Music might see this as a challenge, but there was a lot music could and did do to towards understanding and meaning of environmental change.
 - The need to understand where we have research and education expertise and where we don't and identify gaps and means of filling them. A combination of expertise and leadership needed for discussions with funders.
 - Progress in an academic career and work to enhance the College's scholarly reputation often has a negative impact on the environment, for example through travel, and the need to practice what we preach rather than accepting established practices.
 - Focus on the environment and sustainability is of increasing importance to business and, therefore, is highly relevant to business and professional/executive education.
 - We should be engaging with a wide range of stakeholders to look forward and achieve a depth of understanding of the issues and key disrupters for the next five, ten and 20 years. What are the trade-offs going to be? How will we measure progress?
 - Education, research and climate action at King's are inter-related and need to be seen as such. Most of King's researchers are also educators. Each strand needs to be developed at pace with clear objectives, timelines and deadlines.
 - Interdisciplinary research, while important, is challenging and many research funders are rather conventional. We will either need to work around this, or work with others to ensure suitable funding models for the challenge emerge.
-

-
- We should move beyond thinking of sustainability research in terms of physical sciences, environmental and technology research. Cross-disciplinary research initiatives will be just as important.
 - Since King's works with almost all the UK health professional groups, and given the size of King's health faculties, it would be important to find ways they could make a large contribution to the area through research or education.

Research Enhanced Education –feedback (groups four and five):

- Understanding REE might improve the quality of King's courses and help students understand their curricula better regarding the research content embedded in them.
- Things that would be crucial: mapping of curricula exercise; how REE would relate to skills development and courses with professional requirements; different requirements for undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- We need to think about the impact on time and resources. This cannot be a tick box exercise and needs real engagement.
- As well as linking research into education there is a need to consider how education can impact research.
- What can we learn from models at other institutions: How effective are they? How do they evaluate the impact of what they do? (and the importance of this). How do their frameworks integrate and overlap with other frameworks in place.
- The challenge of motivation and avoiding the creation of additional workload for students and staff. How do we frame discussion around REE?
- We need to recognise what we do already and how to make these things more visible.
- Where and how does the value of pedagogy research get recognised? There are people who do educational research already that informs not only their own practice but practice elsewhere.
- How does quality improvement, which is a key part of healthcare education, fit within REE?

The Principal summarised the feedback as a clear message that environment and sustainability (E&S) must cut across education and research in an interrelated way. The environment and sustainability agenda resonated passionately with King's students. King's ranked well in league tables of sustainable practices but had been late in giving prominence to its E&S academic offering.

With respect to REE the Principal recognised that King's already did this well, and it would be key to improve without increasing bureaucracy. As well as genuine quality improvement there was also a very important narrative to develop - universities were under a lot of political pressure to demonstrate the value of teaching and research cross subsidising and reinforcing each other and also to demonstrate why research intensive universities such as King's were, with good reason, costlier than other institutions which were not research-led. Members were requested to get in touch with Academic Board member Kat Thorne if they had any further thoughts to share.

6 Report of the President & Principal

6.1 Summary Report on Key Issues_[AB-22-03-09-06.1]

The Principal presented his summary report which set out updates on the coronavirus, King's Business School Accreditation and an admissions update. He provided updates and information about additional matters:

Coronavirus: latest data indicated that the level of infection on campus had stabilised, following a slight peak as people returned to campus after a quiet first two weeks of January. Compliance with face masks was ebbing away but a spike as a result of that had not been seen.

King's Business School (KBS) Accreditation: The KBS application to be accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) had been formally ratified by that organisation. This was an

internationally recognised mark of excellence held by fewer than six per cent of the world's institutions offering business degree programmes and involved a rigorous peer review process.

The Executive Dean of KBS further updated the Board that in addition to the AACSB accreditation, European accreditors had visited the school last week with results yet to come, but he was hopeful given the tenor of the visit. Both the AACSB (American) and the European accreditor were major quality assurance bodies. He estimated that probably three percent or less of business degree institutions had received both American and European accreditation.

Admissions update: The situation had moved on since the graphs in the report, but the general direction had not changed. European student applicants were down in number and home students slightly up, though not at postgraduate level; at the overseas level there was again growth in applications. Notable was the increase in diversity of overseas students with respect to country of origin, with the number of applicants from India increasing significantly. It was noted important to diversify where students come from. The key focus this year was to not be faced with further unexpected/unplanned growth.

Masterplanning at the Strand and Waterloo campuses: a masterplanning process was underway addressing better use of space on the Strand and the impact of changes in those parts of the College on other campuses.

Online learning: Discussions were underway about the place of online learning post-Covid and how it would interact with on campus activity. Consideration was being given to how and with whom King's should partner.

Global staff mobility: Issues related to staff working from outside the UK had been highlighted by Covid and the move to remote working. There were huge and significant employment, social insurance and tax considerations for individuals and for the College and those implications were being considered. It was a complex topic involving both Finance and HR. The first draft of a policy was under discussion.

Student mental health and wellbeing support: Ambition for King's to be seen as a leader in this space.

Ukraine – The university had issued two statements: the first, on the first day of the invasion focused on student support; the second was unequivocal in condemnation of the action by the Russian leader. The Principal acknowledged that the university's usual policy of acknowledging first the impact on students and staff rather than the political aspects meant that the university had been slower than it could have been in responding to the atrocity of the situation. The university considered the care of all of its students wherever they were from.

The Vice President (Education) and the Executive Director (SED) provided assurance to the Board as to what was being done for King's students in terms of both academic issues and personal support. Emphasis was being put on supporting cases of hardship. There was a coordinating group with wide representation from Faculties and speciality services to ensure that issues were identified quickly; all Ukrainian and Russian students had been contacted and those with support needs had been signposted to where in the university they could get help. The need for hardship funding was being closely monitored. Academically, Faculties had been advised to apply mitigating circumstances empathetically and the political and humanitarian crisis had been added to the list that would not require evidence regarding mitigating circumstances.

King's had 99 students from Ukraine and 420 from Russia/Belarus. There were currently only 100 applicants from the area, and consideration was needed about how and if to support them in their applications.

A member put forward that the university, while it should not take sides for students personally, it must do so as an institution. It was imperative to be seen as thought leaders: silence was seen as a statement – reference was made to universities in Nazi Germany that tried to stay apolitical and the consequences of that.

The Senior Vice President (Service, People & Planning) requested that any student or staff issues or enquiries be logged through Robin McIver, Deputy Vice President (Operations) to be sure that all elements of concern

for students were captured. The College's partnership with the Russian university, Higher School of Economics, had been suspended. The College had been contacted by medical and dental students in the Ukraine wishing to transfer to King's. This was being dealt with at national level but departments could expect to be contacted, particularly by Russian students wanting to leave Russia. It was noted that one Russian university had just announced it was dismissing students involved in anti-war protests. Investments and fundraising had been reviewed. The College had received one donation from someone who had spoken out against Russia; and held one very small investment from which the College was divesting as were university pension providers SAUL and USS divesting from such investments. The reflection from King's Russia Institute and its School of Security Studies was that this would be a long-term situation and that the College needed to consider its participation as a sanctuary university, without forgetting there are other parts of the world also suffering from conflict.

In response to a query about what King's was doing for academic staff, Board members were informed that the Council for At Risk Academics (CARA) was the main liaison, and that King's would have to provide funding to CARA. There was also an alumni association in the Ukraine that King's was involved with.

The Principal added that an emergency fund had been set aside that can help fund relief at scale. It was deemed sufficient for the short term but might need to be considered again as the situation developed.

During discussion of other matters related to the Principal's report, questions were asked about:

- Hyflex: Colleagues had asked whether Hyflex would continue to be used in the next academic year. Board members were assured that the intention was for a return to full teaching on campus. However, there were benefits that had been realised from digital learning and teaching and progressive innovations that should be recognised. The College wanted to enable instructors who wished to continue to use digital content and tools but needed to ensure that quality was maintained and that the number of student hours on campus was carefully balanced against digital elements.
- A member noted that the next two meetings of the board were intended to be on campus but asked for consideration for them to remain online as she believed the online meetings provided for more equalisation amongst members. It was suggested that the April meeting would be a good candidate to keep online due to its proximity to the Easter Holidays. The Chair highlighted the value of face-to-face meetings, acknowledged the positives of Teams, and agreed to reconsider.

7 Report of the KCLSU President [AB-22-03-09-07]

The KCLSU Vice President for Education (Health) presented the report. She reported on what the KCLSU had been doing regarding the situation in Ukraine. Officers had released a statement of support for all students impacted and highlighting the resources students could utilise. Emailed enquiries were being directed to the right people for the support needed.

Other updates included: The most recent KCLSU Town Hall had been cancelled and would be rescheduled; KCLSU officers had been in conversation with the university about the strategy refresh and officers had been assigned themes to focus on; progress was being made on the KCL/KCLSU relationship agreement; and the KCLSU had had an internal advice audit.

8 Reports of Committees

8.1 Report of the Academic Board Operations Committee (ABOC) [AB-22-03-09-08.1]

Mike Curtis presented the report.

(i) ABOC Membership Amendments

Decision: That the Academic Board recommend to Council approval of the proposed amendments to the membership of the Academic Board Operations Committee Terms of Reference and to the relevant Ordinance.

(ii) Academic Board agenda items proposed by members

A member asked for clarification of the level of discretion that would remain with the Principal when the proposed change was initiated. The College Secretary explained that currently the Chair's discretion was absolute but that would no longer be the case with this change. ABOC was proposing that it be at the discretion of the Chair to determine whether a proposal meets the outlined criteria for adding an item to the agenda, and that if there is disagreement between the group making the proposal and the Chair then the proposal would be referred to ABOC for resolution. The College Secretary referred to the bullet point in the report which set this out, and agreed that this could be added to the list of points to be included in the Ordinances.

Decision: That the Academic Board recommend to Council that paragraph 5.2 of the Ordinances containing the terms of reference of the Board be amended to read:

5.2 *The agenda shall be set by the Chair and supported by the College Secretary. Members of the Academic Board will be able to suggest issues for the agenda and are able to require that an item be considered subject to the following criteria and authority:*

- (i) It is supported by 10% of the membership of the Academic Board.*
- (ii) It is received by the Secretariat six weeks prior to the date of the meeting at which the members seek to have the item discussed.*
- (iii) It is within the terms of reference of the Board or one of its standing committees, and if it falls within the terms of reference of a standing committee it is referred to that committee for initial discussion rather than directly to the Board.*
- (iv) Prioritisation of placement on the Agenda for such items will be determined by the Academic Board Operations Committee in the event that more requests are submitted than can be managed in a meeting alongside other necessary business.*
- (v) A decision regarding the pertinence of particular criteria to a proposed item would continue to lie with the Principal. If such a decision were challenged the Academic Board Operations Committee would be consulted for a resolution.*

(iii) Election process issues – length of appointment

Decision: That the normal three-year term of membership of the Academic Board be extended beyond three years to end on the next 31 July for those that start following the first meeting of the Board in the academic year.

The Remaining items noted on the Consent Agenda:

- (iv) Election Issues (remaining)
- (v) Elections timetable
- (vi) Annual Agenda Plan
- (vii) Future meeting locations

8.2 Report of the College Education Committee (CEC) [AB-22-03-09-08.2]

Items **approved** or noted on the Consent Agenda:

- (i) *Proposal for a new type of King's Award (approved)*
 - (ii) *ICCA Regulations (approved)*
 - (iii) *Education Strategy Refresh*
 - (iv) *Student Mental Health & Wellbeing Strategy*
 - (v) *Student Lecture Capture*
 - (vi) *Initial Teacher Training Accreditation*
 - (vii) *Closing Attainment Gaps Update*
-

-
- (viii) *Race Equity & Inclusive Education Fund 2021/22*
 - (ix) *Policy for Module & Teaching Evaluations*
 - (x) *College Teaching Fund*
 - (xi) *OfS Consultations*
 - (xii) *Exams Annual report*
-

8.3 Report of the College Research Committee (CRC) [AB-22-03-09-08.3]

Items noted on the Consent Agenda:

- (i) *ED&I Update*
 - (ii) *Research Culture*
 - (iii) *Reactivation of Science Gallery London*
-

9 Report of The Dean

9.1 Report of the Dean [AB-22-03-09-09.1]

The report of the Dean was noted as read. The Dean highlighted the vigil for Ukraine on Monday 14 March at 5pm in Bush House courtyard and the upcoming colloquium on Archbishop Desmond Tutu's legacy in early April.

*Item **approved** on Consent*

9.2 Election of Associates of King's College (AKC) [AB-22-03-09-09.2]

Decision:

That those students and staff listed in the report be elected as Associates of King's College.

10 Report from Council [AB-22-03-09-10]

Academic Board received the report from Council, presented by Kat Thorne, one of the three elected staff members of the Board who serve on Council. Kat Thorne presented the issues that had been considered by Council as set out in the report.

11 Any Other Business

A question was raised requesting an explanation from senior management regarding the alignment between the joint statement issued from UCU/KCL, and the university voting with UUK on pension decisions the following day. This had been a disappointment to staff and had seemed corrosive to good will. It fed into a perception that academic staff were simply employees, not recognise that if staff worked only their contractual hours the university would stop. Academic staff were looking for actions that supported statements about their value to the College.

The Senior Vice President (Operations) noted that this same question had been addressed at a recent pensions Town Hall. There were only two options available to select from. The national UCU option which required significant increases in contributions - which UCU was willing to agree to for a short time followed by a further valuation – or the UUK option which was to move now to keep costs reasonable for all in exchange for a good pension. In the joint statement King's UCU believed it was possible to maintain existing benefits without increasing contributions but no proposals had been put forward to achieve this. The national UCU option would almost certainly require an increase in contributions and unspecified benefit changes in future and the mitigation by a future valuation was far from certain. King's would of course like to see lower contributions with unchanged benefits but that was not a choice in front of the university at this time.

The Principal acknowledged the concerns of those who had not been party to the detail of the discussion and pointed out the value of the joint statement was that it demonstrated where there are areas of agreement (for example, disinvestment in fossil fuels and shareholder representation) and areas for joint work (conditional indexation, flexible options). He was keen to continue to work with UCU and to maintain goodwill. Antagonism between academic staff and management was not good for the sector

or for King's. However, it needed to be recognised that King's cannot shift the sectors position unilaterally with 154 other institutions, many very different from King's, being party to decisions.

The meeting adjourned at 16:33.

Irene Birrell

College Secretary

March 2022