

College Council Minutes – Approved

Date	26 September 2018, 17.00
Location	Moot Court, Strand Campus
Present	Lord Geidt (Chair); Baroness Morgan of Huyton (Vice-Chair); Professor Edward Byrne (President and Principal); The Hon Sir David Foskett; Mr Paul Goswell; Professor Brian Holden Reid; Mr Michael D’Souza; Dr Angela Dean; Ms Ros King; Mr Ahad Mahmood; Sir Nigel Sheinwald; Mr Andrew Summers; Dr Ian Tebbett and The Right Reverend Dame Sarah Mullally.
Apologies	Ms Nhuoc Lan Tu; Professor Evelyn Welch; and Professor the Baroness Alison Wolf
In attendance	Hannan Badar, KCLSU Vice President Education (Health) for item 3 Jessica Oshodin, KCLSU Vice President Postgraduate for item 3 Robert Liow, KCLSU Vice President Welfare for item 3 Mohamed Salhi, KCLSU Vice President Education (Arts & Science) for item 3 Shaurya Vig, KCLSU Vice President Activities and Development for item 3 Professor Stephen Bach, Executive Dean King’s Business School for item 7b Professor Frans Berkhout Executive Dean Social Science and Public Policy for item 7b Professor Tim Lancaster, Dean of Medical Education for item 7b Professor Ian Norman, Executive Dean Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care for item 7b Ms Tessa Harrison, Director of Students and Education for items 7c and 7d Ms Maxine Taylor, Director of UK and International External Relations Standing attendees: Baroness Bull, Vice President & Vice-Principal (London) Professor Jonathan Grant, Vice President & Vice-Principal (Service) Professor ‘Funmi Olonisakin, Vice President & Vice-Principal (International) Professor Nicola Phillips, Vice President & Vice-Principal (Education) Professor Reza Razavi, Vice President & Vice-Principal (Research) Professor Sir Robert Lechler, Provost/Senior Vice President (Health) Mr Chris Mottershead, Senior Vice President (Quality, Strategy & Innovation) Secretariat: Ms Irene Birrell, College Secretary Ms Joanna Brown, Governance Manager Mr Paul Mould, Director of Business Assurance

1 Welcome, apologies and notices

The Chairman welcomed visitors to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Ms Lan Tu, Professor Evelyn Welch and Professor the Baroness Alison Wolf.

Baroness Morgan had reported a conflict of interest for item 9 (other business) in her role as Chair of the Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust, and left the meeting for that item.

2 Approval of agenda

The Chair announced an extra item of business, Brompton Feasibility Study, to be taken at Item 9 (Any Other Business). In accordance with Standing Order 20, the Chair altered the order of business, taking Item 6 (Chair’s Report) after Item 7 (Reports of the President & Principal); and taking Item 7c (Student Mental Health & Wellbeing) before Item 7b (Education Strategy Update). Council noted the amendments and additional item of business and approved the agenda as amended.

3 KCLSU Sabbatical Officers Report [KCC-18-09-26-03]

Council received a report from the KCLSU President, Mr Ahad Mahmood, who introduced the report and his colleagues, Hannan Badar, KCLSU Vice President Education (Health); Jessica Oshodin, KCLSU Vice President Postgraduate; Robert Liow, KCLSU Vice President Welfare; Mohamed Salhi, KCLSU Vice President Education (Arts & Science); Shaurya Vig, KCLSU Vice President Activities and Development. The KCLSU sabbatical officers

set out their priorities for the year, and welcomed Council and senior management collaboration in achieving their goals:

- KCLSU six-year strategy with short-term, mid-term and long-term goals - research was an important part of realizing this work, and the KCLSU looked forward to working with the key contacts at the university, and requested senior management support in obtaining engagement from both staff and students.
- NSS review - the KCLSU had conducted an analysis of the NSS results. Institutions that were the most successful were those that had the greatest cohesion between the institution and the student union and achieved a strong sense of community and belonging in the faculties. A KCLSU priority was to achieve that sense across King's. Working together was important for both the college and the student union in delivering on student satisfaction.
- Student mental health & well being - the KCLSU strongly supported implementation of the new Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Plan.
- Lecture capture provision – KCLSU wish for this to be expanded and made equally available across all courses and modules. Provision of lecture capture was currently uneven and consequently some students were unfairly disadvantaged.
- Postgraduate accessibility – there was an issue of retention of undergraduate students over to postgraduate programs for self-funded students. King's competitors offered alumni discounts, and it was felt a similar offer at King's would help with undergraduate to postgraduate conversion. Furthermore deposits for postgraduate programmes were high at King's and particularly off-putting for international students. Increased funding for scholarships and bursaries would help.
- Sports for disabled students – the KCLSU wanted to ensure that disabled students had access to all student union activities, and that all diversity was celebrated.
- International student visas – the KCLSU wanted eligibility to be extended from four to six months beyond the conclusion of studies to match some other universities. It was argued that an increase to six months would improve King's employability statistics, make King's more attractive to international students, and enhance student confidence.

Council members commended the KCLSU presentation. It was clear, comprehensive and ambitious, and the Principal provided commitment and collaboration to the KCLSU goals on behalf of the senior team. During discussion, the following points were addressed:

- The KCLSU sabbatical officers had been in term for three months and had already had meetings with appropriate leaders across the campuses.
- It was suggested that this KCLSU presentation be used as a reference for reports throughout the year to track progress.
- Each of the KCLSU projects set out in the presentation were to be aligned with a senior team member.
- The KCLSU was aiming to achieve better cohesion between the university and the student union by dialogue and engagement, and by putting the student experience at the centre of each of the strategic strands. The NSS scores were being reviewed from a demographic perspective as well as by faculty and issue. In a university the size of King's, clear communication channels were essential in ensuring that students were aware of the platforms that allowed their voices to be heard. It was equally crucial that the student union listened and ensured good feedback channels.
- The new KCLSU sabbatical officers were working on raising the visibility of the KCLSU. A lot of KCLSU services were not sufficiently signposted across the College especially within Faculties. Maximising KCLSU presence at student events like the Freshers Fayre was key to engaging with students, as were the new student spaces in Denmark Hill and Bush House. A digital transformation of the KCLSU was also planned. The KCLSU had launched a 'Welcome Fayre App' for the first time this September and would be looking at other similar tools.

4 Unanimous Consent Agenda (including Minutes of the Previous Meeting) [KCC-18-09-26-04]

Decision

That the reports on the Unanimous Consent Agenda, including the minutes of the 12 July 2018 meeting and the Actions Log, be taken as read and noted or approved.

5 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no matters arising.

6 Report of the President & Principal

(a) Summary Report on Key Issues [KCC-18-09-26-07a]

The report of the Principal outlined key current issues. The Principal provided the following comments on his report:

- The quality of applicants for standard academic jobs was high and continued to rise.
- The operating budget going forward appeared to be what had been prepared for in budget projections.
- The freedom of expression standing advisory group had provided a positive step with an agreement between the KCLSU and King's and a unified approach to contentious events. The Principal was confident that King's would not see platforming again on this issue.
- Research grant performance had opened this academic year with an increase of almost £40M.
- The Francis Crick Institute had brought Imperial College London, University College London (UCL) and King's together. The recently launched London Centre for Nanotechnology was another strong partnership between these universities.
- The opening of Science Gallery London had gone well and was a credit to the Vice President & Vice-Principal (London) and her team.
- Bush House and the Undercroft were both now fully open. They had almost doubled the space allocated to the student union and achieved a major increase in student-facing space on the Strand.

(b) Student Mental Health and Wellbeing [KCC-18-09-26-07c]

The Provost/Senior Vice President (Health) introduced the report. The Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Report and Plan 2018-2020 was institutionally important. This issue had risen in public awareness, with the increased prevalence of mental health problems. The university had a duty of care to its students, and this was intensified by virtue of its assets: the Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, and being aligned with the Maudsley Hospital. The Plan was clear in setting out the action, the intended impact, the responsible people and the measures of achievement. Evaluation (set out in point 2 of the Plan) would be important – the university aimed to be a national leader on this issue.

A steering group had been set up in December 2017, chaired by the Director of Students & Education. The report was aligned around a set of ambitions and the focus was on students, though there was every intention of extending the project to staff mental health and wellbeing, under the leadership of Human Resources.

Professor Lechler stressed that it was important not to over-medicalise the issue. A visual pyramid on page 6 of the report provided a model of the levels of activity already being delivered to support the mental health and wellbeing of the student population at King's: the bottom of the pyramid represented the intention that the well-being and resilience of all students be supported; tier 2 depicted the support provided by the student union; tier 3, the pastoral support provided by personal tutors; tier 4 showed the level of special support services required; and tier 5 was the referral of students with clear mental illness to external specialist assistance.

The Director of Students & Education commended the report as a fantastic example of the university bringing together academic expertise, professional expertise and students. Moving forward, accountability would be monthly, and public, while ensuring that action owners had the support to do what they needed to do. Interventions would be continuously evaluated. It was intended to launch the Plan around the same time as the annual agreement with the KCLSU.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- Whether the university could also address why mental illness was on the increase in society generally, given its particular assets as mentioned above, and that also one of the pillars of Vision 2029 was service to society. The Provost indicated there were ambitions to be national, if not international leaders. There were a number of theories as to why mental health problems were on the increase. One of the flagship themes of the next fundraising campaign would be children's and young adults' mental health.
- It was noted that personal tutors were often the first point of contact for new students, and it was asked how quickly interventions would happen for those new students having difficulties in the early days. The Director of Students & Education could report that the personal tutors were truly committed, that KPIs had been tightened up and for the first time there was a dashboard tracking interventions put in place, and that training for personal tutors had been completed. After the first few weeks of term, there would be a check-in with personal tutors on how many of their designated students they had met with.

Decision

That the Student Mental Health and Wellbeing report and Plan 2018-2020 be approved.

(c) Education Strategy update, including NSS scores [KCC-18-09-26-07b]

The President & Principal introduced the report. Unsatisfactory National Student Survey (NSS) scores had been an ongoing challenge for the university and was the major issue that its leadership and community were currently dealing with, while not being diverted from other major reforms. The Vice President & Vice-Principal (Education), the Provost/Senior Vice President (Health); and Deans of the Business School; Medical Education; Social Science and Public Policy; and the Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care were also present.

The Vice President & Vice-Principal (Education) provided further context. This National Student Survey had been conducted in the midst of industrial action. It was noted that while this did not explain everything, and was not an excuse, it had showed up in the survey and did provide important context for the results. The open text comments sections of the survey had been ubiquitous in how the handling of the industrial dispute had had impact on student experience. Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) scores for overall satisfaction had seen a greater decline than scores for individual questions. It was believed that that was largely the impact of those students being at King's only for one year.

Context notwithstanding, it was acknowledged that the NSS results were a disappointment, although it should also be noted that there were areas that did perform well. Areas that stubbornly did not perform well were assessment & feedback and organisational management. These scores represented structural factors which the education strategy was designed to improve long-term. However, there was a need to have action plans incorporating both the short and long-term along with continuous oversight and analysis.

The Chair suggested that Council and the wider university community must share the results as a common concern and challenge and together provide a supportive environment for improvement. The quality of student experience should run through everything the university did.

The Provost/Senior Vice President (Health) provided context for the scores from the health faculties. They were believed to be partly a result of the challenges of introducing the new MBBS curriculum while still running the old one. Important lessons had been learned from that experience and the Provost was confident that once through this double curriculum student satisfaction would improve. Improvement had been seen on the medical side in terms of quality of teaching and assessment and feedback, and it was thought this was partly a result of the introduction of the new curriculum.

During discussion with Members the following points were raised:

Assessment and Feedback

Members were interested to hear more about the plans for responding to NSS findings on assessment and feedback. There was an ongoing discussion on what and how assessment was carried out. An overhaul of the assessment regime had to be focused on the quality and consistency of the feedback. It was noted that King's had been very traditional in how it carried out assessment: unseen end-of-year exams which provided no feedback; or

so many assessment points that both students and staff felt overwhelmed, with staff unable to provide quality feedback on such a quantity of assessments.

Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care: There were many different types of assessment in this Faculty and the perceived unfairness of assessment marking was a big issue. The focus would be on restoring student confidence in the marking regime. The Executive Dean believed there should be more blind marking and better training for markers. There could also be marking workshops for students to teach them what a good assignment should look like.

King's Business School: Feedback from students, particularly higher fee students, was that they wanted more feedback. Marking workshops had been provided for staff. Following release of the NSS scores, real exam papers and assessments had been scanned and anonymised to help students understand what good work looked like. The Business School aimed to provide real-time feedback rather than waiting for the NSS each year. It was noted that the Business School had moved into Bush House before it was complete, and student space had therefore been limited, alongside class sizes being large. It was also noted that King's Business School was already ranked as the second-best undergraduate business school in the UK.

Members were struck that this initial discussion from the Deans and Vice Presidents around assessment had not mentioned quality of teaching or performance management of teaching. While there was agreement from Council Members on the tone set by the Chair, it was acknowledged that Council had been visiting this issue for many years. It had been understood that it would take a number of years for a turn-around in results, but there remained a sense that there had been little improvement. A discussion was had on whether it was possible to achieve both growth and student satisfaction.

The Executive Dean, Social Science and Public Policy reported that NSS results showed that student satisfaction was up that year in his Faculty, even in areas that had grown rapidly. He did not believe there was a trade-off between growth and excellence: leaders had to take ownership of the student experience. However students' expectations were changing, and every year brought new challenges.

The new Dean of the Medical School, Professor Tim Lancaster, had joined the team that year and significant material actions were underway. His purpose was to improve student satisfaction with medical education. He stated that the link between teaching and assessment was crucial. At the Medical School a strategic error had been to devolve teaching in the last year of the course to NHS sites, as this had resulted in a perceived inequality of experience. The re-establishment of a more centrally aligned teaching programme had the intention of improving student satisfaction. A number of measures had been approved that would allow in-year re-sits and reduce the number of students who had to re-sit whole years. Finally, the new senior medical team were engaged, student-facing leaders, working as a team with student services.

The KCLSU President stated how important it was that students be made aware of changes being implemented, even when they had not had input into those changes, and that an inclusive and transparent approach such as this would be reflected in NSS scores. He also noted that students expected alignment between level of fees and quality of the offer.

The Vice President & Vice-Principal (Education) acknowledged the need to work hard on making students feel a part of the community alongside staff. The university did have high scores on students having the opportunity to provide feedback but low scores on students feeling that their feedback was heard and acted upon. It was her belief that students did have influence but the university needed to get better at demonstrating that. Regarding quality of teaching, the NSS scores demonstrated a need to get better at monitoring and managing what was happening in the classroom. It was reiterated that the university needed systems that would allow it to monitor student satisfaction on an ongoing basis, rather than relying on the NSS once a year. Finally, she stated that King's, and other London higher education institutions, had been doing a lot of interesting work on the London effect, and this would be ongoing.

The President & Principal concluded that he was confident in seeing a turnaround in the university's NSS scores in the next three years. A key issue to work on was the sense of community among all staff and all students, and a sense of pride in the whole institution, which was one of the aims of Vision 2029.

(d) Industrial Relations [KCC-18-09-26-07d]

The President & Principal introduced the set of three reports. On the pay and pensions briefing note, he stated that having initiated the Joint Expert Panel (JEP) scheme he felt King's should endorse it in order to reach a good solution. On industrial action, a lot had been learned from last years' events. Finally, on the current campaign around insourcing cleaners, he stated there was a moral imperative that such a large community, largely BME, should have the same employment conditions in general as King's staff. He was confident that a good way forward had been found.

(i) Pay & Pensions Briefing Note

The Senior Vice President (Operations) set out that pay was still in dispute and union ballots were upcoming. King's was now paying the final offer of a 2% uplift. There was no prognosis regarding how this was going to be resolved nationally. The Principal's agreement to pay London Living Wage increments meant that the lowest paid had received the bigger increases.

Regarding pensions, the JEP report provided context. Movement from the USS trustees was needed and there was still the question of how the Regulator would respond. There was also an issue regarding the legal timeline for re-evaluation. Step-ups in costs for employers and employees would start to take effect in April 2019.

Endorsing the JEP proposal would increase employer contributions to 20.1%. It was stated, as it had been at previous meetings, that a 1% increase in pension costs was equivalent to a £2M cost to the university. This would have to be borne in mind while planning other university projects.

The strike action ballots would be taken institution by institution.

There was general agreement for endorsing the measures set out by the JEP.

(ii) Industrial Actions Preparations

The Director, Students & Education set out that the oversight group that she chaired was working through five sessions to explore next steps. This included drafting policies and guidance, and preparing communications positions ahead of time on a number of key issues to maximize effectiveness.

(iii) Cleaning & Security Insourcing.

The Senior Vice President, Quality, Strategy & Innovation introduced the report on cleaning and security insourcing, which asked Council to approve the establishment of a Task Force under the leadership of the Senior Vice President (Operations) to negotiate the insourcing of King's cleaners and security staff. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The staff wanted to belong to the university community but coming on to a regular King's contract would be disadvantageous to them and it was in the interests of everyone to customize contracts; there were some significant and complex operational issues that would take time to resolve and that could drive up costs, such as weekly payroll and weekly hours. The timeframe for negotiating the insourcing of King's cleaners and security staff before the termination deadline with the current employer was challenging. It was noted that these staff are committed to King's, and interact with students a great deal. Many of them had worked at the university for decades. Management felt the proposal put forward was a positive step and the right thing to do. A principal concern was the transition period, as the current contractors would not have an interest in maintaining standards.

The Council agreed that the proposal as set out was the morally right thing to do, as well as making business sense in terms of King's community, and that the whole process should be achieved as soon as practicably and legally possible.

Decision

That the establishment of a Task Force under the leadership of the Senior Vice President (Operations) to negotiate the insourcing of King's cleaners and security staff, be approved.

The College Secretary introduced the report which provided notice of proposed Ordinance amendments largely arising out of the governance review. The three substantive changes were the terms of reference for the Chairs' Committee (formerly the Chairman's Committee) and the Governance & Nominations Committee, as well as referencing the new Conflict of Interest Policy approved at the Council meeting in July 2018. The rest of the changes were editorial including moving to gender inclusive language.

The Ordinances require that 14 days written notice of amendments be given to Council and this was ensured through circulation to all members on 12 September 2018. Approval must be given by two-thirds of those Council Members present at the meeting, including a simple majority of Independent Members.

It was noted that further Ordinance amendments relating to the terms of reference of the Estates Strategy Committee would be presented to Council at the November meeting.

Decision

That the amendments to the Ordinances, as set out in the report, be approved.

b) E1, E2, E3 [KCC-18-09-26-06b]

The College Secretary introduced the report, which was essentially to improve good governance in relation to the appointment and dismissal of the Principal, the Dean and the College Secretary, respectively.

Bishop Sarah Mullally declared a conflict of interest in that she provided The Dean's license, and abstained from the discussion and decision.

There was a discussion about Council involvement in the process, and it was noted that in relation to the positions of The Dean and the College Secretary, the Principal would convene a panel, at his discretion, and would consider Council Members for this panel. Decisions would be reported to Council as a matter of course.

Decision

That the Governance and Nominations Committee be instructed to develop for the approval of Council:

- processes for the appointment and dismissal of the Principal & President
- processes for the appointment and dismissal of The Dean
- processes for the appointment and dismissal of the College Secretary

and that in the interim the process for dismissal of the Dean be the same as that for academic staff and for the College Secretary be the same as that for the dismissal of professional staff.

c) Update on Governance Review [KCC-18-09-26-06c]

The Governance and Nominations Committee would report to the November meeting of the College Council.

The Council discussed the calendar of business, which was being introduced to aid planning and timely, appropriately proportioned meeting discussion on key issues. The draft calendar attached to the report was a suggested framework showing the annual rhythm of business. It was noted that while it currently contained only routine items, the intention was for strategic discussions to be added and phased into agenda planning, in liaison with members of the Executive. Members discussed the framework and requested that once the year ahead was mapped out, a one page document be produced showing only the big items. It was noted that this exercise would also apply to the Council's committees.

8 Reports of the Committees

a) Estates Strategy Committee [KCC-18-09-26-08a]

Items on Consent (all noted)

- (i) Report of the Director of Estates & Facilities
 - (ii) Delivering Vision 2029 – Size & Shape Update
 - (iii) Procurement and Delivery of the Mulberry Canada Water Site and 152-158 Strand
 - (iv) Specific Development Projects Update
 - (v) Terms of Reference – Estates Strategy Committee
-

