
Approved Minutes

Date	25 January 2018, 17.00
Location	The Policy Institute at King's, First Floor, Virginia Woolf Building, Strand Campus
Present	Lord Geidt (Chairman); Professor Brian Holden Reid; Professor Edward Byrne (President and Principal); Mr Michael D'Souza; Dr Angela Dean; Mr Paul Goswell; Ms Ros King; Professor Sir Robert Lechler; Mr Chris Mottershead; Mr Momin Saqib; Sir Nigel Sheinwald; Dr Ian Tebbett; Ms Nhuoc Lan Tu; The Right Reverend Dame Sarah Mullally; and Professor the Baroness Alison Wolf.
Apologies	The Hon Sir David Foskett; Baroness Morgan of Huyton (Vice-Chair); Mr Andrew Summers; Professor Evelyn Welch; and Professor Nicola Phillips and Professor Jonathan Grant (standing attendees)
In attendance	Professor Sir Malcolm Grant (for item 6a) Tim Orton, Nous Group Simon Lancaster, Nous Group Dr 'Funmi Olonisakin, Vice President & Vice-Principal (International) Professor Reza Razavi, Vice President & Vice-Principal (Research) Mr Steve Large, Vice President (Finance) Professor Gillian Douglas, Executive Dean Dickson Poon School of Law (for Professor Evelyn Welch) Secretariat: Ms Irene Birrell, College Secretary Ms Joanna Brown, Governance Manager Ms Xan Kite, Director of Governance Mr David Newman, General Counsel & Director, Legal Services

1 Welcome, apologies and notices

The Chairman congratulated Dame Sarah Mullally upon her appointment as Bishop of London and welcomed speakers Professor Sir Malcolm Grant, Tim Orton and Simon Lancaster to the meeting.

No conflicts of Interest had been declared in advance of the meeting.

2 Approval of agenda

Council approved the agenda.

3 Unanimous Consent Agenda (including Minutes of the Previous Meeting)

The Principal's Report at Item 6b on the agenda was removed from the Unanimous Consent Agenda in order that the Principal could speak to recent news.

Decision

That the remaining reports on the Unanimous Consent Agenda, including the Minutes of the Previous Meeting, be taken as read and noted or approved.

4 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Council noted the actions agreed at the previous meeting and that all had been completed or would be completed within the agreed timeframe. There were no other matters arising.

5 Report of the Chairman

There were no items to report.

6 Report of the President & Principal

Items for Consideration

- a) Presentation from Professor Sir Malcolm Grant, Chair of the PLuS Alliance Advisory Board
-

The Principal introduced the presentation, noting that the PLuS Alliance was evolving as a key part of the King's international strategy. The two other partners in the PLuS Alliance, Arizona State University (ASU) and the University of New South Wales (UNSW) were two of the best in the world. The Alliance brought strong international links and the other two partners brought exposure to advances in pedagogy and entrepreneurship [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. The development of a PLuS Alliance engineering school in London would bring the expertise of the two significant partners into the UK economy and create a place to experiment with engineering education. Full details and a proposal to approve the development of the new school, which would require some modest investment from the partner universities, would be brought to Council in due course.

Professor Sir Malcom explained the engineering school proposition including the following points:

- The ASU has grown a significant online presence which provides affordable education to those who would not otherwise have access to it from across the world [REDACTED]. Its electrical engineering programme is entirely online and is fully accredited.
- UNSW is the largest higher education institution in Australia and entrepreneurial in its development of pedagogy and delivery methods and it is difficult for other institutions to keep pace with it.
- Within the UK we experience high student debt and pressure to reduce fees and there is a sense that universities are not providing the STEM education that society wants with widespread acknowledgement that there is a shortage of engineers in the workforce. Universities need to show that they are able to deliver education in different ways, but it is difficult to achieve that from within the UK system.
- The PLuS Alliance engineering school proposal would [REDACTED] [REDACTED] seek different kinds of students – those with design and creativity backgrounds and increased numbers of female students. It would offer a two-year undergraduate BEng degree programme and three-year MEng programme with 48 weeks of teaching per year. Thirty percent of the delivery would be online and the programme would be designed in sections which students could choose to take in London or at either of the campuses of the other universities in Australia and Arizona.
- Industrial participation would be sought to ensure that the programme met future needs and to secure support for the programme including the provision of student placements.
- The new engineering school would be complementary to the engineering provision at King's because it would offer more flexible entry and delivery. It would be a wholly teaching institution in the first instance with significant international interest anticipated.

[REDACTED] It was noted that the PLuS Alliance had considerable marketing expertise and that it would focus on service to society and a moral imperative to expand access for a huge talent pool that does not usually have access to education at this level. Graduate quality would provide its ultimate reputational definition.

Experience at the King's Maths School showed that realistic support would be required to assist students with different entry qualifications to cover the requirements of the programme and reach their capacity for a high-quality outcome within a two-year programme.

The programmes would be accredited by all three jurisdictions and the UK Government had indicated that it was keen for this to be the case.

Council members considered the way in which the proposal fitted into the King's Strategic Vision 2029 and how it might be prioritised against other initiatives. Vision 2029 set the path to both strengthen the core business and pursue new developments in order to continue to thrive at the highest level.

Council noted that online delivery carried a heavy set up investment requirement and would require quality and rigour. Corporate sponsors would be sought to assist with this and faculty would be released from teaching duties to development of online materials. There was a potential opportunity to build on the existing ASU platform which King's had already used for some postgraduate delivery. The other two partner institutions had agreed to make available all of their resources. [REDACTED]

Professor Sir Malcolm ended by reminding Council that there were many education options in development and that those that did not provide the kinds of graduate required by industry would not succeed.

The Chairman thanked Professor Sir Malcolm for his time and presentation.

b) Summary Report on Key Issues [KCC_18_01_25_06b]

The Council considered the Principal's report on key issues. In addition to those noted in the report the Principal raised the following additional issue:

- *Synchronisation of the senior team:* Dr 'Funmi Olonisakin had been appointed to the role of Vice President/Vice-Principal (International). The Principal would now establish a Vice President/Vice-Principal (London) which would replace the existing Assistant Principal (London) role. The existing Assistant Principal (London), Deborah Bull, would be appointed as interim in the first instance whilst recruitment to the substantive role was conducted.
- *Recent news:* King's had returned all monies received from the Presidents Club following the recent revelations in the press and would not accept any additional funds from the event. These funds had been donated to support work in the health faculties. The Fundraising Ethics Review Group considered ethics of donations and donors providing a robust routine process, but no concerns had been identified for the Presidents Club through that process.

Decision

The Fundraising team would be asked to review King's other fundraising activities to ensure that there were no more unknown risks and would be asked to present on this topic at the next meeting.

Items on Consent

- c) Modern Slavery Act 2016-17 Annual Statement [KCC_18_01_25_06c] (noted)

7 Governance Review [KCC_18_01_25_07]

Council participated in a workshop as part of the governance review, led by Tim Orton and Simon Lancaster of the Nous Group. The Nous Group had been commissioned to consider mechanisms for enlightened and enhanced governance practice to meet the needs of the university in the rapidly changing environment, rather than auditing compliance with requirements. Council's role until recent years had been to keep the university on the rails, now it had a duty to ensure movement swiftly and securely along the rails.

Through discussion Council concluded that the HE Sector will be different by 2029, that King's is ambitious and that its governance needs to recognise that and to work on enabling that progress. The comments that lead to this conclusion included:

- Higher Education is set to change at a more rapid pace than the already increased pace experienced over recent years.
- The nature of our customers is changing with demand for online delivery, affordable fees, and growth in demand for mid-life repeated career change training.
- Significant growth in student numbers from Africa and India are anticipated and consideration should be given to the composition of the Council to reflect this.
- The institutional focus is changing and we must achieve our Vision differentiators.
- We should be open to considering structural change across institutions.
- We need to consider employer demand as well as student demand.
- The Council has an appetite for risk and innovation and should ensure that the governance arrangements are clear in monitoring the risk register and supporting decision-making with this in mind.
- King's will have to be very different in 2029 in order not to fall back in the university rankings.
- Horizon scanning will be critical to success.
- There are likely to be fewer research institutions at the top and increased instances of partnerships with industry for research.

Council discussed Nous Group's six elements to consider for success:

- Structure and process
- Strategy and how the Council is engaged
- Measuring performance
- Relationships with Stakeholders
- Composition and capability
- Accountability and risk

Interviews with Council members conducted by Nous over the preceding two weeks and issues raised in the meeting revealed a consensus view that Council operates well in general, but that there is scope for improvement, including:

- Re-weight the agenda to create more space for discussion on strategic matters – including "what if?" discussions
- Re-weight the agenda to contributions from the independent members
- Development of strategy as an iterative process with substantial Council discussion
- Systematic monitoring of the things that matter
- Clarity over the roles of each committee and the division between governance and management

-
- Increased international representation and expertise in the Vision 2029 themes and major disciplines, including the life sciences
 - Introduction of a risk appetite statement and increased monitoring of the risk register and Key Performance Indicators
 - Increased agility in dealing with issues relieving the executive reporting processes
 - Council discussion on emerging initiatives at an early stage with opportunity for deep discussion on game changing initiatives before any significant steps have been taken
 - Clear Council view of the portfolio of interests to take decisions on resource approval for initiatives
 - Use of purpose-based, time-bound Council working groups on major projects
 - Improved relationship with the Academic Board and its business
 - Clarity over the question of “to whom/what, is Council accountable?” and defined delegation of authority scheme
 - Ability for independent members to hold informal discussions, in camera sessions and sessions with the Principal alone
 - Independent members to spend time in the university, possibly to form links with specific areas
 - Avoid group-think by involving external speakers
 - Replace the term “lay member” with “independent member”

Nous would capture the output of the discussion which would be considered next by the Governance Committee and further discussion would be held with the full Council at the Away Day on 15 May 2018.

Any members who wished to conduct a “mystery shopper” visit to campus could contact the Secretariat to arrange this if that would be helpful.

8 Report of the KCLSU President

Items on Consent (all to note)

- a) Union branded space at Denmark Hill
- b) Review of funding arrangements for clubs and societies
- c) Recruitment of a new chief executive
- d) Room increment and addition for international students
- e) KCLSU and London Engagement Team
- f) Anti-harassment campaign update

9 Reports of Committees

Report of Academic Board [KCC_18_01_09]

Item on Consent

- (i) International School for Government (noted)

1 Any Other Business

0 There being no other business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Irene Birrell

College Secretary

January 2018