### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/136</td>
<td>Clarify position re the consultation on the proposal to apply for use of University title</td>
<td>JHE/CM</td>
<td>January 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/142</td>
<td>Provide an update at the March Academic Board meeting on changes to the Personal Tutor system</td>
<td>JHE</td>
<td>March 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/162</td>
<td>Circulate summary of Academic Board views on the proposed merger with St Georges</td>
<td>JHE/CM</td>
<td>January 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/166</td>
<td>Refer issue of completion of resources information on cover sheets for consideration at AB Exec</td>
<td>JHE</td>
<td>Feb 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/168</td>
<td>Develop and present a timeline on the implementation of forthcoming College education initiatives</td>
<td>JK and TB</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/200</td>
<td>Update Academic Board on the Enquiry Management System</td>
<td>JHE</td>
<td>Spring/summer 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/163</td>
<td>Amend Minute no. 21/43 in the minutes of meeting held on Wednesday 29 June to read “He noted that this was a consultation with the Board and they would not be asked to vote on the proposal.”</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/103</td>
<td>Circulate information re consultation on changes to the RHBNC Act 1985.</td>
<td>JHE/CM</td>
<td>November 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/218</td>
<td>Contact Development Manager to update nominee statement before nominations are circulated to Council.</td>
<td>PJL/CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/211</td>
<td>Correct name of School in paper AB/21/48 to read “School of Engineering, Physical and Mathematical Sciences” before paper is circulated to Council.</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/226</td>
<td>Amend Minute no. 21/46 in Academic Board Executive Minutes of meeting held on 8 November to reflect that the paper number received was ABE/21/06 and not AB/21/06.</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/227</td>
<td>Ensure Extensions Policy is approved by Chair’s action over the summer and circulate the agreed policy with the October 2021 meeting papers</td>
<td>JHE/CM</td>
<td>October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action from current meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21/131 | Circulate meeting invitations for additional Academic Board meeting on 29 June | CM | June 2021 |
| 21/130 | Add agenda item on progress with implementation plan from Process Fix review of non-academic misconduct and complaints | JHE/CM | October 2021 |
Academic Board
8 December 2021
2pm on MS Teams

Min. 21/231-

Minutes

Present: Prof P Layzell (Chair); Prof J Knowles, Prof T Bhamra, Dr D Whistler, Prof G Agyemang, Prof J Parker-Starbuck, Prof G Pieri, Dr C Matos, Prof T Pincus, Dr R Hemus, Prof R Livesey, Dr D Beer, Dr M Berry, Prof B Langford, Dr E Cox, Prof D Anderberg, Mr R Jago, Dr S Wagner, Prof G Symon, Dr J Nuri, Prof A Jashapara, Dr J McEvoy, D K Clemtishaw, Prof P Dalton, Prof D Schreve, Prof A Palombi, , Prof R Schack, Dr S West, Prof M Wahlstrom, Prof C Mitchell, Prof M Humphreys, Prof R Fitzgerald, Dr D Brown, Dr T Berry, Prof V Boisvert, Dr P Bremner, , Dr V Desai, Dr S Kuenzel, Prof S Murphy, Dr E Xhetani, , Mr S Kendrick, Ms H Warwick, Ms A Goode, Ms M Jarvis, Mr A Parry.

Secretary: Dr J Howden-Evans

In attendance: Dr D Ashton, Ms M Ennis, Mrs A Wallis Miss C Munton (Assistant Secretary)

Apologies Prof R Alston, Prof K Badcock, Prof A Bradshaw, Dr S Collignon, Prof O Heath, Prof H Zagefka

Not present Mr L Kaounides, Prof D Howard

Observers: Mr A Alway

1. Welcome and Apologies
The Principal welcomed members to the meeting, noting that this was Dr P Bremner’s first meeting, having been elected to the Board to fill the vacancy created by Dr D Brown’s appointment to Council.

Apologies were received from Professor R Alston, Professor K Badcock, Professor A Bradshaw, Dr S Collignon, Professor O Heath and Professor H Zagefka.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting
The Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 20 October 2021 were APPROVED.
3. Matters arising

The following actions had been completed since the last meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/163</td>
<td>Amend Minute no. 21/43 in the minutes of meeting held on Wednesday 29 June to read “He noted that this was a consultation with the Board and they would not be asked to vote on the proposal.”</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/103</td>
<td>Circulate information re consultation on changes to the RHBNC Act 1985.</td>
<td>JHE/ CM</td>
<td>November 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/218</td>
<td>Contact Development Manager to update nominee statement before nominations are circulated to Council.</td>
<td>PJL/ CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/221</td>
<td>Correct name of School in paper AB/21/48 to read “School of Engineering, Physical and Mathematical Sciences” before paper is circulated to Council.</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/226</td>
<td>Amend Minute no. 21/46 in Academic Board Executive Minutes of meeting held on 8 November to reflect that the paper number received was ABE/21/06 and not AB/21/06.</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Secretary provided an update on Min. 21/103. Further information had been provided to members with queries on the proposed changes to the Royal Holloway and Bedford New Act 1986, which were required to enable the College to use University title. This feedback was also incorporated into the consultation on the changes co-ordinated by the Legal and Governance Directorate. Two elected members asked for it to be minuted that they had requested discussion of the changes to be added to the December Academic Board meeting agenda. The Secretary and Chair confirmed that their request had been considered but it was not deemed necessary as the changes to the Act are relatively minor and have been interrogated at previous meetings, and there were other significant items of business to cover. Information pertaining to the earlier discussions at Academic Board can be made available to members on request, and a further discussion could be held if members had something specific to raise with the Board. The Secretary was asked to contact enquirers clarifying the purpose of the consultation on the proposal to apply legal use of university title along with the other University of London Colleges.

4. Unstarring of items

There was a request to unstar papers AB/21/66, AB 21/69 and AB/21/70. There were also two requests to unstar AB/21/73, however, this paper was already listed on the agenda as un-starred.

5. Principals Report

Paper AB/21/54, Principal’s Report was RECEIVED.

The Chair noted that government announcements on funding for tertiary education and quality and standards had been further delayed and were not expected until the new year. Information had been received on the new proposals for Access and Participation Plans, and the letter from Minister Donelan had been included with the papers for the meeting (AB/21/54a).
6. **Report from the Council**

Paper AB/21/55 Minutes from the Council meeting held on 7 October 2021 was RECEIVED.

The Chair reported that the Council strategy away days were held on 17 and 18 November 2021, at which Council reviewed progress against the strategic plan.

7. **Report from the Students, Education and Research Committee**

Paper AB/21/56 Report from the Students, Education and Research Committee meeting held on 5 October 2021 was RECEIVED. This was a new agenda item, and completes the reporting loop from Council back to Academic Board on ensuring that the College’s quality assurance processes are working.

An elected member noted that papers AB/21/56 and AB/21/57 refer to changes to the personal tutor system and queried whether academic workload had been considered as part of the discussions and if full use was being made of the expertise within the Careers Service to support students with activities such as CV writing. In response, the Secretary reported that there had been extensive consultations with the School Directors of Student Experience and the Students’ Union on the changes. He will also work with the incoming Director of Education to ensure the relevant professional service areas provide adequate support for academic colleagues in the delivery of the experiential and skills development aspects of the curriculum. A paper outlining the changes would be presented to Academic Board in March 2022.

8. **Reports from the Senior Management Team**

There was nothing to report, not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

9. **Report from Students’ Union President**

9.1 Paper AB 21/57 Report from the Students’ Union President was RECEIVED.

The President reported on the following aspects of her report –

- Representatives from the Royal Holloway Students’ Union had engaged in two days of discussions with their counterparts at St George’s on the benefits and challenges presented by the merger opportunity. A paper had been submitted to Council summarising SU views on the merger.

- Alongside the Vice President Education, Ms Warwick had met with Royal Holloway UCU representatives to gain a better understanding of the issues faced with regards to the four fights. The SU currently holds a neutral stance in relation to industrial action, however, in response to a verified petition a referendum will be held in the New Year for students to mandate whether they do or do not support the industrial action.

9.2 Paper AB/21/58 Drink Spiking update was RECEIVED. The President provided an update on the five preventative measures in place, viz additional security in Students’ Union venues, offering Spikeys with bottled drinks purchased in SU venues, trialling protective drinks covers, offering drug testing kits to students who suspect they have been a victim of spiking and a wider educational campaign highlighting that spiking is a serious crime and encouraging students to look after each other. There is a national shortage of Spikeys but it was hoped that the trial with protective drinks covers would offer an alternative and more environmentally sustainable longer term solution. The President had met with two local police...
forces to discuss the relatively new and concerning nationwide reports of needle spiking, and a working group has been set up to review how to conquer this.

An elected member offered to share some student research into the ethos in sports clubs and societies, and which considers a range of possible preventative measures in relation to spiking.

10. Reports from Schools

The Head of the School of Law and Social Sciences PROVIDED a presentation, circulated with the papers as AB/21/59.

Highlights included

- An overview of the statistics on the number of academic staff, students, research centres and income generated.
- Specific achievements within the four departments, including NSS (PIRP), REF (Economics), grant income (Economics and PIRP), the Legal Advice Centre (Law and Criminology), student number growth (Law and Criminology and PIRP) and diversity (Social Work).
- Challenges and opportunities; challenges include stabilising NSS scores in Law and reversing a downwards trend in Economics, reducing BAME awarding gaps and championing innovation across a diverse set of disciplines and subject specific pedagogies. Opportunities include the interdisciplinary potential offered by the subject mix, developing more courses to be taught on the London campus and through the University of London Worldwide and the repositioning of Social Work and bringing them together with Law creates a unique identity in the sector.
- Recent innovations in teaching, for example embedding peer mentoring into modules to improve student experience and development of new pedagogies with learning technologies.
- Future priorities include wider embedding of skills development in the first year curriculum and a focus on diversifying the curriculum and addressing the attainment grant.
- An overview of the topics and staff who submitted impact case studies in the last REF.
- Challenges in research include developing a new strategy for impact case studies to address a gender imbalance and to encourage more collaborative working.
- Research successes include growing research income in all four departments and working with colleagues in Life Sciences and the Environment to explore research opportunities created by the new Department of Health.
- A summary of the external environment and community, including a range of external partnerships with different types of organisations, a Student Legal Advice Centre which provides a direct service to the local community and an active advisory board comprising of a diverse range of members.

The Senior Vice Principal (Education) noted his congratulations to the staff in the School who gained ESRC grants, which are very difficult to win.
Strategy Discussion

Proposed merger with St Georges, University of London

Paper AB/21/60 Proposed Merger with St Georges was RECEIVED.

The Deputy Principal (Operations) ASKED for comments from the Board, particularly in relation to the six questions posed in AB/21/60, noting that these would inform a paper to assist Council’s decision making on whether to proceed with the merger.

An elected member asked for clarification on why the College was re-considering a merger with St Georges following the decision in 2009 not to proceed with a merger of the two institutions and for an update on the financial due diligence. The Chair explained that there have been a number of changes in the external landscape since 2009 and the College may be better placed to address global and societal challenges through its research and knowledge exchange activities if they had available a full suite of disciplinary subjects. There are academic advantages to both institutions through a merger, for example it is difficult for St Georges to grow their student numbers as places on medical degrees are capped. The Deputy Principal (Operations) confirmed that the institutions had received a financial due diligence report on each other’s finances. Representatives from the two College Councils were discussing these in more detail and their conversations would be reported at the Royal Holloway Council meeting in January to help inform their financial decision on the merger. In addition to the due diligence being carried out by PWC and the College Council, members of the Executive were discussing various models showing student number and research income targets to identify what would be required to ensure a sustainable and surplus generating institution.

The Head of the Department of Health Studies advised that the merger creates an exciting opportunity to offer a comprehensive portfolio in health education with the addition of the clinical courses offered at St Georges. She also noted that this would come with increased accountability to professional regulatory bodies such as Public Health England and may create challenges for the College in ensuring it was responsive to workforce demands in the health care sector.

The Head of the Department of Strategy, International Business and Entrepreneurship asked for an update on the approval of the Environmental Strategy and any potential impact from the merger. Dr Ashton advised that Council would receive detailed costings on achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2040 and by 2050 to inform a decision at their meeting in February 2022 on how quickly the College can realise its ambitions. There would need to be an extended review of the Environmental Strategy and its application to a new institution if the Colleges agreed to proceed with a merger.

The Head of the Department of Biological Sciences summarised the main opportunities and concerns reported by staff in his department. Colleagues were enthusiastic about the opportunities obtaining a medical school would create in education and research. However, they were also concerned about preserving the department’s tradition of good NSS scores, noting the poor scores returned at St Georges, whether posts would be rationalised in a merged institution, whether staff outside of biomedical sciences would feel side-lined, and about outgrowing their current facilities and resources if there was a dramatic increase in student numbers. In response to concerns about resources and staffing, the Chair advised the merger was being driven from choice and a position of strength and not because financial cuts were required.

An elected member asked for reassurance that the impact of a merger on professional services was being considered as part of the decision making and whether it was realistic to reduce the
resource spent in this area from 34% to 30% as noted at the October meeting. The Deputy Principal (Operations) reported that a growth strategy provides significant opportunities in professional services larger institution must be adequately resourced.

In response to a question from the Head of the Department of Digital Innovation, Dr Ashton discussed place, cohesiveness and identity for the merged institution. The two Colleges recognised the geographical challenges but were focussing on the compelling set of possibilities presented by the three campuses; Bloomsbury is located in the intellectual heart of London, Royal Holloway is well connected by the M4 corridor and St George’s is situated in hyper diverse south London. This should offer students and staff a comprehensive experience. He also noted a sense of common purpose and culture could be cultivated through creating a single set of academic regulations, a combined Academic Board and through re-organising the Schools to bring colleagues together. A people strategy would be created to reflect a merged institution.

The Chair summarised the discussion as broad support from the Academic Board for a merger with St Georges. He reiterated that the merger creates academic opportunities across all departments, not just those in the Life Sciences and Environment. He reflected on the concerns raised about NSS scores, noting that as discussions proceed, Royal Holloway would need to understand the mitigations from St Georges in improving their scores. Council would meet in January 2022 to make a decision on whether to proceed to the next stage of the merger. The Secretary would draft a note summarising views from Academic Board members, which he would circulate to Academic Board for comment ahead of the Council meeting.

12. PGT Credit Framework

Paper AB/21/61 PGT Credit Framework was RECEIVED and APPROVED.

The Senior Vice Principal (Student and Staff Experience) PROVIDED an overview of the paper, notably the advantages of aligning the undergraduate and postgraduate taught credit frameworks into multiples of 15 credits. One advantage not explored in detail in the paper was the opportunity to review the amount of assessment and marking within PGT modules and ensure we are not over assessing; using ten credit modules, for example, can lead to assessment heavy courses. In recognition of there being a number of PGT modules to change, Professor Bhamra reassured colleagues that she was working closely with the Directors of Postgraduate Taught Education to create timelines for phasing this in. The aim was to complete the realignment by the end of the 2023-24 academic year at the latest so that new students joining in 2024-25 would be taught and assessed on the new framework.

The Head of the Department of Information Security was concerned that the proposal would increase the amount of assessment and modules across the degrees offered in his department, and about the additional workload alongside teaching January starts and new distance learning courses. Professor Bhamra emphasised that the framework was in multiples of 15, which means that some courses may move to using 30 credit modules. She recognised the additional workload, hence working closely with the PGT School Directors to implement sensible timelines that reflect these pressures.

An elected member was supportive of the proposals but raised concerns that the cover sheet does not mention the resource implications of this change, noting the comment is not specific to this particular paper. They asked that paper authors are honest about the resource implications of their proposals before submitting them to Academic Board.
The Head of the Department of Geography concurred with the workload concerns and also wanted reassurance that modules taught on undergraduate and postgraduate courses would not become conflated over time. Professor Bhamra clarified that standards of awards would be preserved; the College has no plans to incorporate undergraduate modules into postgraduate taught courses and that this is prevented within the quality assurance framework for the structure of courses.

The Head of the School of Life Sciences and the Environment commented that the same staff members are being asked to help with a number of undergraduate and postgraduate initiatives. She considered it would be reassuring for staff if the Senior Vice Principals could present to them an integrated approach to implementation along with a timeline.

The Head of the Department of English thanked Professor Bhamra for her work on this. She welcomed the proposals and was looking forward to clarification of the timelines for this work and its interaction with the PGT portfolio refresh. She considered that the return of PGT specialists in School admin teams would be welcome as this role had been missed post restructure, and an investment in professional service teams and the Academic Quality and Policy Office would be appreciated. The Senior Vice Principal (Education) advised that he is working on a streamlining of the curriculum development process.

13. Regulations on Progression and Award (Covid-19)

Paper AB/21/62 was RECEIVED and APPROVED, subject to three minor corrections in the text for two of the MSci cohorts prior to publication.

The Chair advised that the Office of the Independent Adjudicator had reported a reduction in student complaints about degree outcomes as a result of the mitigation policies implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic. The transition to standard regulations is causing some angst among students and he asked staff to reassure concerned students that College processes are fair and designed to help students achieve good outcomes.

14. Shape of the Year

Paper AB/21/63 Shape of the Year – a mid-year assessment point was RECEIVED.

The Senior Vice Principal (Education) recapped the context around the paper, viz that there is inconsistency across departments in the implementation of a mid-year assessment point. This has resulted in workload concerns for staff and a detrimental impact on the student experience, most notably for joint honours students. Joint honours students have reported that in one department they are being assessed and need to attend exams, whilst in the other department they are expected to receive teaching as normal. Staff in some departments are experiencing significant pinch points in marking and have requested a designated break in teaching after Christmas to enable them to mark and return feedback to students in a timely way. Academic Board agreed at their meeting on 2 June 2021 to proceed in principle with the implementation of a mid-year assessment point from 2022-23, and to use the time in the early part of 2021-22 to identify the difficulties associated with changing the shape of the year and consider solutions. Subsequent to that meeting, the Senior Vice Principal (Education) has met with Heads of Schools and Departments on the models presented in AB/21/63 and to establish any subject specific concerns arising from each.

Professor Knowles summarised the proposed models. He noted that teaching patterns vary by subject, there is unfortunately not an ideal model and that compromises would need to be made in some disciplines. Models two week A and two week B both result in at least one orphaned week of teaching post Easter. This concerns certain departments, specifically in the
Engineering, Mathematical and Physical Sciences where difficult subject material is taught towards the end of term and students are working on their final year projects. A model similar to the one used by QMUL, which decouples the spring break from the Easter bank holiday and offers a shorter Easter break, received considerable support but is not popular with all colleagues.

The Board were invited to feedback on the proposals. Members commented as follows –

The Head of the School of Engineering, Mathematical and Physical Sciences considered that the Board agreed only to implement a mid-year assessment point and that the time period for this remained negotiable. He suggested that one week would make a significant different in some disciplines.

An elected member advised the models in the paper were difficult to understand and the complexity of the situation is compounded by the lack of policy on reading weeks. They reported further concerns about shortening the Easter break on staff and student wellbeing, noting that staff need to be given time to recover from the previous term and take a proper break. Students often use the Easter vacation to balance part time jobs with revision.

The Head of the Department of Mathematics was concerned about the consultation process, noting that as it has now been identified that there are major consequences to changing the shape of year in some subjects, there needed to be further discussion on whether or not to proceed with implementing a mid-year assessment point at all. He thought there was too much focus on pressing forward with an assessment period and not enough on weighing up the benefits and costs arising out of the consultation.

An elected member raised concerns about the potential decoupling of the academic year from religious holidays. They considered setting exams after Christmas and a shorter Easter break are not family friendly policies and hoped that these would be considered in the context of an equality and diversity impact assessment before making a final decision. In addition, the Head of the School of Life Sciences and the Environment advised she has been inundated with concerns about uncoupling the Easter vacation from the school holidays. She further noted there are some benefits to the introduction of an assessment period and that a one week period would be easier to implement.

The Head of the Department of English reported there has been a closure in some of the metrics in the Access and Participation Plan on progression and award for some demographic groups following the introduction of more in year assessment, and the department were keen to retain the new assessment framework. However, the current arrangement has also led to a workload crisis for staff and students in her department and she welcomed the discussion on changing the shape of the year for this reason. She noted it was important to remember that QMUL are a fully semesterised institution and although the QMUL model was referenced in the paper, it was not in the context of implementing a full semesterisation at Royal Holloway at this time. She was sympathetic to the concerns raised about the decoupling of the spring break from Easter and asked if further consideration needs to be given to replacing terms with semesters at the College. She advised that a mid-year assessment point must be at least two weeks to have a positive impact on workload concerns.

The representative from Law and Social Sciences affirmed that his School are teaching and assessing very large student cohorts and need the two weeks to mark and provide timely feedback. Following discussions with students, the School identified that the delay in providing feedback on January assessments had a detrimental impact on their NSS scores relating to assessment and feedback. He considered that introducing a mid-year assessment point would positively impact on students in the School.
The Head of the Department of Music noted that research trips and conferences are often held in Easter and these may be impacted if the break was shortened. There may also be implications for sabbatical leave if the College implements a ‘soft’ semesterisation.

The Head of the School of Humanities, whilst sympathetic to the concerns raised, struggled to understand fully the pedagogic objections to the proposal, noting that there different teaching models across universities offering the same subjects as the College.

The Heads of the Department of Accounting and Finance Management and Law and Criminology were in agreement with the comments made by the Head of English; notably that the status quo is unsustainable for staff and students and the College had to find a solution even though it might not be agreeable to all.

The Chair confirmed that there is a need for two weeks, and although the minutes may not have explicitly referenced the implementation of a two week assessment period, the paper and discussion at the previous meeting had been on the basis of two weeks.

The Senior Vice Principal (Education) reported that the next stage of the discussions is about a semesterised system; this first step is an attempt to find a sensible compromise where there are different needs across the College. There are a number of models that could be used and it was important to allow as much time as possible for departments with a mid-year assessment point. It was recognised there may be solutions to some of the difficulties but others are genuinely difficult to resolve and need careful negotiation. He considered the priority was to ensure staff are given time to mark and students are not split between competing demands in departments. Another possibility would be to map the situation for joint honours students so that departments who need the time for assessment and marking can use it and departments that do not continue to use the time as they wish. However, he had concerns about this viz managing student perceptions. Once there had been a decision on how to proceed with the two week assessment period, there would need to be a further discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of full semesterisation.

In response to a question from an elected member, Professor Knowles confirmed that all of the models preserved a two week overlap in the Easter break and Surrey state school holidays. This would include most of Greater London but he could not confirm it covered all London boroughs as schools are given flexibility with scheduling holidays.

The Head of the School of Life Sciences and the Environment supported the two weeks as long as her School were allowed to use the time to deliver specific activities required at subject level.

The Head of the School of Engineering Mathematical and Physical Sciences remained concerned about the costs of compressing a number of modules in the School into ten weeks, noting it was difficult to use the orphaned weeks for effective teaching. Although it might solve issues in some Schools he was concerned this was at a high cost to others. This view was supported by the Head of the Department of Physics who raised similar concerns about the suitability of using orphaned weeks for teaching, the impact on the continuous assessment model used in Physics and on student outcomes if their final project has to be compressed into fewer weeks.

There was a brief discussion on the eight week term model used at Oxford but it was not considered to be feasible to implement at the College.
It was confirmed that the College would implement a two week mid-year assessment point because the status quo is unsustainable with regards to staff workload and student experience, but it was not possible to agree during the meeting which model to implement. There were knock on consequences on other areas of the academic offering from implementing any of the models and this required further consideration. The Chair asked that the Senior Vice Principal explore with colleagues whether a more ambitious solution such as full semesterisation would solve more problems than it would create. He noted there has to be agreement on an interim solution for 2022-23 but this doesn’t preclude implementing a more radical solution in the future. The Senior Vice Principal confirmed the next steps as continuing the consultations with staff on agreeing a solution for 2022-23. He will also consult staff through a series of working groups, to draft a green paper for a more ambitious solution to addressing the concerns raised. The Chair emphasised that the Board cannot keep re-running the same debate, there would need to be some compromises, and there must be trust in the members of the working groups to develop a suitable policy.

15. Student recruitment
   Paper AB/21/64, summary of student numbers at the 1 December 2021 count, was RECEIVED.
   The Deputy Principal (Operations) REPORTED that this initial data shows recruitment is below target for undergraduate and postgraduate. An updated report with the official census data would be available from 1 February 2022. There will need to be further discussions at that time about next steps to address any shortfall in recruitment.

Items for formal approval

16. *Proposed amendments to regulations for 2022-23
   Paper AB/21/65 Proposed amendments to the academic regulations for 2022-23 was RECEIVED and APPROVED.

17. *Terms of Reference
   Paper AB/21/66 Terms of Reference and Membership of Academic Board Executive 2021-22 was RECEIVED.
   This paper was unstarred for discussion. An elected member proposed that the elected members themselves could determine by election which representatives from this group sit on Academic Board Executive. The chair advised that all committees undergo a periodic effectiveness and this request will be considered at the next review.

18. *Nominations for committees
   Paper AB/21/67 updated nominations for Statute 9 and student discipline committees was RECEIVED and APPROVED.
Items for report

19.  *Annual Review
   Paper AB/21/68, composite School reports from the review of undergraduate provision in 2020-21 was RECEIVED.

20.  *Suspensions of regulations
     *20.1 Paper AB/21/69, report on the suspension of undergraduate and postgraduate taught regulations in 2020-21 was RECEIVED.

     AB/21/69 and AB/21/70 were unstarred for discussion. An elected member observed that incorrect advice had resulted in a number of suspensions of regulations, and were concerned the reason for this may be the loss of staff with departmental knowledge during the restructure and hoped that this would be considered in the Schools implementation review. The Secretary confirmed this was being considered by the Enquiry Management solution Project, more details of which would be brought to a future meeting of Academic Board. The Chair added there also needs to be a greater focus on standardising regulations and processes.

     *20.2 Paper AB/21/70, report on the suspension of postgraduate research regulations in 2020-21 was RECEIVED.

     Paper AB/21/71, annual report on the business of the Executive Committee for Assessment was RECEIVED.

22.  *Academic Board Executive
     Paper AB/21/72, Minutes of the meeting of the Academic Board Executive held on 8 November 2021 were RECEIVED.

23.  Unstarring of Academic Board papers
     Paper AB/21/73, procedure for unstarring Academic Board papers was RECEIVED and APPROVED.

24.  *Quality Assurance and Standards Committee
     Paper AB/21/74, minutes of the Quality Assurance and Standards Committee held on 13 October 2021 was RECEIVED.

Other Matters

25.  Date of the next meeting
     Wednesday 16 March 2022 at 2pm via MS Teams.

     The Chair REPORTED the imminent introduction of COVID-19 Plan B measures was expected. There would be exemptions from the working from home guidelines for education institutions. The College would reflect on the guidance once it was released but face to face teaching would continue. It was unlikely the new guidance would prevent the graduation ceremonies taking place during week commencing 13 December from going ahead as planned. Professor Layzell emphasised that these had been organised in consultation with Director of Health and Safety and there would be strict protocols to follow to protect staff and students.