

Dear Frances,

As members of the Academic Board we note with concern that the current proposal for restructuring the College, 'Evolving Goldsmiths', was not referred to the Board prior to its approval by Council. It is our contention that the statutes of the institution require the Council to consult the Academic Board in such matters.

The statutes of Goldsmiths are explicit in this regard. Statute 4, in describing the powers of Council, states that: 'The Council shall, subject to the Charter and these Statutes, be the governing body of the College [...] provided that, before determining any questions or taking any decision on the allocation of resources which the Council considers to affect the academic policy of the College, the Council shall seek the advice of the Academic Board'. Further, Statute 4.20 declares that Council only has the power 'To establish or abolish any posts in the College, provided that the Academic Board shall be consulted on any changes to the establishment which involve major change to the academic profile of the College.'

The proposed restructure involves a substantial reallocation of resources and the establishment of new posts that together manifest a major change and directly affect Goldsmiths' academic policy and profile. The decision to establish three 'Executive Deans' who will be 'responsible for setting the direction of their schools' clearly constitutes such a change. Removal of responsibility for budgets and the line management of DBMs from Heads of Department likewise directly affect academic policy. It is our conviction, therefore, that Council was required by statute to consult Academic Board on these questions prior to their being determined and is required to do so now.

When the question of why the Academic Board had not been consulted was raised at a recent meeting with Heads of Department, you declared that you had received advice from the Head of Legal and Governance and the Academic Registrar to the effect that this was not required. We request that this advice be published immediately so that it can put on the Agenda and be scrutinized in good time for discussion at the Academic Board on March 18 and the joint meeting of Council and Academic Board on March 24.

The ordinances of Academic Board state that that we must be (5.1) 'responsible to the Council for all academic matters' and (5.8) 'make recommendations to the Council on the organisation of departments'. We would be remiss in our duties as Board members if we did not seek this clarification on this issue of Governance as a matter of urgency.

A version of this letter has also been addressed to the Chair of Council.

Yours sincerely,

Ben Levitas

Anna Furse

Maggie Pitfield

Wood Roberdeau

Ayesha Hameed

Dan Neyland

Martin Savransky

Alison Griffiths

Cris Shore

Clea Bourne

Michael Archer

Iris Garrelfs

Rebekah Lee

Joe Leam

Lauren Corelli

Dagmar Rita Myslinska

Roger Kibble

Henrike Donner

Ragupathy Venkatachalam

Rajyashree Pandey

Timothy Chapman

Joanna Zylinska

Alan Pickering

Steve Kierl

Richard Noble

Frank Krause

Mike Waller

Stephen Graham

Richard Noble