

An Alternative Approach to *Evolving Goldsmiths*: Doing Higher Education Our Way

17 Mar. 20

This document has been compiled from numerous inputs from a broad range of staff and students with a firm desire to constructively engage in the difficulties Goldsmiths faces in a manner that is pragmatic, inclusive, democratic, and positive.

Introduction

We are well aware of the challenges Goldsmiths faces: the prospect of a cut in student fees or capped numbers for certain subjects (e.g. the creative arts), increased pensions costs, potential losses from Brexit and EU research funding, and demographic uncertainties. And now Coronavirus brings heightened concerns over international student applications in particular. Students everywhere continue to struggle with massive debt burdens and increasing levels of mental ill-health while more staff are on precarious contracts and face rising workloads, pay inequalities and threats to their pension.

Innovative and urgent responses are in short supply across the sector. Institutions seem to be more prepared to cut programmes and staff costs than they are to involve their own communities in devising creative and responsible approaches. Goldsmiths is ideally placed to meet these challenges with a genuinely collaborative approach that will inspire staff and students, within a vision that is socially transformative.

A Goldsmiths' response should not just reproduce existing approaches but should carefully consider how to do things differently. It should not uncritically defend the *status quo* but embrace a progressive vision of change whilst also ensuring it addresses the challenges it faces.

The vision of this alternative approach is to put Goldsmiths at the forefront of re-casting the university with a vital and distinctive role to play at a moment where we are faced with economic uncertainty, ever increasing global inequality and levels of poverty; where public spaces are being lost; where trust in politicians and elites is at an all-time low; and where the knowledge gap between the highly educated and the rest is increasingly felt.

Universities are about so much more than delivering a narrow range of degrees to a select student body providing job-ready skills and higher graduate salaries. They are about spreading knowledge, facilitating critical skills and expanding our understanding of the world around us.

This vision is based on some simple principles:

- The willingness of the **whole** of Goldsmiths to adopt practices dedicated to pursuing social, economic and environmental justice as well as financial and environmental sustainability
- A commitment to equality and inclusivity in order to secure a flourishing higher education for the public good
- The adoption of strategies to develop Goldsmiths as a proudly anti-elitist, deeply democratic, inclusive, academically rigorous and politically transformative institution

This alternative approach has been drafted in full recognition that any change that is viewed as illegitimate by a large part of the Goldsmiths community will be resisted, leading to a prolonged dispute with potentially serious consequences for the College. At a time when we are facing the combined problems of a financial deficit, ongoing recruitment concerns, the impact of Covid-19 and a likely global recession, we need an approach developed through genuine and meaningful consultation, not by opacity, top-down directives and *fait accompli*. Such an approach is bound to fail – we need an **alternative**.

The financial case for change

The [Evolving Goldsmiths programme](#) (EG) includes the claim that “by 2030 we will have a solid financial foundation to ensure the university is viable and sustainable.” However, it fails to provide any evidence of

how this would be achieved beyond staff cuts or indeed any explanation of *how* an institution that had been considered in relatively good financial health in its last set of accounts would now have to wait for a decade to recover sustainability. This document concentrates on responding to these two critical issues through an analysis of the financial accounting it is based upon. Reference to sources is provided wherever possible.

Tuition Fees Income

A “shortfall of £6 million” tuition fees income has been quoted repeatedly in the EG communications. However, this shortfall does not represent a significant decline in recruitment, but rather a failure to match growth targets. Following years of consistent growth, fee income fell from £99.226m in 2018/19, to £99.133m in 2019/20: a decline of -0.093 % [1]. The shortfall is measured against the 2019-20 budget, which assumed that tuition fees income would rise to £104.47m a projected growth of 5.3% [2]. While growth in previous years had been strong, preserving a stretch target overlooked sector-wide indicators that would have called for caution (*e.g.* the demographic dip, Brexit, Departments nearing capacity, the cumulative effect of removal of quotas by 2019).

Research Income

The budget for 2019-20 included a total of £6.5m in research grants. This sum incorporated income from grant applications that were at application stage. This is a high-risk assumption, and not standard practice. The *First Financial Reforecast* document (RF1) of January 2020, signals “*a significant reduction in research grant income this year.*” However, while it removes the net increase assumption, it fails to remove associated costs [3].

IT Investment

Investment in IT is extremely high, rising from £1.623m in 2018/19 to £3.43m in 2019/20 and £2.662m in 2020/21. The College is capitalising software to a value of £2.46m – much higher than expected for an institution this size. Aside from references to a backlog, no explanation for this is provided [4].

Capital Expenditure

Despite the operating deficit, capital expenditure is set to more than double in the 2019/20 budget, rising from £4.2m in 2018/19 to nearly £8.8m and remaining high in 2020/21 at £8.68m. The new Enterprise Hub refurbishment of the New Cross Road shopfronts demands an investment of £6.64m over 2019/20 and 2020/21, partly offset by capital grants totalling £2.3m. This leaves a still substantial cost of £4.34m to be met by Goldsmiths.

The budget did not include the cost of leasing the Batavia Mews halls of residence, despite the lease expiring only in December 2020. The building has remained empty for 2019-20, with subsequent loss of income [5]. Batavia Mews provided an income of £0.5 million a year, with net contributions of £0.3m towards accommodation overheads [6]. This income has not only been lost for 2019/20, but an additional cost will be attached to servicing the lease until its expiration (at least £212,000), an estimated net loss of £>0.5m [7]. It is likely that this situation has arisen as a result of mismanagement of the project.

Worryingly, these costs have now been introduced in the RF1 but have been wrapped up in a net figure for professional services savings, obscuring the costs directly related to Batavia Mews – and misattributing costs to professional services [8]. In addition, no dilapidation costs have been included in the RF1.

Staffing Costs

The 2019-20 budget assumed vacancy savings of £3.5 million, stating that this had been historically achieved. This claim is contradicted in the RF1, where it is taken down to £2.5m [9]. RF1 mentions that “*the annual pay award and USS pension on-cost assumptions used in the budget were very cautious,*” [10] but no mention of this ‘caution’ appears in the original budget. If the increase reflected a ‘cautious’ budget for the annual pay award, then the variance would have adversely affected the overall staff budget at the same time as benefiting any vacancy saving. The former would dwarf the latter. If the opposite was the case, £1million would be missing from the RF1.

The report to the Office for Students (OfS) in December 2019 stated that,

“we have assumed staff headcount reductions of 2.5% in 2019/20, 5 % in 2020/21, 3.1% in 2021/22 and 1.5% in 2022/23. This is a total reduction of 12.1% that will reduce costs by around 11%.”[11]

Reductions on this scale would mean **1 in 8 staff will go**. Figures in OfS report indicate 54.65 fewer FTE academics and 70.45 fewer FTE staff in professional services by July 2023 [12]. These figures have now been revised upwards and accelerated, with the Reforecast document demanding a 15% cost reduction in professional services by July 2022 [13]. Restructuring costs remain set at £2 million for 2019/20 and £1 million each in 2020/21 and 2020/22 in the re-forecast, despite projected staff reduction rising from 12% to 15%. We have yet to see any published figures about savings made in previous voluntary severance schemes in 2010 and 2015.

Should EG go ahead, it is not unreasonable to predict that new posts will also have to be created to support the new senior management team (SMT) roles, to maintain business as usual while the restructuring process is taking place, and to oversee the restructuring itself. These costs will be significant and will involve either assuming a larger deficit or aggressively reducing staff costs even more elsewhere increasing significantly the overall cost of restructuring.

Errors and Omissions in the January 2020 Reforecast

Aside from those listed in this document, several further errors and omissions were found in the RF1 presented in January 2020 by the Interim Head of Finance to the Goldsmiths Leadership Group. Together they present a worrying picture of the process followed to both prepare and scrutinise these documents. They also cast doubt on the figures presented to Council.

Activity-based costings (ABC) methodology and its associated overhead recovery model have been applied in order to devolve responsibility from SMT to Departments for all deficits incurred. These costs are supply-driven, with Departments having no say on how Professional Services costs are budgeted and managed. The ‘cost drivers’ behind the model (Student FTEs, square footage of estates, etc.) are too broad and generic to identify the real costs of ‘activities’. The methodology has clearly been framed as a way of identifying Departments (and Schools) that ‘challenge the concept of sustainability’, and disciplining (or cutting them?) accordingly, The ABC methodology diverts any blame or accountability from SMT whose actions are effectively black-boxed by this way of presenting costs, serving to obscure any imprudent or incompetent management of college finances.

Summary

Current financial difficulties stem largely from an over optimistic budget from 2019-20 which, aside from a stretch target in fees income, which was not met, contained a number of assumptions that were difficult to justify. Their removal has created a substantial deficit in budget versus revised forecast. These assumptions have been replaced by some identified savings, but their presentation is marred and suggests some serious errors and omissions. The proposed re-structure, far from being a cost-saving exercise will be a costly operation that will plunge us further into debt and/or demand large-scale redundancies. The Evolving Goldsmiths process undermines our largest existing income stream (tuition fees) in order to pursue high risk strategies (distance learning, corporate training, knowledge exchange, philanthropic giving, and rental income) at high speed without a sound business plan in place. Far from securing Goldsmiths’ future, these proposals could instead jeopardise it.

This analysis indicates that Evolving Goldsmiths will **not** lead to a balanced budget, nor a more secure financial future for Goldsmiths. We need an approach that is realistic and one that people will be inspired to get behind.

Action plan

In the short term: first steps

1. Evolving Goldsmiths has been imposed without meaningful consultation in advance of its roll-out across the institution. We need a different starting point. We should avoid a top-down solution that will increase costs in the short to medium term (through additional appointments at senior management level and through voluntary severance pay-outs and associated restructuring costs, totalling at least £4 million). We should also avoid an approach premised on centralising management control over Departments that will disincentivise staff, aggravate an increasing and provoking sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’, result in ever-decreasing staff morale and poor decision making at a distance. Instead, we need to start change at Departmental level and in an inclusive way that is intellectually rooted and makes the most of what we are good at.

Action: Heads of Departments (HoDs) and Departmental Business Managers (DBMs) have already been asked to make financial savings within Departments. There should be a series of rapid consultations within Departments involving all staff to analyse in detail the teaching provision (present and future) to determine strengths and weakness – what is going wrong, what can be improved, and where further savings can be made. A plan should be drawn up within individual Departments for agreement at their summer Departmental Board with a view to quick changes for September 2020.

2. We need to better understand why recruitment is dropping and retention is poor at a granular level within Departments. Targets should not be so high as to be unrealistic – and generate artificial deficits – or so low that there might be a justification for staff cuts. Departmental autonomy is crucial if we are to encourage maximum participation in devising new programmes and ways of working that will either bring in new cohorts of students or improve the learning experience of those who are already here. We need to focus immediately on converting UG applications to firm acceptances and in enhancing MA recruitment through persistent and direct communication with students that stresses the richness of our research and creative environment.

Action: SMT/Planning to provide Departments with detailed analysis and supporting evidence of why applications and admissions have dropped in relation to particular programmes. Move away from the model of central services cascading down targets with the paperwork game that follows. Replace this with practical implementation plans with clear interpretations of resources and best practices. Devise plans to address the issues that can be agreed by end of the summer term 2020 and implemented in the Autumn. Set up working groups across Schools and professional services and including the Students Union, to look at student experience, admissions and retention. Drawing on best practice across the College and in the sector, devise and agree plans to address any concerns within Departments (through the summer term Departmental Board) and to implement changes in Autumn 2020. Agree targets with Departments that are neither artificially high nor unfeasibly low and that are based on an expectation of consolidation, not crisis.

3. We need to suspend Evolving Goldsmiths while we make these assessments to address the financial challenges we face, learn from other institutions and implement changes to our offer that are responsive both to our intellectual strengths and to student demand. The Coronavirus pandemic will seriously restrict our ability to recruit overseas students in the coming year. In this context, Evolving Goldsmiths is a divisive distraction that will very likely make it more difficult for us to secure essential revenue in the immediate future. We need all hands on deck. This is not the moment to weaken the role of Department Business Managers (DBMs) nor to hollow out the Head of Department role (despite the promises made in EG proposals that HoDs will be better able to focus on intellectual leadership because they will no longer have budgetary control). Staff within Departments know very well that undermining the role of DBMs through proposed new line management reporting structures constitutes

a potentially huge loss of knowledge, experience and information that is vital to their successful operation. Staff also realise that removing budgetary control from HoDs does not free them up to focus on academic issues but restricts their ability to make effective decisions about both academic and non-academic matters. Despite SMT's view that the centralisation of administrative support will increase consistency and efficiency across the university, we need DBMs and HoDs with all their specific and local knowledge of their respective Departments precisely in order to help devise and implement necessary changes.

***Action:** Suspend Evolving Goldsmiths and work with DBMs and HoDs to deliver (1) and (2) above. Some Departments will find it harder than others to make savings (either through cost saving initiatives or increased income from fees etc.). Where possibilities exist for greater sharing of components across degrees and Departments and where there is intellectual compatibility, this should be considered; where there is scope for sharing of other student support areas from mental health to work placements to study skills these should also be considered, with a view to implementation in September 2021.*

4. Ensure capital expenditure remains under £5m for the next 4 years. While capital budgets are separate from operational budgets, reducing planned capital spend buys more time. Indeed, in the 2019 OfS commentary, it is said explicitly that the cash impact of any inability to achieve the staff number reductions required, could be part-mitigated by reducing the level of capital expenditure to conserve cash, although this would have limited initial impact on our surplus/(deficit).

***Action:** Suspend the development of the Enterprise Hub and bring other capital expenditure down over the next 4 years.*

In the medium to long term: next steps

Once a meaningful and committed discussion takes place within Departments about the need to act urgently in the short term, we need then to consider longer term initiatives in the broad areas of teaching, research and administration.

Teaching

1. Focus on what Goldsmiths is known for: its innovative approach to teaching and research in arts, humanities and social sciences. Further, we need to extend its reach through a portfolio of new degrees (see Appendix for some examples) that foreground political, economic, environmental and social justice and can in turn attract high level philanthropic funding to tackle inequality, climate change and social justice in the academy and society.
2. Find ways to make Goldsmiths the global go-to university for the learning and advancement of social and economic justice and a flagship for environmentally sustainable practice. Goldsmiths ought to be a centre of radical thinking with creative practice at its heart – bridging the gap between the rhetoric of ‘brand Goldsmiths’ and the reality. Establish working groups within the College working with professional services staff to devise an implementation plan that can begin as soon as possible and extend over five years.
3. Foreground these degrees on the website and link them directly to portfolios of relevant research at Goldsmiths and the ongoing range of events that occur weekly. Bring our research to life and to the forefront of students and parents’ attention rather than buried on the website.
4. Enable a raft of Goldsmiths short courses to be credit-bearing leading to a combined arts degree/diploma that would open up a project of lifelong education and contribute to our widening participation objectives. We would need to ensure that lecturers who teach short courses are not treated as casual staff but are included as part of the Assimilation Agreement for hourly paid staff.
5. Look creatively at selectively growing MA courses that fit our vision and extending their duration where appropriate – particularly in Departments that have few Masters programmes – to decrease the vulnerability of these Departments and expand their income streams.
6. Seek to create an institution built not on transactions – ‘your fees for our service’ – but on meaningful relationships. We want to see students not as consumers but as citizens and to embrace an understanding of teaching excellence that goes beyond the NSS. In order to achieve this, we should draw on the expertise of our own Department of Educational Studies in order to better understand the student experience and to develop our own much more meaningful qualitative forms of student evaluation that we can champion and publicise widely.
7. In relation to the above, we should be challenging the logic of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), for which Goldsmiths has received a bronze classification. It doesn’t do what it says on the tin: it does not deliver teaching excellence because so much of it is about something other than teaching (for example in relation to future employment) and appears to be better suited for Russell Group institutions. It is currently being trialled at subject level with Goldsmiths as a pilot institution. But the subjects do not map onto Departments so the process runs the risk of being meaningless. We need to do better than this. We should establish a working group of relevant academic and professional services staff across the schools and, together with Goldsmiths Students’ Union, devise a meaningful system of student evaluation that can adequately capture, analyse and then seek to address concerns relating to teaching quality and educational provision.
8. Examine the staff/student ratio at a more granular level and break it down in terms of established permanent staff and Associate Lecturers, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity, to better understand the issue of casualisation within the College. There needs to be accurate monitoring and analysis of all staff on an annual basis. The Assimilation Agreement needs to be fully implemented across the College in order to recognise the crucial role of hourly paid and casual workers in the delivery of teaching.

9. Recognising the impact of precarity on staff and students, we need to explore ways to significantly decrease the use of casualised contracts of employment in order to improve both the staff and student experience.
10. Recognise that student debt and cost of student housing (particularly in London) is a big issue that requires imaginative solutions that rely on co-operative not corporate values. London remains a huge draw for both UK and international students but attracting students to Goldsmiths is difficult without decent affordable housing. More student housing should be available at lower cost and we should seek partnerships with accommodation providers from the public sector wherever possible.

Research

Research is not an afterthought or a mere budget item. It is at the heart of Goldsmiths' culture and perhaps the reason for its global reputation. The exhortation in EG to 'strengthen research' is an empty one given the fact that our research infrastructure has been unable to perform effectively for the past decade. We need to see a commitment to research – and not a conflation of it with enterprise – at the heart of any attempt to restructure the institution. This will mean ensuring that staff have the time to commit themselves to conduct high-quality research and scholarship and that they have adequate administrative support for all academic activities.

We need to ensure the Research Office and Research Finance are fully functional units and able to proactively support the development of research grants and the management of research contracts. The high turnover of staff in the Research Office has led to a loss of knowledge and understanding about Departmental research strengths, research possibilities and ongoing concerns with existing research grants. To counter this, Departments require comprehensive administrative research support in situ, working closely with academic staff and reporting to the Research Office.

In making the case for its core values of equality and social justice more intently, Goldsmiths should consider setting up radical think tanks connected to Centres of Research that offer a go-to source of data and analysis for news media and raise our profile nationally and internationally in the recruitment marketplace. At present the institution is functioning as a small educational supermarket sandwiched between a high-end Waitrose and a cut price Aldi. It should work to its strengths and stop trying to compete with Russell Group institutions on their own terms. Instead, offering itself as an independent, ethical provider would attract a significant self-selecting contingent of committed students and supply an alternative narrative to punitive 'key information sets'. Given the demographic prospect of a growing number of increasingly left-wing prospective applicants, and a set of crises that show no signs of abating, it would be both ethically right and pragmatically wise to appeal to this constituency both in teaching and research.

Administration: Governance and Management

External advocacy begins with internal cohesion and a common understanding of who we are and what we want to achieve. If we do not respond to the desire expressed by staff and students for engagement and involvement, we will lose our legitimacy and waste a huge potential to thrive through change. At worst, we will foster conflicts and increase divisions. We need to work towards more shared and distributed models of decision making and control so that all those who want to can play a full part in the things that matter to them and can bring the wisdom and expertise that we need. We need to deepen the connections between all the people and communities that make up Goldsmiths and not simply to create more layers of management and bureaucracy as a reflex measure.

We are not opposed to change. We are opposed to being excluded from 'change management' procedures. We are happy to collaborate with others in order to create more agile Departments that are responsive to changing student demands and external priorities. We want, above all, to secure and a more democratic and inclusive institutional structure that privileges academic excellence, widening participation, high quality learning and working conditions and that is committed to rooting out the forms of discrimination that interrupt this ambition.

1. Turn the Warden's open meetings into an official termly 'General Assembly' integrated into the structures of governance.
2. Establish a thoroughgoing review of governance processes and Departmental structures that is fully representative of the views and experiences of all sections of the College community with a view to increasing democratic participation in decision-making throughout the College. Take the recommendations in the [Gold Paper](#) as a starting point.
3. Reform Academic Board so that it includes better representation of the academic and student communities and is the chief forum in which any major changes to the College's academic and academic-related structures are discussed.
4. Revisit the current School structure that was originally based on short-term bureaucratic considerations at the time rather than any systematic discipline-based work. We need an alternative model which should involve a full consultation on which Departments might best cooperate on academic initiatives as a way of enhancing interdisciplinarity while also maintaining discipline-led Departments. This might result in more Schools or a different framework for existing ones but, either way, this needs to be a process in which all staff are able to contribute and in which Heads of Departments and Departmental Business Managers can share issues, identify inconsistencies, build collaborations, synergies and inter-disciplinary working and if appropriate standardise approaches. It also needs to be an approach built on evidence drawn from other universities – how has moving to school structures that diminish the power of Heads of Department and that undermine effective Departmental administrative support impacted on staff and student experiences in other places? Have those institutions succeeded in reversing deficits and improving teaching and learning?
5. Trust is key. One of the main reasons for resistance to centralisation at Goldsmiths is not simply that 'change is difficult' but that there is little trust in the centre's capability to take on tasks that are currently situated in Departments. Until now, attempts at centralising some functions have not removed workloads from Departments but have simply added new layers of complexity, bureaucracy and time lags that have impacted efficiency and responsiveness. Trust can be gained through co-design and collaborative decision making that follows proper accountability structures. The Goldsmiths Leadership Group (consisting of all Heads of Department), the newly formed Professors' Forum and the joint Departmental Business Managers group should all be embedded into Goldsmiths' structures of governance to increase transparency, scrutiny and accountability. If we want well-functioning structures, they have to have staff buy-in and leadership that is recognised and respected.
6. Where the economic decisions of Goldsmiths impact on the local community, a full and open consultation process should be observed with members of the community and with evidence of meaningful engagement. This should then be fed back to Goldsmiths staff and students on a regular basis.

For more information, please email: alternativegoldsmiths@gmail.com

Appendix 1: References

- [1] Minutes of Goldsmiths Council, January 2020. CNCL 119, 11-263, Paper F, unnumbered p. 8.
- [2] See, “20190617 Council Budget 2019-20 and forecast 2020-21 to 2023-24”, p. 12.
- [3] (GLG), Jan. 2020, First Financial Re-forecast (RF1) - High Level Update”, p. 4, note 10.
- [4] Goldsmiths is depreciating anything over £10k, which is unusually low. Overall its depreciation/amortisation is nearly 10% of annual income, when 6-7% would be typical and this percentage has risen steeply since 2013. *Goldsmiths might be hitting its KPI for operating cashflow because of this policy.*
- [5] Land registry, TGL117257
- [6] 20190617 Council Budget 2019-20 and forecast 2020-21 to 2023-24”
- [7] This is the yearly rental, subject to revision, in the original lease, Land registry, TGL117257
- [8] “(GLG), Jan. 2020, First Financial Re-forecast (RF1) - High Level Update”, p. 3, note 6.
- [9] “20190617 Council Budget 2019-20 and forecast 2020-21 to 2023-24”, p. 15, n. v cf. “(GLG), Jan. 2020, First Financial Re-forecast (RF1) - High Level Update”, p. 2, n. 2.
- [10] “(GLG), Jan. 2020, First Financial Re-forecast (RF1) - High Level Update”, 1.
- [11] Office for Students (OfS) Annual Financial Return 2019 Tables, “Assumptions”. It is worth noting *that this contains a miscalculation as the yearly reductions were summed*, the actual figure would have been 11.6%.
- [12] OfS Annual Financial Return 2019 Tables, “Staff”
- [13] “(GLG), Jan. 2020, First Financial Re-forecast (RF1) - High Level Update”, p. 4, n. 11.

Appendix 2: Examples of possible curriculum development

1. *BA 'Environment in Context'*

This relates to the ever worsening crisis of climate change and environmental collapse and is inspired by the great mobilisation of young people (highlighted by the popularity of Extinction Rebellion and climate movements dominated by youth). This degree would recognise that potential students want to do more than protest; they want to identify areas in which they can be proactive and make a difference. 'Environment in Context' would focus on areas of knowledge that nurture an understanding of climate change including the natural sciences (geology, horticulture, agriculture, energy) as well as social sciences (for example, economics, international law, politics and International Relations, media and communications) and arts and humanities (the worlds of representation through literature, art, music and performance). On graduating, these students would have a broad understanding both of how climate change has evolved and of what fields and initiatives are out there for them to work with in responding to the climate emergency. Attached to this degree would be a student-led 'Environment Fair' that would help profile the degree internationally and link it to many charitable foundations and activist organisations working in the field. These could open up a network of post-graduation paid internships.

2. *MA 'Just Worlds'*

Today NGOs run approximately 45% of administrative structures around the globe. That means that they are doing important work, connected to immense areas of resources that are neither governmentally nor privately controlled. Many of our potential MA students want to find meaningful work that will allow them to simultaneously engage while deepening their arena of conceptual knowledge through taught graduate study. Our students are deeply committed to notions of justice. MA 'Just Worlds' would work to identify the forms of knowledge required for working with both domestic and international NGOs, whether these are doing crisis management or running stable services. The MA would combine law and justice modules, logistics and management, global economies, geopolitical conflict and cultural interventions. The MA dissertation could take the form of a 'case study' and involve extensive interviews with all forms of stakeholders. We have all these forms of knowledge at Goldsmiths and extensive experience of working with NGOs and it would be easy for us to locate several close partners who would help construct the curriculum and provide ongoing contact with students.