

Senate

Tuesday 1 March 2022

Minutes

Present: Professor Jenny Higham (Chair), Professor Rachel Allen, Chris Baker, Professor Dot Bennett, Dr Marcus Bhargava, Dr Mark Bodman-Smith, Dr Florencia Cavodeassi, Professor Charlotte Clark, Professor Kathy Curtis, Sue David, Dr Kate Everett, Professor Jon Friedland, Dr Julia Gale, Professor Cilla Harries, George Hadjiyiannakis, Sally Hayward, Julie Hendry, Dr Vanessa Ho, Dr Carwyn Hooper, Angela Kubacki, Professor Jodi Lindsay, Karen Lobb-Rossini, Professor Julian Ma, Dr Rosie MacLachlan, Professor Katalin Török, Professor Jane Saffell, Dr Philip Sedgwick, Dean Semmens, Dr Carol Shiels, Dr Jennifer Stott, Dr Ferran Valderrama, Dr Andrew Walley, Jeannie Watkins.

In attendance: Christine Swabey (Council member observing), Derek Baldwinson, Julie Hendry (item 13 only), Julia Hutchinson (item 4 only), Jenny Laws, Dr Julie Leeming (item 5 only), Sian Marshall, Susan McPheat, Paul Ratcliffe, Emma Whitaker (clerk).

Apologies: Kate Bascombe, Professor Iain Beith, Rob Churm, Dr Marcus Jackson, Becky Kemp-Arnold, Georga Longhurst, Dr Aileen O'Brien, Georgina Sims.

36. Apologies for absence
Apologies were noted as listed above.

37. Minutes
Considered and approved: The minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 25 January 2022.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3A

38. Matters arising from the minutes
Received and considered: Open actions from the Senate Action Tracker.

Discussed:

Action 1: To review the Senate membership again next spring (2022): The Senate membership would need to be reviewed to take account the Joint Faculty Dissolution. The Director of Governance, Legal and Assurance Services (GLAS) had discussed with the Chair how to take this forward, as the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Executive Board, among other Committees that report into the Senate and Executive Board, would also need to be reviewed to take into account the Dissolution. It had therefore been agreed that a Task and Finish Group be established, to review the membership of relevant Committees. This Group would make recommendations to Executive Board and Senate by the end of the academic year. The Director of GLAS would welcome volunteers to become members of the Group; if anyone was interested they were asked to e-mail simarsha@sgul.ac.uk

It was agreed that this would be a good opportunity to consider Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and other issues within the review.

Action 4: Programme Monitoring Committees to be asked to review pastoral support at programme level to share good practice and to work towards consistency in provision – This had been discussed at a previous meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC). The Academic Lead for Quality and Partnerships would discuss this further with the Chair of TPCC and would provide an update at the next Senate meeting (1 March 2022). This action was now closed, as it would now become an action for QAEC and would be reported to Senate via the regular student welfare paper.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3B

Strategic Matters

39. Counselling Service Annual Report 2020-21

Received and considered: The Annual Report from the Counselling Service, covering academic year 2020/21, presented by the Head of Counselling.

Reported:

That there have been a lot of changes within the Counselling Service team; a few members had retired and some left quite soon after the start of the pandemic. The service had onboarded new team members remotely over the past year. It was reported that this had been good in some ways, for example for diversity, but had also been difficult; such as remote working with a new team.

That since the end of last year, the service had been offering a mix of remote and on-site sessions. This had worked well for students, especially those on placement.

That the service saw slightly less clients than in previous years – this was the same as the sector as whole – as there was a drop in demand during the pandemic.

That the service had only recently started collecting routine outcomes for clients, in order to monitor their improvement and to have a sense of the complexity of referrals; however, the data was not available in time to be included in this report. It was reported that students were often coming into the service with an average score of 'severe' on the core form, which was a concern. There had been an increase in high complexity cases across the sector.

That students were being registered online for the first time, which had been helpful. The team had had a lot of support from the university to move their administrative processes online. The service could now manage flow, keep a waiting list (which helps to prioritise clients), and has the option of sending out core forms in order to monitor client outcomes.

That the waiting list for the service was around 10-12 weeks. This was a short wait when compared to the waiting lists for Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) and other similar NHS services; however, it was recognised that students found the wait time difficult and distressing, especially at this time of year, when they may have exams coming up.

Discussed:

That the Senate welcomed this report. The Chair thanked the Head of Counselling for the accessible and easy to read report format. She noted that, although this report had been shorter than previous reports, it did not lack for information.

Whether the students with high or complex needs were previously known to the service. This data was not available as the online registration was new and there was no easy way to cross reference with those students who accessed the service previously.

Whether the mindfulness sessions that began last year would continue into this year. It was confirmed that the mindfulness courses are continuing this year. However, there remains a high level of demand. Each course had a maximum of 18 attendees and there were 35 applications over two days when the advert for this term went out, so it had to be closed early. The next course would take place in the Autumn term.

Whether some short-term support could be provided to help the service with the waiting list; e.g. supportive conversations and/or peer support. The Head of Counselling advised that she had attended the Student Support and Welfare Committee prior to coming to Senate, where this item was discussed at length. Some services in the sector had begun using a 'one at a time' model, where students could only book one session at a time, but this had not improved waiting times and outcomes for this model are non-existent. It was noted that SGUL students are not automatically offered a set amount of sessions; the offer would be personalised to that student's needs. Peer support options would be useful to consider. It was also noted that some students could teach mindfulness courses.

The Deputy Principal (Education) suggested a student-staff project grant be considered, in order to work up a plan for peer support that could have a lasting legacy. The Deputy Principal and the Head of Counselling will discuss this outside of the meeting.

It was asked what types of counselling the service could offer, as course teams could advise students about this. Then if the offer is not what the students want or need, they could access something more suitable, rather than waiting 12 weeks and not finding the offer useful. The Head of Counselling advised that the service offers many different types of therapy, so that the students would be offered what would be most helpful for them. The service does refer students to other services, where possible, when this is more appropriate for the needs of the student.

The Associate Dean for Access and Participation thanked the Head of Counselling for including diversity and inclusion information in the report; and stated that it was heartening to see that access for all students seems proportionate and that the team are diverse. The Associate Dean was interested in what the teaching team did and the ambition to promote the service to reach all students. This work could tie in with the new Inclusive Education Framework that was being developed. The Associate Dean would write to the Head of Counselling to discuss this outside of the meeting.

Whether there should be concern that the students accessing counselling from the Bachelor of Medicine and Surgery (MBBS) course make up 50% of the whole referrals to the service. It was clarified that the report should state that it was 50% of MBBS students that had referred to the service. It was also noted that the course is double the length of the other courses offered at SGUL and has traditionally more students than other courses, so this figure was not disproportionate. It was asked that in future reports another column be added to the table (pp. 4-5 of the report) to give a sense of the size of the programme. This information could be provided by course leads.

It was noted that the promotion of the service varies from course to course; for example, there are now more referrals by paramedic students due to the good work of the course pastoral lead in promoting the service and raising mental health as something that could be talked about.

That the Student Union are looking to formalise the informal peer support that currently goes on within the student societies by creating a mandatory welfare officer role in each society from next September. People in this role would be trained in Mental Health First Aid (MHFA).

The Senate requested feedback next term on service provision, especially with regards to the waiting lists.

Action: Head of Counselling.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3C

40. St George's (SGUL) Strategy

Received and noted: An update on the timeline and development of the SGUL Strategy.

Reported:

That the current SGUL strategy is about to expire, so there is a need to develop a new strategy. The sector is a fast-changing environment at the moment; for example, the Augar response had now been published and had the Department for Education had launched two consultations, plus there were three ongoing OfS consultations. Tuition fees were not dropping but had been frozen. All of these things would need to be considered as context for setting the strategy.

The Senate was provided with an indicative timetable. The Associate Director of Development and Alumni and the Director of External Relations, Communications and Marketing would be acting as strategy development leads.

That the programme of setting the strategy would be starting with a workshop with the senior leadership team, to gather initial thoughts to formulate some conversations. These conversations would be taken to the teams by the Directors. The Deputy Principals had already started conversations in their areas; the Chief Operating Officer (COO) would be starting conversations with Professional Services directors. There would also be various meetings set up, where staff would be able to get together to feed back on these discussions. All of this work would culminate in a green

paper which would be sent out to key stake holders for feedback before being finalised. The final green paper would then be launched as a consultation for all stake holders, including alumni and staff, to be able to contribute to.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3D

41. Education Strategy

Received and considered: An oral update on the Education Strategy.

Reported:

That an update paper will come to the June Senate and Council meetings respectively.

That there is a project which started in February and is aiming to finish in July, regarding portfolio growth from 2022-2030, which would feed into the overarching SGUL strategy work. The project had 10 workstreams, including: areas the university may grow, infrastructure, people, information systems and international dimensions.

Education and the Student Experience

42. Student Conduct and Compliance Annual Report 2020-21

Received and considered: The Annual Report from the Student Conduct and Compliance team, presented by the Director of GLAS.

Reported:

That the report shows the profile of cases received by the Student Conduct and Compliance (SC&C) team and provided assurance that the team were managing cases effectively. The report included an action plan for reviewing any identified issues.

Highlights of the report included:

- The number of cases remains high overall, with a sharp increase since the 2018-19 year.
- The profile of cases changed in the 2020-21 year, with a rise in assessment irregularity referrals, particularly for the Biomedical Sciences course. There are some recommendations in the report around deterring assessment irregularities, as the recent rise in cases is a concern; although the high number of cases also showed that the course teams are detecting assessment irregularities effectively.
- The report reflects the increase in the burden of work for the SC&C team. It was noted that assessment irregularity cases are a more burdensome process than other procedures, such as discretionary panels.
- There are concerns that the report may not include all cases for reporting, such as informal concerns and complaints and plagiarism, as some are handled by the course teams directly.
- The increase in Fitness to Practice and Sexual Assault and Misconduct cases reflected national trends.
- The success rate of academic appeals remains low, which should provide assurance to Senate that the university had robust and effective assessment practices and policies.
- The low number of complaints overall and the low number of cases that were escalated to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) should give the Senate confidence that cases were being managed well.
- There had been a KPMG internal audit of complaints and SC&C processes which gave a rating of 'significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities'. This provided assurance that the university had good processes in place.

That the report had been previously considered at the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) meeting held last week, and was a substantial agenda item. Comments had been made by the Committee which would need to be incorporated into a final version of the report. Due to the timings of meetings, these changes had not yet been incorporated into the version of the report that was circulated to Senate. Senate instead received a verbal update of these comments from the Academic Lead for Quality and Partnerships, who is also Chair of QAEC:

- That QAEC supported all of the recommendations in the report and would be mapping these out in order to monitor progress, and to support achieving them. This would be reflected in an action plan.
- That there was a lengthy discussion around mitigating circumstances and how that operates differently across teams. It was noted that there is already a piece of work underway, being led by the Operational Excellence team and the Registry, to try to standardise mitigating circumstances processes across the university.
- That the QAEC discussed concerns and complaints and informal complaint recording. They had suggested that guidance is developed to make the process clear, to include what constituted a complaint; and establishing a university-wide way of recording and reporting informal concerns and complaints, which would be monitored by the SC&C team.

Discussed:

That the rise in assessment irregularity referrals may relate to having online assessments during the pandemic. The Deputy Principal (Education) reported that this would not be a scenario that would happen going forwards, as the majority of assessments had been moved, or would be moving back, on campus; also that it had been agreed that any assessments designed to be remote in the future would need to be to be 'open book'. The Director of GLAS added that 45 cases had been received by SC&C in the last few days, so it was still important that the recommendations and actions in the report around assessment irregularity cases were taken forward.

The Chair added that a member of Council had commented that a Clinical Academic Group (CAG) project looking at communication with students at each stage of SC&C processes may be useful.

That it would be helpful, in future SC&C reports, to know how many students were on each course, and how many written assessments there were for that course; e.g. Biomedical Sciences had a wealth of written assessments and some programmes had next to none. This would be a useful backdrop to the statistics and data.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3F

43. Sexual Assault Policy

Received and considered: A verbal update on the SGUL Sexual Assault Policy.

Reported:

That an updated Sexual Assault Policy was being drafted, which would come to Senate for approval when finalised. The updated Policy would take into account the Universities UK (UUK) sector-wide guidance that had been received recently.

That Student Services had secured staff training funding and were in the process of agreeing how to spend the funding.

That the updated Policy would also include proposals to adjust the complaints process slightly for students who are reporting allegations of sexual misconduct, to ensure that students were well supported through the process.

The Senate also received an update on workstreams going on within the area of sexual assault and misconduct:

- The Student's Union (SU) were working with the charities Against Violence and Abuse (AVA) and Rape Crisis South London and had agreed a service that the charities would provide free for female and non-binary survivors of sexual assault. There would be five months of funding provided by the SU.
- The SU had received a report commissioned from AVA from the 'combat misconduct' project. A number of recommendations had been made and the SU would examine how to take these forward. Some would be taken forward by workstreams already in place; for example, SC&C now has information on its intranet pages specifically for staff dealing with sexual assault cases, and there would be a student Code of Conduct drafted.
- It was hoped that a student Code of Conduct would be a better way to articulate to students the expectations of their behaviour and any outcomes that they could expect should their behaviour not be of the expected standard. In complaints for students who are enrolled on professional courses, the students are assessed against their set of professional standards.

The Code of Conduct could be used across all courses, especially where there is not a set of professional standards.

Discussed:

That the SU had discussed with the Deputy Principal (Education) the drafting a Student Charter, which could be progressed as a staff and student project grant piece of work. This would sit alongside the new student Code of Conduct.

That the SU President had been liaising with Rape Crisis South London to agree that they would provide six students a month with an outreach worker, who can support them or refer them on to organisations who would be able to support them.

That the SU had implemented a new Responsibilities and Conduct Policy to inform SU staff of their individual responsibilities, that included specific guidance on the use of social media.

Partnerships

44. Update on Joint Faculty Dissolution

Received and considered: An oral update on the Joint Faculty Dissolution, presented by the Academic Lead for Quality and Partnerships.

Reported:

The Academic Lead for Quality and Partnerships thanked everyone involved in the planning and implementing of the Joint Faculty Dissolution.

That the staff consultation started last week and would last 45 days. Staff would soon be informed as to who would be TUPE transferred to SGUL. At the end of the consultation a consultation response would be formulated.

That Kingston University (KU) was currently in the process of forming a new faculty.

That SGUL had begun a number of engagement meetings for staff, the first of which took place yesterday (28 February). Professional Services had a meeting today (1 March) and others were planned. The meetings would include information on HR and pensions. Staff were keen to hear about pensions so that specific meeting would be brought forward.

That as the list of staff who would be coming to SGUL was still not decided it was not possible to target relevant invites for the events. Invites were therefore going out to the whole of the Faculty. The TUPE principals had been jointly agreed but in some cases the detail had not been shared, despite SGUL asking repeatedly. ECRM had also asked for mailing lists in order to hold engagement sessions but had not received them so these sessions had not been possible.

That the high-level principals of the Teach Out phase had now been agreed and there was a joint oversight group established.

That there had been progress in some of the workstreams. There would be an unavoidable volume of work generated once it is known which staff would be transferring; especially in the IT and data workstreams.

Discussed:

The Chair, on behalf of the Senate, echoed the thanks to all of the staff involved in the planning and implementing of the Joint Faculty Dissolution.

The Chair stated that, if needed, in her role as Principal she would escalate the lack of engagement in respect of sending over TUPE lists and mailing lists. She stated that it did not sound like a satisfactory process if decisions were not being made together.

The Deputy Principal (Research and Enterprise) held a Research Session yesterday (28 February) for staff who would be TUPE transferred to SGUL. He raised a concern that a high number of staff seemed to think that they would be involved in Research within SGUL, and that he would appreciate

some clarity around this. The Chair, the Deputy Principal (Research and Enterprise) and the Academic Lead for Quality and Partnerships agreed to discuss this outside of the meeting, and as part of the SGUL strategy discussion.

Action: Deputy Principal (Research and Enterprise) and the Academic Lead for Quality and Partnerships

Research

45. Research Update, including Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Received and considered: A verbal update on Research, including an update on the REF.

Reported:

That the audit process for the REF had been completed and a number of issues had been identified.

That there would be a consultation and an executive meeting to discuss what the next REF would look like.

That the embargoed REF results would be received on 9 May 2021 and would be released to everyone on 12 May 2021. There would be a communications plan in place for the results to be shared with the wider university.

Matters for Approval

46. Student Protection Plan

Received and considered: The updated SGUL Student Protection Plan, for onward approval at Council and submission to the Office for Students (OfS).

Reported:

That the university is required to consider any risks around continuation of student study courses within the institution, and to create a Student Protection Plan.

That the Plan needs to go to the Student Union for comment prior to being finalised.

That the document was not approved at Senate today. A new version, incorporating the points listed in 'Discussed' below, and any comments sent post meeting to the Academic Registrar, would be circulated by e-mail for approval by Senate. This would be done in good time for the Plan to be revised and to go to Council for approval on 29 March.

Discussed:

That some minor additional updates be made as follows:

- Paragraph 11, which refers to the OfS's approach to financial information, as their approach had changed slightly.
- Paragraph 20, which refers to how SGUL met the OfS initial conditions and meet ongoing conditions, needs the wording changed slightly.
- Page 8 – the last sentence referred to undergraduate clinical placements - the wording needs slight amendment as the university also had some post graduate clinical placements.
- The business continuity section (paragraphs 12 and 13) could be made clearer to show how the university worked during the pandemic.

It was noted that the document may need amending further when the Joint Faculty Dissolution has been finalised, and again when the GMC take over accrediting the PA programmes, which was expected to be in August 2023.

Action: Academic Registrar

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3G

47. Student Transfer Policy

Received and considered: The updated SGUL Student Transfer Policy.

Reported:

That the university is required to have a Student Transfer Policy by the OfS, but they no longer require it to be submitted for approval.

That the Policy needs Senate approval. It did not have to be approved by a certain date but the Academic Registrar would like to finalise the Policy before the beginning of the next academic year.

That the Policy had been restructured to be more consistent with other SGUL policies and easier to read and understand for students; for example, there was a flow chart added to show the process in an easier way and an updated section added on Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) / Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL).

Discussed:

That the university does not receive many transfer requests, but those that it does receive can often be complicated and time consuming to process.

The Deputy Principal (Education) asked for the courses listed as exclusions to transfers to be reconsidered to ensure the reasons for exclusion are still valid. The Director of Quality and Partnerships noted that the OfS were keen to promote student mobility between institutions where possible and it would be good to show that any barriers have been considered and removed if possible. It was agreed for this discussion to take place at the next Education Student Strategy Committee (ESSC) and it would feed into a new draft of the Policy. The new draft would come to the Senate for final approval, either by e-mail or to the next meeting (June).

That it can be difficult to compare curriculums and the extent to which they match in terms of content level and purpose.

That the ESSC would discuss a strategic overview of how to support students who transfer into the university.

That a piece of work may need to be done in the future on the transfer of lifelong credit beyond institutions.

That SGUL may receive transfer in requests from students who had been studying in the Ukraine but cannot return there due to the ongoing conflict.

That the OfS requires that all institutions provide information on their transfer Policy on their website. It was agreed to put the current version (which had been approved previously) onto the SGUL website for now with a note that the Policy was currently being updated.

Action: Academic Registrar

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3H

48. Name Change – BSc Therapeutic Radiography

Considered and approved: The proposal to change the section and degree name of the BSc Therapeutic Radiography to BSc Radiotherapy and Oncology, from 2023.

Reported:

That the therapeutic radiographers had changed their section name to Therapeutic Radiography and Oncology in August 2021, in order to be clearly separated from their other diagnostic colleagues.

That a name change for the degree would increase visibility to perspective students and would bring the degree in line with many of SGUL's competitors. This had followed discussions around communications and relevant search hits on the internet for similar courses. The name change would also ensure the degree title was in line with what the role actually entails. The proposed name change was supported by market research, which had been undertaken by ERCM.

That the section had gone from a cohort of 10 in 2018 to a cohort of 31 in 2021, thanks to the hard work of the team.

49. Approval of any changes to membership and terms of reference (TOR) for sub-committees of Senate
Considered and approved:

- (i) Changes to membership and TOR for the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

Discussed:

That there were no major changes to the Committee's membership. The membership would be reviewed again as part of the work to align Committee TORs.

That there were changes in the TOR around the quality monitoring of programmes, in respect of enhancement and student experience.

That the Committee would be the conduit to resolve issues at university level that programmes could not address themselves.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3J

- (ii) Changes to membership and TOR for the Education Student Strategy Committee (ESSC).

Discussed:

That the TOR had been reviewed with no changes made.

That the membership of the Committee had been amended to allow for the Joint Faculty Dissolution.

That the Student Experience Action Group, which fed into the Committee, was being dissolved and a new group formed, in order for the Committee to discharge their student experience duty in a more effective way.

That the ESSC would be monitoring delivery of the forward plan and inputting into the SGUL strategy.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3K

Matters for Report

50. Academic Promotions

*Received and noted: The academic promotions process and timetable.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3L

51. Public Sector Equality Duty Report

*Received and noted: The Public Sector Equality Duty Report 2021.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3M

52. Validation and Review Report – BSc and MSc Occupational Therapy

*Received and noted: The report confirming the validation of the MSc Occupational Therapy and revalidation of the BSc Occupational Therapy, in October 2021.

Reported:

That there had already been some applicants for the MSc Occupational Therapy course. The Royal College of Occupational Therapists had signed off the programme fully but the Health and Care Professions Council had yet to respond.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3N

53. Reports from the sub-committees of Senate

*Received and noted:

- (i) A report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3O

- (i) A report from the Research Committee.

Discussed: The Committee were focusing on breaking down silos and encouraging joint working. That a PhD student group now reports into the Committee and was working very well. There was also a PhD student representative in the Senate membership.

That a new 'arrival and survival' guide was available for those who join SGUL research community, to help them settle in to the university.

That it was planned to reopen the Biological Research Facility (BRF) to house Zebrafish this year. It was a complicated process that included dealing with the Home Office and recruiting appropriate candidates for necessary roles.

That the Image research facility (IRF) had purchased new microscopes during the pandemic and had been doing more in terms of outreach and enterprise.

That Research Day had gone well, with excellent lectures and awards given out as listed in Paper 3P. Highlights of research work included Paul Heath's COVID-19 vaccine paper.

That it was hoped research grant income would increase following the pandemic and there had been some large grant success in the Public Health Research Institute. The department would be trying to increase grant income per academic FTE researcher.

That there had been lots of activity around CAGs, which had a lot of enthusiasm from within both the university and the Trust.

That NHIR funding had been awarded for the BRF. This was an important development and may lead the department to receiving further funding for other projects.

That enterprise activity had increased over time and income had doubled over the last three years. The department would be launching new panels and activities, one of which was named 'SGUL: Open for business' which was taking place on 16 March. The team would be increasing its consultancy and hiring new people in order to expand.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3P

- (ii) A report from the Education Student Strategy Committee.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3Q

54. Actions taken by the Chair

*Received and noted: Decisions taken on behalf of Senate by the Chair since the last meeting of Senate.

Senate/2021-22/Paper 3R

55. Student Cases

It was noted that there were no student cases to report to this meeting of the Senate.

56. Minutes of Senate Sub-Committees

Noted that minutes of the following Senate sub-committees were available on request:

- a) Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee
- b) Research Degrees Committee (unreserved)
- c) Research Committee
- d) Student Support and Welfare Committee
- e) Taught Postgraduate Courses Committee
- f) Undergraduate Programmes Committee.

57. Any other business

External Examiner Nomination

The following external examiner nomination was considered and approved by Senate, following approval by TPCC:

Miss Libby Thompson, University of the West of England; MSc Occupational Therapy; to begin in 2022/23.

58. Dates of meetings in 2021-22

- Tuesday 14 June 2022
- Tuesday 5 July 2022 – Joint with Executive Board

All meetings commence at 2.00pm.