



Research Committee LSE

Schedule Wednesday 24 April 2024, 10:30 AM — 1:00 PM BST
Venue CBG.11.13
Organiser Casimira Headley-Walker


Agenda

Procedural

10:30 AM 1. Welcome


10:32 AM 2. [Declaration of Interest](#)
For Note - Presented by Susana Mourato

10:34 AM 3. Minutes
For Approval - Presented by Casimira Headley-Walker






10:37 AM 4. Matters Arising
For Approval - Presented by Casimira Headley-Walker
 RC 23 44 March Matters Arising.docx 1

10:40 AM 5. Pro-Vice Chancellor's Update
For Report - Presented by Susana Mourato

Items for Discussion

10:55 AM 6. [Research for the World Strategy: spotlight on growing research income and contribution \(Management Information Report\)](#)
For Discussion
 RC 23 45 Spotlight on research income.docx 4



11:10 AM	7. Research for the World Strategy: spotlight on enhancing research culture and collaboration (Summer of Culture Scheme) For Discussion		
11:30 AM	8. Middle East Centre Review Report For Discussion		
12:00 PM	Coffee Break		
12:15 PM	9. PhD Academy Update For Discussion		
	 RC 23 48 PhD Academy report on doctoral training.pdf		10
12:30 PM	10. Review of the European Institute For Approval		
	 RC 23 49 European Institute Review Report.pdf		19
12:35 PM	11. Review of the School of Public Policy For Approval		
	 RC 23 50 SPP Review Report.pdf		34
12:40 PM	12. Recognised Groups For Approval		
	12.1. LSEE		
	 RC 23 51 LSEE.pdf		61
	12.2. SPICE		
	 RC 23 52 SPICE.pdf		63
12:45 PM	13. Any Other Business For Note		



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■

The London School of
Economics and Political Science
is a charity and is incorporated
in England as a company limited
by guarantee under the
Companies Acts (Reg. No 70527)

Items to Note



Action items arising from
Research Committee
Wednesday 6 March 2024, 10:30 AM — 1:00 PM GMT

Agenda	Action	Due Date	Assigned To	Status
3.. Minutes	Amend “6.2.3.2. Under Attracting and retaining talent R4, make it clearer that this refers to diversity of applicants applying for grants, and not applicants for LSE Jobs (monitored elsewhere)” to reflect this is outwith the Research Strategy		Casimira Headley-Walker	Completed
3.. Minutes	Create an action from Minute 8.2.1		Casimira Headley-Walker	Completed
4.. Matters Arising	Draft a letter to HEPI refuting the HEPI article ‘Regional research capacity: what role in levelling up?’	28 Feb 2024	Jen Fensome	Completed
4.. Matters Arising	Chair to meet with Head of International Relations before and after the upcoming department related Research Centre Reviews.	5 Jul 2024	Susana Mourato	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Amend the training and support workstream		Bingchun Meng, Pete Mills	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	<p>Revise paper to establish current practice in DRU funding and resourcing, return with adjusted recommendations.</p> <p>Meeting held to agree course of action. CHW to contact DRUs to establish current practice.</p> <p>Paper to include a list of the School's DRUs and Recognised Groups.</p>	31 May 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Outstanding

Agenda	Action	Due Date	Assigned To	Status
	Due date changed to June Research Committee Meeting.			
4.. Matters Arising	Update Governance of Research Document.	14 Jun 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Reschedule the International Inequalities Institute for 2024-25	3 Jun 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Announce results for the AI RISF Call at the upcoming AI Showcase	30 Apr 2024	Anouska Nithyanandan	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Make use of the Data Science Institute to draw together staff who are working on AI at LSE, and establish clear links.		Ken Benoit	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Research and Innovation to provide a summary of unsuccessful grants, detailing reasons given and commonalities in the applications. To be resolved via the use of Tableau dashboards currently under development	28 Jun 2024	Anouska Nithyanandan	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Establish a list of AI researchers at LSE, and ensure they receive directed communications.	31 May 2024	Ken Benoit	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Respond to the School that the Committee supports Recommendation 1, but does not support Recommendation 2.	18 Jan 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Completed
4.. Matters Arising	Proactively contact UKRI Centres for Doctoral Training in artificial intelligence for collaboration.	31 May 2024	Ken Benoit	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	PhD Academy to provide an annual summary of applications and awards	1 Oct 2024	Peter Mills	Outstanding
4.. Matters Arising	Circulate the Oxford Economics Report.	29 Mar 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Outstanding

Agenda	Action	Due Date	Assigned To	Status
11.. Research Centre Reviewers for the Data Science Institute	Contact the Data Science Institute to ask for an expanded list of potential reviewers.	29 Mar 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Completed
12.. Departmental Review Process Update	Feed back that there should be more focus on impact and partnerships in the review, and that research grants should be mandatory.	12 Apr 2024	Casimira Headley-Walker	Completed

Research for the World Strategy: spotlight on growing research income and contribution (Management Information Report)

Background and purpose

Research and Innovation are seeking to develop both a baseline for current income, and ongoing monitoring. In parallel, the team is also working to provide transparent and up to date metrics on grant awards and applications, as requested by the committee.

The paper contains a consolidated report and analysis, to ensure that all members of the committee can access the same data.

Actions Required and next steps

Committee is asked to note the paper and use the information to inform strategic thinking.

Grace McConnell

RESEARCH & INNOVATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION REPORT MARCH 2024

Research, Impact and Innovation Income

Income Metrics: Key Information

This report is the **first time that consolidated reporting has been conducted** for all income received related to Research, Impact, and Innovation across LSE. The **values used relate to actual income received in year, not awards or pledges made**. This data is drawn from three years of financial records held in One.Finance and includes competitively won grants and projects, hypothecated and QR income and activities arising from fundraising and strategic programmes across the school. Details in the Key Information table (Annex A) provide information on the categories included in each stream.

Income Metrics: Summary

Income Stream	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23
Research	£51,741,944	£53,120,661 (3%) ↑	£60,392,075 (12%) ↑
Impact	£31,022,223	£32,874,894 (6%) ↑	£37,015,686 (11%) ↑
Innovation	£2,388,360	£2,608,169 (8%) ↑	£3,808,121 (32%) ↑
Total	£85,152,526	£88,603,724 (4%) ↑	£101,215,882 (12%) ↑

Table 1. Income received over the last 3 years by category.

Research, Impact and Innovation streams all show growth from 2020/21 to 2022/23 with the **total growth across streams for the 3 years reaching almost 20% (£85M to 101M; 18.8%)**.

Research income streams experienced the highest growth in this period (£51M to £60M; 16.7%). QR funding accounts for £20M (30%). Impact was most consistent (£31M to £37M; 10.9%). HEIF accounts for £6M (16%). Innovation grew by over 50% but is the smallest part of the income mix overall, reaching only 3.7% (£3.8M) of the total income stream at its current peak in 2022/23.

Within the Research stream, notable changes are the **decrease in Quality Related Funding (QR) and the significant variation of PaGE Research and Research-related income**. QR funding cuts were an outcome of the latest REF submission and Research England funding algorithm which LSE is seeking to influence in advance of the next assessment. PaGE Research and Research-related income has grown due to a change in reporting of research activity related to Other grants and donations, and an **increased appetite for research activity from corporate, public body and foundation partners**. Detail on reported HESA research income split across these income streams is available in Annex B.

Impact funding accounts for 36% of the total R, I and I income at LSE in 2022/23. It has increased steadily with **growth in hypothecated funding from Research England** (e.g. for Policy and participatory research activity). Corporate Engagement and contracts research activity has decreased due to a genuine decrease as well as changes in the classification of PaGE income into PaGE research-related income. **New entries in the impact area are LSE Press, LSE Generate and facilities income from the hire of the Behavioural Lab**.

Innovation is the smallest strand of income with the **most notable investment going towards Innovation Capacity Investment (£1.8M 2022/23)** such as the ESRC Impact Acceleration Account (IAA) with growth in commercialising LSE consulting activity through the **Speakers Bureau (£508k 2022/23) and Exchanges (£883k 2022/23)**.

R&I Research Applications

Research Funding Applications: 5 year Overview

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
UK	209	300 (30%) ↑	227 (-32%) ↓	219 (-4%) ↓	191 (-15%) ↓	69 (-177%) ↓
EU	51	51 (0%) -	42 (-21%) ↓	58 (28%) ↑	29 (-100%) ↓	10 (-190%) ↓
Non-EU	24	31 (23%) ↑	31 (0%) -	22 (-41%) ↓	26 (15%) ↑	7 (-271%) ↓
Total	284	382 (26%) ↑	300 (-27%) ↓	299 (0%) -	246 (-22%) ↓	86 (-186%) ↓

Table 2. Applications over the last 5 years by volume of submitted applications, by region of funder.

FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

UK	£65 M	£83 M (21%) ↑	£70 M (-18%) ↓	£76 M (9%) ↑	£94 M (19%) ↑	£26 M (-268%) ↓
EU	£43 M	£31 M (-38%) ↓	£38 M (19%) ↑	£38 M (-2%) ↓	£16 M (-136%) ↓	£3 M (-374%) ↓
Non-EU	£4 M	£3 M (-29%) ↓	£2 M (-24%) ↓	£11 M (75%) ↑	£6 M (-83%) ↓	£2 M (-235%) ↓
Total	£112 M	£117 M (4%) ↑	£111 M (-5%) ↓	£125 M (11%) ↑	£116 M (-7%) ↓	£31 M (-278%) ↓

Table 3. Applications over the last 5 years by sponsor funded amount of submitted applications, by region of funder.

This data shows the number of research applications recorded on the grant management system and as such **does not include fundraising activity led by the philanthropy teams**. This also does not include hypothecated or QR income. The data is current as of 31st January 2024.

Grant applications have been trending downward in the past 5 years. The total value and number of applications made in 2022/23 is at its lowest for this period. Some reasoning for this is stated in the Research Committee GRAM report of the first meeting this year. **Notably, EU applications performed more poorly in 2022/23 than in previous years**, a trend noted across the UK sector, and for which a “**bounce-back**” is expected in 2023/24 following association. UK applications saw a peak in value submitted in 2022/23 whilst the volume remained consistent demonstrating the appetite LSE has had in submitting large funding applications to Centres and large calls.

Research application volumes are performing stronger at the start of 2023/24 (59) compared to 2022/23 (47); although still not as strong as previous years. **Values of applications are still downwards trending this year to date.**

Research Funding Applications: Success Rate & Income Ratio

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
UK	31%	31% (0%) -	34% (9%) ↑	41% (17%) ↑	35% (-17%) ↓	20% (-75%) ↓
EU	29%	35% (17%) ↑	26% (-35%) ↓	47% (45%) ↑	34% (-38%) ↓	20% (-70%) ↓
Non-EU	38%	61% (38%) ↑	58% (-5%) ↓	68% (15%) ↑	50% (-36%) ↓	29% (-72%) ↓
Total	31%	34% (9%) ↑	35% (3%) ↑	44% (20%) ↑	36% (-22%) ↓	21% (-71%) ↓

Table 4. Success rate of applications over the last 5 years by count of successful outcome of submitted applications, by region of funder.

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 23/24
UK	23%	35% (34%) ↑	14% (-150%) ↓	28% (50%) ↑	15% (-87%) ↓	2% (-650%) ↓
EU	20%	19% (-5%) ↓	20% (5%) ↑	27% (26%) ↑	8% (-238%) ↓	1% (-700%) ↓
Non-EU	45%	44% (-2%) ↓	48% (8%) ↑	37% (-30%) ↓	45% (18%) ↑	4% (-1250%) ↓
Total	23%	31% (26%) ↑	17% (-82%) ↓	29% (41%) ↑	16% (-81%) ↓	2% (-700%) ↓

Table 5. Success rate of applications over the last 5 years by value of successful outcome of submitted applications, by region of funder.

The success rate has a yearly average of around 35-40% by volume of applications; the **success rate was at its highest in 2021/22 (44%)** where applications submitted in all regions had an increase in success rate. However, the success rate when looked at by value tells a different story with an yearly average around 20-30%, peaking in 2019/20 (31%). Success rates for 2023/24 are still emerging with pending proportions of awards at 48% for 2022/23 and 84% for the first quarters of 2023/24.

Success rates for Non-EU awards are higher (c. 45%) than for the UK (around 25%) and for the EU around 23%). Notably, **EU success rates increased in 2021/22 up to 27% by value**, a jump of 10% from previous years. It is possibly due to the first rounds of EU funding arising post-Horizon Europe and a build-up of interest during the break between H2020 and Horizon Europe in late 2019 to late 2020.

LSE is still trending towards higher volumes at lower values with 35% of applications made in 2022/23 being below £50k. Data for Q2 is still being finalised.

Research Funding Applications: Department Profile

Across parent Departments, the **Department of Economics is consistently the highest performer in terms of value of applications submitted and value of awards received** (top every year except 2021/22 for applications and 2022/23 for awards where Health Policy was first). The Departments of Geography and Environment, and Health Policy and significantly high performers as well. Given the Centres that sit below these Departments are highly prolific, this is

expected. In fact, **STICERD, Centre of Macroeconomics, and the Centre for Economic Performance consistently rank in the top 5 units** for value of applications submitted and value of successful applications.

[Research Funding Applications: Principal Investigator Profile](#)

The profile of applications across career stages is consistent. **Early Career researchers typically submit more applications but at a smaller total value than more senior counterparts.** This is similar to sector-wide trends in grant and fellowship awards data and follows the availability and scale of funding schemes aimed at different career stages.

R&I Research Awards

[Research Funding Awards: 5 Year Overview](#)

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 24/24
UK	129	93 (-39%) ↓	128 (27%) ↑	102 (-25%) ↓	106 (4%) ↑	50 (-112%) ↓
EU	19	22 (14%) ↑	23 (4%) ↑	9 (-156%) ↓	9 (0%) -	7 (-29%) ↓
Non-EU	22	26 (15%) ↑	27 (4%) ↑	16 (-69%) ↓	14 (-14%) ↓	6 (-133%) ↓
Total	170	141 (-21%) ↓	178 (21%) ↑	127 (-40%) ↓	129 (2%) ↑	63 (-105%) ↓

Table 6. Awards over the last 5 years by volume of awarded projects, by region of funder

	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	FY 21/22	FY 22/23	FY 24/24
UK	£44 M	£42 M (-4%) ↓	£18 M (-131%) ↓	£25 M (25%) ↑	£19 M (-27%) ↓	£7 M (-190%) ↓
EU	£10 M	£6 M (-75%) ↓	£6 M (1%) ↑	£2 M (-172%) ↓	£389 K (-465%) ↓	£432 K
Non-EU	£2 M	£3 M (30%) ↑	£2 M (-30%) ↓	£3 M (34%) ↑	£4 M (20%) ↑	£157 K (-2K%) ↓
Total	£56 M	£51 M (-11%) ↓	£26 M (-93%) ↓	£30 M (11%) ↑	£24 M (-27%) ↓	7 M (-225%) ↓

Table 7. Awards over the last 5 years by sponsor funded amount of awarded projects, by region of funder

Award data separates awards originating from philanthropy teams and those supported in LSE R&I.

Grant awards in terms of numbers have been trending downwards in the past 5 years. The total value and number of applications made in 2022/23 are second lowest for this period only to the 2021/22 awards data. The **number of awards made has slightly increased from 2021/22 to 2022/23 however the value of awards has decreased.** The **awards made in the first quarter of 2023/24 have increased by volume (40) and value (£6M)** compared to the same period in the last two years. The first quarter of 2023/24 has also been more consistent in awards than previous years. Awards from the UK have been more consistent in volume across the period with no significant growth or decrease. However, the **volume of awards from Non-EU and EU have decreased significantly since 2021/22.** The value of non-EU awards has stayed steady, but EU values have decreased alongside volume. The Research Committee GRAM report of the first meeting this year explains some of the key changes and drivers.

[Research Funding Awards: Principal Investigator Profile](#)

The **profile of awards made across career stages varies year on year.** In 2019/20 the volume of applications across stages was similar, however the value of awards is significantly skewed towards Senior career researchers (£41M; 75%). In 2022/23, whilst the volume of awards distributed across career stages is relatively even, there is a slightly higher distribution for award volume ECRs compared to mid-career and senior career counterparts; senior career colleagues have a higher value of awards than their more junior colleagues. **In 2023/24 there have been more senior career awards made to date (23; £4.7M) than to other career stages.**

PaGE Research Awards

[PaGE Research Awards](#)

Research **Awards coming through PaGE are trending away from lower value awards** with awards less than £50k decreasing by 58%. The value of awards >£1M has also been decreasing over the 5-year period from £41M in 2018/19 down to £7M in 2022/23. The region attributed to these awards is primarily the UK which is showing a steady decrease in value; **Non-EU awards are comparatively showing growth in value** across the same 5-year period.

Annex A: Key Information Table: Income Streams

Income Stream	Category Name	Category Description
Research	R&I Research Income	Income classified as HESA-Research originated by LSE R&I
	PaGE Research and Research-related Income	Income classified as HESA-Research originated by PaGE (excluding that generated via the Corporate Engagement Team), donations classified as research, and other grants generated for research activities. Note that data for "Other grant income" only currently exists from 22-23 onwards as it has not been separately categorised prior to that date (but only accounts for £58k within 22/23). This will be a future enhancement. N.B. Total pledged value of other grants and donations reported via other means will show significantly higher figures than actual income received, which is used here.
	Training Grants	Based on all spend we can reclaim from ESRC. Primarily studentships managed through FSO for the DTP but also includes relevant PHD Academy spend in line with the DTP grant as well as Research and Training support grant spend administered through departments.
	Quality Related Funding	QR and RCIF.
Impact	HEIF and Hypothecated Funding	HEIF, Policy Support Fund, Specialist Provider Element, Participatory Research funding, HEIF business and commercialisation supplement, Museums, Galleries and Collections fund, non-recurrent allocations, Strengthening partnership working and Strengthening university capacity.
	Consultancy	Consulting activity undertaken through LSE consulting.
	Contract research	HEBCI-defined contract research activity across LSE
	Collaborative research	HEBCI-defined collaborative research activity across LSE
	PaGE Corporate Engagement Income	Income originated by PaGE Corporate Engagement Team.
	International Growth Centre FCDO Award	Major impact and capacity award and other associate FCDO funding to IGC
	LSE Generate	Impact activity undertaken through LSE Generate such as the Schools' programme work, impact summits and peer-support programmes.
	LSE Press	Book sales straight into the LSE Press account
	Publication Licensing Royalties	All income from publications originating across LSE academic units
	Training	CPD and other training activities run by LSE Consulting and LSE Generate, and Custom Programmes run via LSE Enterprise.
	Executive Education	Open enrolment executive education courses and online certificate courses originated by SSEP
	Facilities Income	Income from hiring out the Behavioural Lab and drawing on Lab expertise.
Innovation	Innovate UK Award	None currently. In future, this will include Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and other Innovate corporate engagement.
	Spin out equity shares	None currently. In future, this will include income received from Houghton Street Ventures and LSE's shareholding in Zinc.
	Spin out sales	None currently.
	Spin out dividends	None currently.
	Academic Speakers Bureau	Speakers income originating from the LSE Consulting Academic Speakers Bureau programme
	LSE Consulting Exchanges	LSE consulting Hub income as part of the Exchanges programme
	Innovation Revenue Sharing	Currently this is TPI FTSE Partnership Revenue Share income. Other revenue projects for academic investment will be added in future.
	Innovation Capacity Investment	Professional services-led innovation. Includes CCF1 and CCF2 income, IAA and other innovation-related income via LSE Generate. In future will include CCF Social Venture Fund, ESRC Catalyst, Aspect 3.0 and related income generated via PaGE.
	LSE Generate	Includes OakNorth donation. Other donations will be added in future.
Research Innovation Grants	PI-led innovation. Includes ICURe and Innovate UK awards that are not Horizon Europe Guarantee. In future will include Horizon Europe pillar 3 income and related income generated via PaGE.	

Annex B: HESA Research Grants and Contracts

Research grants income, as reported to HESA and stated in the Annual Accounts, is split across Research, Impact and Innovation income streams as follows:

Income Stream: Category	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23
Research: R&I Research Income	£24,609,604	£27,283,052	£30,130,520
Research: PaGE Research and Research-related Income	£1,804,961	£2,356,919	£4,449,158
Impact: Contract research	£2,794,909	£1,525,978	£1,007,661
Impact: Collaborative research	£3,327,684	£3,491,231	£3,781,507
Impact: PaGE Corporate Engagement Income	£628,873	£826,615	£266,813
Innovation: Research Innovation Grants	£60,088	£75,243	£83,360
Total Research Grants Income	£33,226,119	£35,559,038	£39,719,019

PhD Academy: Rolling report on bids for funding to support doctoral training

Background and purpose

The Research Committee have requested this report in order to better understand the state of doctoral training, and where expansion could best be carried out.

Actions Required and next steps

Committee is asked to note the paper and use the information to inform strategic thinking.

PhD Academy: Rolling report on bids for funding to support doctoral training

PhD Academy: Rolling report on bids for funding to support doctoral training	1
1. Report date and committee	2
1.1. Accurate as of: 20/03/2024	2
1.2. Produced for: Research Committee	2
1.3. Produced by: PhD Academy Manager	2
2. Overview	3
2.1. How is this report produced?	3
2.2. Which types of bid does this report cover?	3
2.3. Which types of bid does this report not cover?	3
2.4. What is the time-period for this report?	3
2.5. Which information does this report provide?	3
2.6. Key terminology	3
3. Ongoing bid processes	5
3.1. Ongoing research council 'landscape' award bids	5
3.2. Ongoing research council 'focal' award bids	5
3.3. Other ongoing research council bids associated with the LSE ESRC DTP	5
3.4. Other non-research council bids for doctoral training funding	6
4. Bid processes completed in the 2023/24 academic year	7
4.1. Completed research council 'landscape' award bids	7
4.2. Completed research council 'focal' award bids	7
4.3. Other completed research council bids associated with the LSE ESRC DTP	7
4.4. Other bids for doctoral training funding	7
5. Bid processes completed in the 2022/23 academic year	8
5.1. Doctoral Training Partnerships (research council)	8
5.2. Centres for doctoral training (research council)	8
5.3. Bids associated with the LSE ESRC Doctoral Training Partnership	8
5.4. Other bids for doctoral training funding	8



Rolling report on bids for funding to support doctoral training

1. Report date and committee
- 1.1. *Accurate as of: 20/03/2024*
- 1.2. *Produced for: Research Committee*
- 1.3. *Produced by: PhD Academy Manager*

2. Overview

2.1. *How is this report produced?*

2.1.1. This report is maintained on a rolling basis by members of the PhD Academy team, and submitted by the PhD Academy Manager where requested by committee secretaries.

2.2. *Which types of bid does this report cover?*

2.2.1. This report covers two types of bid.

2.2.2. The first is bids for doctoral training grants, whether funded by research councils or other entities such as the British Council, Wellcome and Leverhulme Trusts.

2.2.3. The second is other bids for sources of funding for doctoral training, such as research grant bids which include funding for studentships, in which the PhD Academy is involved.

2.3. *Which types of bid does this report not cover?*

2.3.1. This report does not cover bids in whose creation the PhD Academy was not involved.

2.4. *What is the time-period for this report?*

2.4.1.1. This report covers all ongoing bid processes, and completed bid processes during the current and previous academic years. In practice, this means that bids started more than two academic years ago but completed less than two years ago will always be included.

2.5. *Which information does this report provide?*

2.5.1. This report provides core information on bids processes, including bid process timescales, departments, institutes, research centres and collaborating academic and non-academic partners. Financial information is not generally provided as the PhD Academy is not routinely involved in providing costings for studentships.

2.6. *Key terminology*

2.6.1. When first implemented, block grant funding awards by UK research councils were awarded to support 'Doctoral Training Centres'. LSE's first doctoral training grant therefore resulted in the 'LSE ESRC Doctoral Training Centre'.

2.6.2. In subsequent funding rounds, UKRI shifted to a broader range of terminology – such as Doctoral Training Partnership, Collaborative Training Partnership - reflecting an expanding range of potential doctoral training grant forms. Accordingly, under its second doctoral training grant, the 'LSE ESRC Doctoral Training Centre' became the 'LSE ESRC Doctoral Training Partnership'.

2.6.3. Following UKRI's January 2024 [change in terminology](#), the titles of existing awards will not change, but all new doctoral training grants will be categorised as either:

- i. 'landscape', replacing names such as Doctoral Training Partnerships, Collaborative Training Partnerships, or;



- ii. 'focal' awards, replacing 'Centres for Doctoral Training' and 'Centres for Doctoral Training Plus'.

3. Ongoing bid processes

3.1. *Ongoing research council 'landscape' award bids*

3.1.1. The PhD Academy is not currently involved in any ongoing landscape award bid processes.

3.2. *Ongoing research council 'focal' award bids*

3.2.1. AHRC has published a [2023/24 call for Centres for Doctoral Training](#), which has been publicised to colleagues in departments and research centres. The PhD Academy Director has convened ongoing discussions.¹ Departments currently involved in include the Departments of Sociology, Methodology, Anthropology, International History, and Media and Communications, as well as the Firoz Lalji Institute for Africa. Submission of a bid seems likely. **There is no notification of intent stage, and the final application submission deadline is 2 July 2024.**

3.3. *Other ongoing research council bids associated with the LSE ESRC DTP*

3.3.1. The LSE ESRC DTP is associated with four ongoing [ESRC Centres](#) bids. Shortlisting will occur in March 2024. Decisions will be announced in May 2024.

3.3.2. LSE-led bids

- i. The proposed Centre for the Student of Prices, Income, Costs and the Economics (PRICE), in which LSE is the lead institution. The cost of one studentship has been requested for LSE from the prospective grant, at no cost to the DTP, and the School has committed to fund the cost of one further studentship. Both will be funded 50/50 through the grant and School funds. The DTP will host both recruited students. The entry year for the studentship is not currently known, but is likely to be October 2025.
- ii. The proposed Centre for Public Authority in Polycrisis (CPAP), which will be based in the Firoz Lalji Global Hub at LSE, in which LSE is the lead institution. The cost of one studentship has been requested for LSE from the prospective grant, at no cost to the DTP, and the School has committed to fund the cost of one further studentship. Both will be funded 50/50 through the grant and School funds. The DTP will host both recruited students. The entry year for the studentship is not currently known, but is likely to be October 2025.

3.3.3. Bids in which LSE is participating as a partner

- i. The proposed Poverty Eradication Research Centre (PERC), in which LSE is a partner in a bid led by Heriot-Watt. One studentship has been reserved from the ESRC DTP 2025 entry cohort allocation. This will be awarded as a collaborative studentship.
- ii. The proposed Centre for Conservation Social Science (CROCUS), in which LSE is a partner institution in a University of Cambridge-led bid. One studentship has been requested from the grant, at no cost to the DTP. The student will be hosted by the Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science (PBS) and will not be a DTP student, as PBS is not an accredited DTP research environment (formerly pathway).

¹ This opportunity was published slightly before UKRI's shift to landscape vs. focal awards. Accordingly, these awards will be made under the previous 'Centre for Doctoral Training' terminology.

The entry year for the studentship is not currently known, but is likely to be October 2025.

3.4. *Other non-research council bids for doctoral training funding*

- 3.4.1. The LSE Care Policy Evaluation Centre participated as a partner in a UCL-led bid under the [Alzheimer's Society 2023 call for Doctoral Training Centres](#). The outcome is due to be announced in March 2024.
- 3.4.2. The LSE Law School and the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment submitted a joint application under the [Maria Sklodowska-Curie Actions Doctoral Networks](#) 2023 call. The deadline for submission of applications was 28 November 2023. The notification of the call results is due in April 2024.
- 3.4.3. The current [Leverhulme Research Centres 2024](#) call, to which the School is highly likely to submit bids, permits use of resources to support doctoral students. At the time of writing the PhD Academy has received no requests to support the creation of specific bids.

4. Bid processes completed in the 2023/24 academic year
- 4.1. *Completed research council 'landscape' award bids*
 - 4.1.1. BBSRC and NERC published a [Doctoral Landscape Award 2024](#) call in January 2024. This was publicised to colleagues in departments and research centres. At the point of the notification of intent deadline (7 March 2024), no indication had been received from colleagues about participation in the bid.
- 4.2. *Completed research council 'focal' award bids.*
 - 4.2.1. The PhD Academy has not been involved in any completed bid processes for focal awards during the 2023/24 academic year.
- 4.3. *Other completed research council bids associated with the LSE ESRC DTP*
 - 4.3.1. The PhD Academy has not been involved in any completed bid processes for awards associated with the LSE ESRC Doctoral Training Partnership during the 2023/24 academic year.
- 4.4. *Other bids for doctoral training funding*
 - 4.4.1. The International Inequalities Institute and Data Science Institute submitted a joint, single-institution bid under the [Leverhulme Doctoral Scholarships 2023/24 call](#) in June 2023. The unsuccessful outcome of the bid was announced in October 2024.
 - 4.4.2. A potential bid for a British Museum Collaborative Studentship was explored by the Department of Anthropology. The proposed bid was postponed due to demand management in the partner department within the British Museum. The department plans to apply in the next iteration of the scheme.

5. Bid processes completed in the 2022/23 academic year
 - 5.1. *Doctoral Training Partnerships (research council)*
 - 5.1.1. LSE submitted a single-institution bid under the [2022/23 ESRC call for ESRC Doctoral Training Partnerships](#). The bid was submitted in February 2022. In September 2023, LSE was **successful** in securing accreditation, and will receive funding to recruit 5 cohorts of 20 studentships from October 2024 onwards.
 - 5.2. *Centres for doctoral training (research council)*
 - 5.2.1. LSE participated **unsuccessfully** in two bids submitted under the 2022/23 call for [EPSRC Centres for Doctoral Training](#).
 - i. Department of Mathematics – lead institution in a bid involving KCL, QMUL and UCL.
 - ii. Department of Management – partner institution in a bid led by The Institute of Philosophy (University of London).
 - 5.2.2. The Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science participated **unsuccessfully** in a bid submitted in partnership with the University of Warwick under the [ESRC Centre for Doctoral Training Plus in Behavioural Science Research call](#). Other potential DTE bids explored
 - 5.2.3. The Grantham Research Institute were notified of a 2023 [NERC open call for Centre for Doctoral Training bids](#), and a [NERC call for Centres for Doctoral Training in ‘mineral resources for energy transition’](#). No bids were submitted.
 - 5.3. *Bids associated with the LSE ESRC Doctoral Training Partnership*
 - 5.3.1. The Department of Statistics submitted a bid via the LSE ESRC DTP for two studentships under the [2022/23 Administrative Data Research](#) PhD studentships call. The bid was **partially successful**, securing one studentship. The resulting studentship is hosted by the LSE ESRC DTP, and has been awarded to a September 2023 entrant.
 - 5.4. *Other bids for doctoral training funding*
 - 5.4.1. The PhD Academy was not involved in any completed bid processes for other sources of funding for doctoral training during the 2022/23 academic year.

Review of the European Institute

Background and purpose

The APRC review of the European Institute was carried out in December 2023. Dr Albrecht Ritschl attended the review on behalf of the Research Committee.

Actions Required and next steps

Committee is asked to note the research related recommendation of the report:

- Recommendation 3: The Department should investigate how it can further support and incentivise research grant applications, particularly for large and prestigious grants

APRC is not looking for feedback on the review process itself at this stage.

REVIEW OF THE EUROPEAN INSTITUTE

Purpose of paper	For the Committee to consider the Review Panel Report (Annex A) on the European Institute and decide on the recommendations including whether or not to release the Department from Review.
Background	<p>The first round of regular in-depth Academic Planning and Resources Committee (APRC) Reviews of Academic Departments finished in the 2018/19 academic year. Following a gap, arrangements for another round of Reviews starting in 2021/22 were confirmed.</p> <p>As part of the Review process APRC receives the Review report and is asked to agree the recommendations.</p>
Recommendations	For the Committee to agree the recommendations including releasing the Department from Review.
Previous consultation including subcommittee approvals	The Head of Department had the opportunity to identify factual corrections at the end of the report's drafting stage. The Department has provided a commentary (Annex B) and the School Management Committee has provided a response (Annex C) to the report. There is no approval process beyond APRC.
Strategic context	A Department Review considers whether a Departments' activities and plans, and proposed investments in them, are in keeping with the strategic aims of the School.
Risk assessment and mitigation	N/A
Financial considerations	A Department Review considers a Department's plans for strategic development, recruitment, and revenue generation, its workload allocation model, and its income/expenditure position, and if and how they might be improved.
Inclusivity considerations	A Department Review takes into account inclusivity considerations.
Ethical considerations	A Department Review takes into account the six core principles in the Ethics code.
Environmental considerations	N/A
Next steps including required committee approvals	APRC is the decision making body for next steps for the Review process.
Author Name	Evert Nivari Senior Planning Officer (Policy and Review)
Report Sponsor	Professor Eric Neumayer Pro-Vice Chancellor Planning and Resources
Release of Paper	<p>To be determined by APRC.</p> <p>APRC has withheld some Review Reports in the past where it has considered that releasing the report may prejudice the effective conduct of School affairs due to the sensitive nature of issues discussed.</p>

EUROPEAN INSTITUTE – DEPARTMENT REVIEW PANEL REPORT*December 2023***1. Background**

- 1.1 The first round of regular in-depth Academic Planning and Resources Committee (APRC) Reviews of Academic Department, re-instated beginning in 2014/15, finished in the 2018/19 academic year. Following a gap, arrangements for another round of Reviews starting in 2021/22 were confirmed, including the merger of the old Student Affairs Committee (ASC) Reviews into a single, School-wide Department Review process (carried out by APRC with input from Education Committee and Research Committee). The Review of the Department took place in the third year of the new round.
- 1.2 As of 2023/24 the European Institute has 6.1 FTE Professors, 7.0 FTE Associate Professors, 3.0 FTE Assistant Professors and 4.9 FTE LSE Fellows, alongside which it has 11.5 FTE Professional Services Staff (PSS). The European Institute was established in 1991 as a dedicated centre for the interdisciplinary study of processes of integration and fragmentation within Europe and later became a formal Department. It was last reviewed in 2014/15. The Department's scores in internal student satisfaction surveys have varied along with the School's overall results, but are generally above the School average. The relevant Unit of Assessment, comprised entirely of the Department, was ranked seventh by Grade Point Average (GPA) in the 2021 Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise.
- 1.3 The Department has four standard taught postgraduate programmes as well as four double degree programmes (where students follow one of the standard programmes during their LSE year), with a total of 283 students across these in 2022/23. It does not provide undergraduate teaching. It also has its own MPhil/PhD programme in European Studies.

2. Membership of the Panel

- 2.1 Internal members of the Review Panel (Panel) were: Professor Eric Neumayer (Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Planning and Resources)) as Chair, Professor Emma McCoy (Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)), Professor Catherine Boone and Professor Wendy Sigle (APRC), Professor Albrecht Ritschl (Research Committee), and Dr Niamh Dunne (Education Committee).
- 2.2 Four external expert members were recruited to the Panel to assess the comparable standards of the Department with other institutions and to suggest improvements to the Department: Professor Frank Schimmelfennig (ETH Zurich), Professor Kristin Bakke (UCL), Professor Amy Verdun (University of Victoria), and Professor Peter Hall (Harvard). **Annex A** gives their profiles.

3. Approach of the Panel

- 3.1 **Annex B** gives the advance information received by the Panel. **Annex C** gives the two-day Review schedule.
- 3.2 The Panel thanked the Department for its contributions to the Review and for the detailed Self-Evaluation Document (SED).

4. Key Findings and Recommendations

- 4.1 The Panel found that the Department has responded well to the challenges it faced at the time of the last Review and is strong in many areas, including its teaching delivery and internal culture. It has a very collegial and multidisciplinary internal environment which is appreciated by faculty and students and has effective leadership and a strong professional services team. It makes the delivery of an outstanding educational experience a priority and this is evident in how students feel about their experience. It produces high quality research, notwithstanding a dip in the most recent REF, and it has a good PhD programme. Overall, the Panel did not find any areas of major concern. The Department will need to continue discussions to define and sharpen its vision and identity and ensure that it is developing in a strategic way that responds to the outside environment, and it

will need to ensure that research continues to be of the very highest quality, and that it recruits well to its existing vacancies.

- 4.2 The Panel found little to fault with the Department's teaching delivery. Students were particularly happy with the extra-curricular activities offered by the Department such as events, careers support and alumni engagement, and also largely satisfied with the curriculum and teaching. The Department has very good survey scores and feedback received by the Panel was positive. Going forward, the Department should ensure that its taught curriculum reflects both its strategic vision and the needs of students.
- 4.3 The Department's research is generally of high quality, and the Panel accepted at least some of the reasoning for the recent drop in REF performance. The Department should ensure that faculty are publishing truly outstanding research outputs, rather than larger amounts of merely "internationally excellent" (in REF terms) outputs. The Panel agreed with the Department that increasing research grant income (and particularly large grants) should be a priority.
- 4.4 The Department has good faculty and has hired well in recent years. Faculty feel supported and engaged and the Department has good processes for career development and workload allocation. It should ensure that LSE Fellows in the Department also have a suitable workload that allows for career development, and that objectives and opportunities are clearly communicated. Going forward, the Department has several vacant faculty positions and the Panel stressed the importance of making strong, high-quality hires that maintain the recent success in this area and further strengthen the Department's research outputs. More broadly, the Department also needs to continue efforts increase the diversity of its faculty.

Recommendation 1: The Department should continue to consider its vision and identity, with the aim of drawing out its distinctive features and developing a strategic vision of what it stands for and the direction in which it intends to develop.

Recommendation 2: In considering its future direction, the Department should ensure that it maintains its historic strength in terms of visibility as a leader on the political economy of Europe, including through real-world engagement.

Recommendation 3: The Department should investigate how it can further support and incentivise research grant applications, particularly for large and prestigious grants.

Recommendation 4: The Department should ensure that Fellows have a suitable teaching workload which allows sufficient time for career development and that they clearly communicate the responsibilities and opportunities associated with the role to all Fellows.

Recommendation 5: The Department should consider whether one of its vacant faculty positions could be filled at a senior level with the aim of providing additional senior leadership and visibility and increasing the Department's diversity.

Recommendation 6: More broadly, the Department should continue efforts to increase the diversity of its faculty and consider how this can be linked to diversity in research programme and taught curriculum.

Recommendation for the School 1: The School should investigate how central support for process improvements within Departments can be improved, particularly in terms of training and support for relevant IT tools.

Recommendation for the School 2: The Department should be released from Review.

5. Academic Overview and Developments

- 5.1 Overall the Panel was impressed with the Department, its organisation and its activities. The Department has responded well to concerns raised at the last Review and is doing very well in most aspects of its work. It has a collegial and welcoming community and has successfully created a strongly interdisciplinary environment; it delivers a high-quality educational experience that its students appreciate; and it produces some very good

research. It has also addressed, at least for the time being, the student recruitment issues which were a concern in the previous Review. Many areas of the Department's activity are functioning very well and are well-managed and monitored by the School through more regular assessment processes such as Annual Monitoring, and this report accordingly has little to say on them. The Panel found it difficult to identify any significant issues with the Department's current state, but felt that continued renewal and forward momentum will be needed to deal with future challenges and to further enhance the Department's profile and the quality of its outputs, and therefore cautioned the Department against inertia and complacency going forward.

- 5.2 The Panel was impressed by the Department's collegial nature and the way in which it manages the complexity of bringing together faculty from different disciplines. Good relations among faculty (and among professional services staff as well as among all staff) and a positive atmosphere form an excellent foundation which allows faculty to flourish and to deliver effective teaching and produce high-quality research in collaboration with each other, knowing they have the support of colleagues and professional staff. Notwithstanding the strength the Department draws from this, the Panel was keen to stress the need for departmental activity to continue to include a spirit of frankness, constructive criticism and innovative thinking. The Department should not allow a culture of friendliness to develop into one of "not rocking the boat", leading to inertia and a lack of the kind of creative disruption and innovation needed to further develop the Department. Given continuing shifts in the external environment the Department will need to develop its vision for the future and may need to respond to developments (both as a unit and in terms of research priorities) with some urgency.
- 5.3 The self-evaluation document submitted by the Department contained an initial strategic vision for the Department, and the Panel also heard several (related) alternatives during the review sessions. It was not clear that the vision outlined in the SED is conclusive or entirely cohesive – many of the ideas and slogans articulated during the review were applicable to some areas of the Department's work, but none seemed to fully capture the guiding spirit of the Department's work and intended direction of travel. Accordingly, the Panel recommends that the Department continues the internal discussion around its vision of its direction and its identity in order to draw out what's distinctive about it as an entity and sharpen its edge. Development of such a vision will also help guide the Department in its hiring, ensuring that it is doing so in a strategic and focussed way (rather than necessarily replicating and perpetuating existing structures) as well as acting as a signal for potential faculty in terms of the project they can expect to be joining. Similarly, further sharpening of the vision will allow the Department to focus on securing research grants in the areas it has identified as key).
- 5.4 The theme of "internationalising" the Department's profile was prominent in the SED, and while the Panel felt this (alongside the potential introduction of more 'critical' perspectives, reflecting on the paradigms within which research is carried out) was a deserving element of the Department's future direction, the Department should also be cognisant of its historical strengths (e.g. in Political Economy) and the reputation it has developed as a leader in these areas. These both attract students wishing to study from a more traditional perspective, but also link to the Department's overall visibility and reputation as an active participant and hub in European affairs (which is also reflected in its programme of public events). The Department should ensure that it maintains its visibility as a leader in this area as it develops in others, and that it maintains as strongly as possible the real-world links (as well as research excellence) which make that possible.

Recommendation 1: The Department should continue to consider its vision and identity, with the aim of drawing out its distinctive features and developing a strategic vision of what it stands for and the direction in which it intends to develop.

Recommendation 2: In considering its future direction, the Department should ensure that it maintains its historic strength in terms of visibility as a leader on the political economy of Europe, including through real-world engagement.

- 5.5 One of the areas of the Department's work which the Panel was particularly appreciative of is its strong and valuable programme of public events. It was clear that these events are appreciated by the Department's students, that they position it as a leading institution in the field, and that they make a significant contribution to the School's overall visibility and public profile. The Department should be commended for the resources and hard work it puts into this area, and the Panel felt strongly that it should be valued and continued. As the

Department develops and sharpens its strategic vision it should ensure that the programme of public events is linked to and supports the strategic research priorities of the Department.

6. Leadership, Management and Organisation of the Department

- 6.1 The Panel found the Department well-led and managed, with a commendable esprit-de-corps and an apparent lack of internal disagreements or other fundamental structural issues. Decisions are arrived at in a collaborative way and faculty at all levels, as well as the PSS team, feel included in the work and decision-making of the Department. The Panel found the large PSS team to be excellent in its work and well-led, as well as being clearly appreciated by the faculty and by students. The Department and its leadership should be commended for the position of the PSS team within the Department and the PSS team for its enthusiastic approach to service delivery and genuine care for students.
- 6.2 Overall there did not seem to be any significant issues with the Department's leadership or organisation. The Panel heard from the PSS team that attempts to improve efficiency and deliver more effective service were in some cases hamstrung by lack of central support for relevant IT tools and in particular for deploying these in a systematic way to improve processes and increase efficiency. The Panel felt that action at the School level on providing training and support in order to improve administrative efficiency and move beyond piece-meal manual work, which causes delays and negatively affects the experience of students and faculty in many areas, would help deliver savings and better outcomes across the School.

Recommendation for the School 1: The School should investigate how central support for process improvements within Departments can be improved, particularly in terms of training and support for relevant IT tools.

7. Education, Teaching and the Student Experience

- 7.1 The Department has four standard teaching programmes (postgraduate only), and four double degree programmes. The Panel was pleased to see the quality of the Department's teaching and the student experience. Scores on internal surveys are generally high (above the School average), and students at both the focus groups carried out prior to the Review as well as the Review session were extremely positive about their experiences in the Department. It is clear that the Department has, for some time, made delivering a high-quality student experience a top priority and that faculty and PSS are very engaged with both teaching delivery and the wider student experience. In particular, students appreciated the welcoming atmosphere of the Department and the wide programme of extra-curricular activities, from public lectures to careers and social events – this was clearly a major positive of the Department's offer and one it should strive to keep up, as it is highly valued by students.
- 7.2 Overall the Panel found little to comment on in the Department's educational provision. However, in dealing with the strategic tensions discussed elsewhere in this report, it should also keep in mind the link between its strategic and research priorities and the taught offer, and in particular pay attention to what students expect from the Department. The Panel heard that while some students value the internationalisation recently pursued by the Department and would welcome more 'critical' perspectives included in the curriculum, others were specifically attracted by the opportunity to study Europe and e.g. European institutions. While these two directions are not necessarily in opposition to each other, the Department should ensure that it pays attention to balancing between different visions of what it might offer and continues to provide students with an offer that is attractive and matches their interests and needs.

8. Research

- 8.1 The overall quality of research in the Department is of high quality. Although the Department's UoA (to which it was the only contributor) ranked only seventh by GPA in the most recent UK Research Excellence Framework (REF), the Panel accepted that at least some of this was due to the nature of this specific UoA. Going forward the Department will need to do further work on understanding and addressing the REF result (including potentially considering the pros and cons of splitting its submission into the various disciplinary areas). The Panel considered that the Department should also think about the link between its multidisciplinary research

agenda and its fairly well-defined taught programmes, and the extent to which the structures of one area map onto the other. In pursuing a goal of internationalisation (in what is being taught to students) it should make sure that its research is producing similarly critical diverse outputs so that students continue to benefit from cutting-edge faculty research.

- 8.2 With the drop in the Department's position in the most recent REF (from first place in previous REF exercises), it is natural that there is more scrutiny of the Department's scholarly profile. While the Panel accepted much of the Department's explanation for the REF result and indeed was keen to emphasise that maximising REF positioning should not necessarily guide the Department's research agenda, it was also keen to stress the importance of faculty continuing to publish research of the very highest quality (and pleased to hear from junior faculty that publication of top quality research in top journals is a focus). The Department needs to be clear on the importance of truly "world-leading" research (as opposed to a larger quantity of merely "internationally excellent" publications and not necessarily equating truly "world-leading" with the grade-inflated 4* category in the REF) and also to ensure that it continues to clearly communicate and define the expectations around publications. In terms of its broader scholarly reputation, the Department should also be cognisant of the weakening of its ties to EU decision-making post-Brexit (and in the context of the retirement of key faculty); it should ensure it has a conscious strategy for ensuring that its international reputation is not unduly affected by this and that recruitment of new faculty supports continued relevance in this policy sphere.
- 8.3 The Panel was pleased to hear that increasing research grant income is a priority for the Department and encouraged it to continue efforts in this area with a strategic awareness of the benefits that grants (particularly large grants) can bring to the Department (e.g. PhD studentships). With renewed access to EU funding the Department should be in a strong position to increase the funding it receives and should therefore ensure that it is doing everything it can to incentivise and support grant-writing activity, whether through seed funding, individual rewards or workshops or other guidance from colleagues or from senior faculty.

Recommendation 3: The Department should investigate how it can further support and incentivise research grant applications, particularly for large and prestigious grants.

PhD Programme

- 8.4 The Department has one PhD programme, with 18 full-time students in 2022/23. The Panel was impressed by the students it met and by the positive experiences they reported. As with the Department's taught students, the PhD students feel welcomed into a Departmental community and are appreciative of the collegial and collaborative environment the Department provides. PhD students met by the Panel also showed a clear understanding of the benefits of the Department's multidisciplinary nature and the core PhD seminar. The Department has done well to create a truly interdisciplinary atmosphere and encourage the development of the seminar, while also allowing students the freedom to forge links with scholars in other, disciplinary departments. No major issues were apparent in this area, but the Department should be mindful of the work it has taken to create such a supportive environment (and ensure that this is maintained).

9. Faculty Development and Recruitment and Retention

- 9.1 The Department has hired well in recent years, attracting strong junior faculty. Overall, it has an energetic departmental culture that supports faculty and a strong esprit-de-corps. Faculty seem happy to be in the Department, feel well-supported and engaged in Departmental life, and reported that career development processes and criteria for promotion are clear and well-communicated. The Department has a transparent workload distribution model, and the Panel did not hear significant concerns about this area from the faculty (although it should ensure that all faculty, including Fellows, are sufficiently informed of how this functions). While the Department should also be commended for many aspects of how it treats LSE Fellows (e.g. regular Career Development Review (CDR) meetings, multi-year contracts, a concentrated effort to maintain continuity in course assignments across years), the Panel heard that some Fellows struggled with the teaching workload, and the role of research in their contracts was not always clear to the Fellows themselves. The Department should ensure that Fellows across the board understand their role and responsibilities as well as the opportunities for career development and have sufficient time to produce research that will further their careers.

Recommendation 4: The Department should ensure that Fellows have a suitable teaching workload which allows sufficient time for career development and that they clearly communicate the responsibilities and opportunities associated with the role to all Fellows.

- 9.2 At the time of the review the Department had a number of vacant faculty positions, due to be filled by junior hires. The Panel did not make any particular recommendations regarding the areas in which the Department should seek to hire, but stressed the importance of making strong, high-quality hires that maintain the recent success in this area and further strengthen the Department's research outputs in particular. The Panel also suggested that the Department consider whether it might seek to make one of the hires at a senior level. At a substantive level, a senior hire would add to the Department's leadership and allow it to take further strides in enhancing its reputation and visibility at a time when this is potentially threatened by the weakening of links with Brussels-based decision-making.
- 9.3 A senior hire would also be an opportunity to improve the diversity of the Department's faculty, which it acknowledges as an issue in the SED, and which was noted by students and faculty alike. The professoriate in particular is lacking in diversity and therefore a concentrated effort to bring in faculty at a senior level (in addition to promotion from within) which increase diversity would help speed up the process of addressing this. More broadly, the Panel was keen for the Department to make the diversity of its faculty a priority and consider the full range of ways in which diversity can be injected into the Department (such as the faculty at all levels, visiting fellows and other associated scholars, the taught curriculum, research areas).

Recommendation 5: The Department should consider whether one of its vacant faculty positions could be filled at a senior level with the aim of providing additional senior leadership and visibility and increasing the Department's diversity.

Recommendation 6: More broadly, the Department should continue efforts to increase the diversity of its faculty and consider how this can be linked to diversity in research programme and taught curriculum.

10. Best Practice

- 10.1 During consideration of Review reports from the previous round of Reviews, the APRC found that a better understanding and diffusion of best practice arising from Department Reviews and Annual Monitoring would be useful. As such, while the Panel was not explicitly asked to identify best practice in the Department, the following areas of good practice should be considered by the relevant areas of the School for further study or dissemination as relevant: the well-organised and effective PSS team, the extremely collegial and welcoming Departmental community (at all levels), the interdisciplinary PhD programme, and the high-quality educational experience.

11. Review process

Recommendation for the School 2: The Department should be released from Review.

Professor Eric Neumayer, Vice President (Planning and Resources)
Evert Nivari, Senior Planning Officer (Policy and Review)

Annex A: External Review Panel Member Profiles

Professor Frank Schimmelfennig

Professor Schimmelfennig is Professor of European Politics and a member of the Center for Comparative and International Studies at ETH Zurich. He is also a member of the Swiss National Research Council, an Associate of the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute, Chairman of the Scientific Board of Institut für Europäische Politik Berlin and a member of the Board of the Trans-European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA). His research focuses on European integration and, more specifically, integration theory, EU enlargement and Europeanization, differentiated integration, democracy promotion and democratization. In 2021, he won an ERC Advanced Grant for a project on “Bordering Europe: Boundary Formation in European Integration” (EUROBORD). He has published in a variety of European politics, International Relations and Political Science journals.

Professor Kristin Bakke

Professor Bakke is Professor of Political Science and International Relations at UCL. She is Associate Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway, and Associate Editor at the Journal of Peace Research. Her interdisciplinary research focuses on political violence and draws on multiple methods including large-n cross-case analyses, surveys, and fieldwork-based case studies. She is currently principal investigator on two large collaborative research projects, funded by the National Science Foundation and Research Councils UK (jointly) and by the Norwegian Research Council.

Professor Amy Verdun

Professor Verdun is Professor of Political Science and the founding Director of the European Studies Program at the University of Victoria. She is an Executive Committee member of the European Consortium of Political Research and the Chair of the Dutch Political Science Association. Her research is in the broad areas of European integration studies, comparative politics, governance, international political economy, and international relations. She was previously co-editor of the *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. She is author or editor of 20 books and has published widely, as well as serving on the advisory boards of journals including *International Politics*; *Journal of Economic Policy Reform (T&F)*; *Canadian Journal of European and Russian Studies*; *Journal of European Integration (T&F)*.

Professor Peter Hall

Professor Hall is Krupp Foundation Professor of European Studies in the Department of Government at Harvard University and resident faculty at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He has written widely about developments in the OECD political economies, the role of ideas and institutions in politics, methods of political science, European politics and issues of social inequality, and his current research focuses on changes in growth regimes and electoral politics in the developed democracies and the social basis for inequalities. He has previously served as Associate Dean for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard and Director of its Center for European Studies, and is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Royal Society of Arts, as well as a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy.

Annex B: Information Received for the Review

In advance of the Review, the Panel received an Information Pack consisting of the following documents: a briefing note from the Chair, the Department’s Self Evaluation Document (SED) and its associated annexes, a selection of Department Profile data, benchmarking data on its proffered peer set, the report of the Department’s previous APRC Review (2014/15), a summary of student focus groups conducted for the Review, and CVs of the Department’s faculty.

Annex C: Schedule of the Review

The Panel met on Thursday 23rd November 2023 for the first day of the two-day Review to consider the material and interview the following individuals and groups: the Departmental leadership, the junior faculty, the taught postgraduates, the PhD students, and the Professional Service staff. On the second day, Friday 24th November, the Panel met the Professoriate, discussed its initial findings, and related them to the leadership of the Department. Meetings were held in the Vera Anstey Room on both days. This Panel Report was subsequently produced and has been circulated to SMC and the HoD for comment. The Report plus the comments of SMC and the HoD will be made available to the APRC meeting on 13 February 2024.

EUROPEAN INSTITUTE – DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO REVIEW PANEL REPORT*February 2024*

The Department would like to thank the Review Panel for its report. It was good to see that the Panel concluded that we are doing very well in most aspects of our work.

While we are glad that the Panel found it difficult to identify any significant issues with the Department's current state, we understand why the Panel also cautioned us against inertia and complacency going forward.

The theme of renewal was to the fore in a number of the Panel's recommendations, and we are enthusiastic about this ourselves. The Panel is right to insist that forward momentum will be needed to deal with future challenges and to further enhance our profile and the quality of our outputs.

The first recommendation is perhaps the most explicit in this regard. In its own way it is also the most challenging. Rather than spelling out a recommended course of action likely to yield a sought for outcome, there is a broad recommendation to explore the 'vision and identity' of the department:

Recommendation 1: The Department should continue to consider its vision and identity, with the aim of drawing out its distinctive features and developing a strategic vision of what it stands for and the direction in which it intends to develop.

This recommendation had been made orally at the conclusion of the Review, so we were not surprised to see it. Moreover, we entirely welcome it. Indeed, even before receiving the Review Panel Report we had already instigated the formation of a new working group tasked with thinking about the direction we intend to develop for the Department.

As we see it, this task involves thinking systematically about the formation of European Studies in 10 years' time. With this in view, we are establishing a working group that will host short presentations, from both inside and outside the LSE, to reflect on this theme. The meetings will be akin to our seminar series *Europe@LSE*, but with a focus on the future of the subject area. The HoD has convened a small working group comprising 7 selected faculty (the group will be discipline, sex, and age balanced) along with 3 additions: two doctoral students (one of whom works in the political economy of Europe – see Recommendation 2) and the EI's DM. This group will meet regularly at lunchtimes through term and will report back to the whole department at Department Staff Meetings when appropriate to do so. In addition, we will be using our established departmental structures to reflect on the teaching provision of the European Institute, reviewing our courses and programmes, exploring student demand and student recruitment, and opportunities for teaching innovation.

The task then is to work towards developing a sharper sense of an EI 'vision' of its contribution to the development of European Studies – something like an orienting self-understanding. We do not

regard this as urgent in the sense that we need to come up with something quickly. Nevertheless, it is urgent in the sense that we need to make a start now. In our meetings we will be keen to hear how colleagues and external experts imagine the subject area developing, and hence how we might imagine re-imagining ourselves too – including giving proper attention to the ongoing significance of the EI as a leader on the political economy of Europe (the substance of Recommendation 2 below).

Recommendation 2: In considering its future direction, the Department should ensure that it maintains its historic strength in terms of visibility as a leader on the political economy of Europe, including through real-world engagement.

As noted above, this is an excellent recommendation to feed into the reflections of our new working group. The HoD has invited a PEE doctoral student to join the working group (along with PEE faculty representatives) to ensure that this dimension of the EI's historic and current identity is kept clearly in view in our deliberations and discussions concerning our future.

Recommendation 3: The Department should investigate how it can further support and incentivise research grant applications, particularly for large and prestigious grants.

We recognise the research contribution that large grants can make, and firmly believe many colleagues are keen to pursue them, given the right support. In addition to the initiatives outlined in our review documentation, we shall be working with Susana Mourato to identify ways to improve our processes and to encourage applications.

Recommendation 4: The Department should ensure that Fellows have a suitable teaching workload which allows sufficient time for career development and that they clearly communicate the responsibilities and opportunities associated with the role to all Fellows.

The Department has been allocating mentors and conducting CDRs for LSE Fellows since 2017, which has only become a recent requirement School-wide. Additionally, we provide research funding for our Fellows, something which is currently not a requirement in the School. The European Institute is strongly committed to the development of all our Early Career Researchers.

Equity is at the heart of our workload model in the Department, with all full-time faculty expected to contribute 100 contact hours for teaching each year. LSE Fellows are not expected to teach more than senior members of faculty. The European Institute feels that any decision on teaching hours for Fellows should also be done on an equitable basis, i.e. School-wide. We would not oppose a policy of a slightly reduced teaching load for LSE Fellows (e.g. 80 hours), but the School would need to consider resource implications for smaller departments such as ours. LSE Fellows are often hired for sabbatical cover and buyouts, and on the assumption of like-for-like full-time cover, so a reduction below a full-time teaching load would need to be addressed centrally.

Recommendation 5: The Department should consider whether one of its vacant faculty positions could be filled at a senior level with the aim of providing additional senior leadership and visibility and increasing the Department's diversity.

We were absolutely delighted to have been given permission to upgrade one of our 3 pending Assistant Professor posts to Full Professor, via the single nomination process.

Some in the department objected to this kind of process in principle, preferring an open competition. However, there was sufficient weight in favour that we have agreed to go ahead. Objections from now on will be about prospective candidates, not the process of single nomination.

We have already made considerable headway. Following discussion with EI programme leads it was agreed that we should try to recruit someone working in the migration stream. A number of names were considered in discussions led by Eiko Thielmann with the migration group. One person was unanimously identified as a credible and genuinely exciting candidate.

LSE Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) Charles Stafford has overall responsibility for the single nomination process, and in discussion with the EI HoD six steps were identified as essential to making an appointment. These may prove useful elsewhere in the School so are worth spelling out. These are the steps we will take:

1. If we have more than one person we are interested in approaching, approach them *one at a time*. (We have only approached one person.)
2. If someone in the department has an existing connection to the person we are approaching, the first approach could come from them. (Our first approach went through Eiko Thielmann. The person we approached was content to discuss the proposal further.)
3. The prospective candidate then has a conversation with the Head of Department. (The EI's HoD met the prospective candidate in the middle of January and communicated that we are genuinely keen to explore the possibility of them joining us.) There is an additional step for the School to take inside this third step, led by the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development): the prospective candidate's work should be read by a specialist in the School outside the Department. The School also needs to be confident that a single nomination appointment is appropriate. (In this case, we received a quick and extremely positive report, and Charles was happy for us to proceed.) Following the HoD's meeting with the prospective candidate it was agreed that we could take the next step.
4. The proposal to appoint the prospective candidate by single nomination is discussed in the Department. The HoD invites everyone in the department to read the CV and selected work by the prospective candidate. There should be wide support for the proposal of inviting the prospective candidate to interview. We do *not* need unanimity, but the Department should not be badly split either. Supposing there is a clear majority supporting a YES from faculty, then:
5. We invite the prospective candidate to visit the Department and to meet people in person. Supposing there is (still) a YES from the prospective candidate, then:
6. The Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) convenes a Single Nomination Panel to consider the appointment of the candidate. The panel would comprise the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development), the Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee, 2 Relates (Professors in related departments in the School) and 2 Externals (specialists in the candidate's field). There will also be a presentation from the candidate to the Department. And then supposing there is no further impediment to making the appointment, the candidate is offered the job.

At the time of writing we are at Step 4. The prospective candidate is now known to the Department. However, like any job application there is a degree of confidentiality involved, and for now the identity of the prospective candidate is still not public.

Recommendation 6: More broadly, the Department should continue efforts to increase the diversity of its faculty and consider how this can be linked to diversity in research programme and taught curriculum.

Without going into detail, everything in our response to Recommendation 5 has been guided from the start by our ambition to maximise the chance of increasing the Department's diversity, especially at a senior level. As already indicated, we have chosen to link this to our teaching and research on migration. This process effectively began two years ago, with the appointment of a young scholar, Niina Vuolajarvi, who introduced a new option course entitled "Migration From Below: Theories and Lived Experiences of Borders". In only its second year, this course was re-designated a core course for the IMPP programme. An indication of the significance of the prospective candidate for the single nomination appointment is that *this course is largely based on that person's work*. Here's a link to the course:

https://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/courseGuides/EU/2023_EU4A8.htm

However, while efforts to maximise diversity is easier in a single nomination process, we have found this more challenging in traditional appointments, where candidates are unlikely to self-identify in their applications. Given that HR cannot share EDI data as part of the process, we would appreciate more support from the School in helping us – and across LSE – to ensure that job advertisements attract the broadest range of candidates. This might be considered both in composition and design of adverts, and how they are promoted.

Existing developments in the Department have mostly been part of our post-Brexit strategy of "internationalisation". However, they also bring in themes and viewpoints linked to diversity that go beyond that. Current efforts can be summarised as follows.

IMPP was a programme that had been focused almost exclusively on European migration *governance*. It is now far more receptive to questions concerning the migrant *experience* of that governance. The purpose of the new working group engaged with the Department's vision and identity will be, in part, to look at our engagement in European Studies overall to assess opportunities to cultivate viewpoint diversification across the department.

PEE already has two developments worth flagging up: a (very) new course "Political Economy of the Green Transition in Europe" (EU4A7) and a (relatively) new course "Europe in World Trade" (EU482). Both of these bring to bear global and planetary themes into the purview of our studies of Europe. A new Assistant Professor appointment, currently in process, seeks to recruit a political economist with teaching expertise that covers Europe and its international links, including with China. It should be noted, as we explained in the Review, that we are revising the programme's title to MSc Political Economy of Europe in the World (**PEEW**) from AY 2025/26.

EIPP has already seen considerable reformation: originally a degree focused on the politics of European integration it now seeks to explore internal and external European policy making. An Associate Professor in the EIPP group is currently applying to become a Jean Monnet Chair. That application speaks to the identity issue that has been the centre of our existing ambitions to re-imagine the European Institute: it's about the need to internationalise our teaching on the EU. A new Assistant Professor appointment, currently in process, seeks to recruit a political scientist whose work has clear policy relevance, another aspect of the programme that needs strengthening.

CCGE has had a sharp eye on Eurocentrism since its inception and is a focal theme of one of the core courses “The Culture of European Politics” (EU478). A recent addition to the programme’s course portfolio is “The Americas and Europe” (EU4A3). That course examines the role played by the idea of the Americas in the European imaginary and examines ‘Europe’, in turn, from the American context. By looking into processes of colonisation, modernisation, globalisation, and decolonisation, the course introduces themes and perspectives previously unavailable on this programme.

Conclusion

The Department Review was a significant event for the European Institute. As the Panel’s Report notes, the last review did not go well. It is probably worth reporting that the sense of *relief* in the Department that the Review passed without drama initially eclipsed a sense of *pride* that the Review had generally been so positive. It is thus appropriate to stress in conclusion that we really are proud of our achievements. As a centre for the study of Europe in Europe, the European Institute has a record that would surely be the envy of other such centres. Our staff and students are proud to be part of the European Institute – and proud too to be valued by the LSE.

SMC considered the European Institute report at its meeting on 30 January 2024. SMC’s considerations are summarised in the minutes of the meeting:

	4. European Institute Review Report (SMC/117)	
NOTED		That the report was positive overall, with the Institute presenting as one with engaged and happy students and staff.
		The key issue for the Institute was the need to formulate and articulate their place and role in a post-Brexit Britain as an entity named the European Institute, or to consider whether this was still appropriate.
		The diversity of Centres attached to the Institute and their role across the School; and further noted their interest in hosting the Fudan partnership.
AGREED	4.1	SMC approved the report to progress to APRC; and would welcome discussion there on the Institute’s interaction with CIVICA, their interest in partnerships and double degree programmes, and the Institute’s ambitions. ACTION: Eric Neumayer to ensure APRC minutes encourage further engagement with CIVICA, and flag other areas of SMC interest.
	4.2	Discussed the recommendation to the School under 6.2; noting that a number of related projects were in development, and would impact on this recommendation in the next 12 months. ACTION: Andrew Young and Joanne Hay to consider the recommendation and take forward appropriate action.
	4.3	That it would be beneficial in future discussions of Departmental Review reports for SMC to consider the relevant Self-Evaluation Document alongside it. ACTION: Executive Office to ensure this is enacted for future Departmental Review items.

Review of the School of Public Policy

Background and purpose

The APRC review of the School of Public Policy was carried out in January 2024. Dr Raphael Wittenberg attended the review on behalf of the Research Committee.

Actions Required and next steps

Committee is asked to note the research related recommendations of the report:

- The SPP should continue its active global outreach and engagement while ensuring that these engagements support its broader strategic aims. In doing so it should ensure that it is working with rather than competing with existing provisions at LSE, and in ways which further its vision.
- The SPP should consider how it can enhance and develop its research culture to support existing and future faculty (including potentially instituting a research seminar series), working to engage with interested colleagues from across the School.

APRC is not looking for feedback on the review process itself at this stage.

REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Purpose of paper	For the Committee to consider the Review Panel Report (Annex A) on the School of Public Policy (SPP) and decide on the recommendations including whether or not to release the SPP from Review.
Background	<p>The first round of regular in-depth Academic Planning and Resources Committee (APRC) Reviews of Academic Departments finished in the 2018/19 academic year. Following a gap, arrangements for another round of Reviews starting in 2021/22 were confirmed.</p> <p>As part of the Review process APRC receives the Review report and is asked to agree the recommendations.</p>
Recommendations	For the Committee to agree the recommendations including not releasing the SPP from Review.
Previous consultation including subcommittee approvals	The Dean of the SPP had the opportunity to identify factual corrections at the end of the report's drafting stage. The SPP has provided a commentary (Annex B) and the School Management Committee has provided a response (Annex C) to the report. There is no approval process beyond APRC.
Strategic context	A Department Review considers whether a Departments' activities and plans, and proposed investments in them, are in keeping with the strategic aims of the School.
Risk assessment and mitigation	N/A
Financial considerations	A Department Review considers a Department's plans for strategic development, recruitment, and revenue generation, its workload allocation model, and its income/expenditure position, and if and how they might be improved.
Inclusivity considerations	A Department Review takes into account inclusivity considerations.
Ethical considerations	A Department Review takes into account the six core principles in the Ethics code.
Environmental considerations	N/A
Next steps including required committee approvals	APRC is the decision making body for next steps for the Review process.
Author Name	Evert Nivari Senior Planning Officer (Policy and Review)
Report Sponsor	Professor Eric Neumayer Pro-Vice Chancellor Planning and Resources
Release of Paper	<p>To be determined by APRC.</p> <p>APRC has withheld some Review Reports in the past where it has considered that releasing the report may prejudice the effective conduct of School affairs due to the sensitive nature of issues discussed.</p>

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY – DEPARTMENT REVIEW PANEL REPORT

January 2024

1. Background

- 1.1 The first round of regular in-depth Academic Planning and Resources Committee (APRC) Reviews of Academic Department, re-instated beginning in 2014/15, finished in the 2018/19 academic year. Following a gap, arrangements for another round of Reviews starting in 2021/22 were confirmed, including the merger of the old Student Affairs Committee (ASC) Reviews into a single, School-wide Department Review process (carried out by APRC with input from Education Committee and Research Committee). The Review of the School of Public Policy (SPP) took place in the third year of the new round.
- 1.2 As of 2023/24 the SPP has resources equivalent to 8.3 FTE Professors, 4.6 FTE Associate Professors, 3.9 FTE Assistant Professors and 8.1 FTE LSE Fellows. This includes c 8 FTE resources used to “buy in” faculty from other departments. Faculty appointed within the SPP itself comprise: 2.2 FTE Professors, 2.4 FTE Professors of Practice, and 3.5 FTE other faculty above the LSE Fellow level. The SPP also has 9.5 FTE Professional Services Staff (PSS) posts. The Institute of Public Affairs (IPA) was established in 2011 as an umbrella group for the MPA programme(s), which did not have significant further areas of activity. From 2013 onward it was allowed to develop its activity first as an Institute and, from 2018, as a Department under the name of School of Public Policy (SPP). This is the first Department Review undertaken of this area, although significant review and negotiation accompanied the previous developments.
- 1.3 The SPP has three standard taught postgraduate programmes as well as three double degree programmes (where students follow one of the standard programmes during their LSE year), with a total of 342 students across these in 2022/23 (one of the programmes, the MPA in Data Science for Public Policy, is new in 2023/24). The core MPA also benefits from dual degree arrangements with several partners. It also has three executive MSc programmes with a total of 165 students across these in 2022/23. It does not provide undergraduate teaching or have PhD students. The Department’s scores in internal student satisfaction surveys have varied along with the School’s overall results, but are generally around or above the School average and have improved in recent years.

2. Membership of the Panel

- 2.1 Internal members of the Review Panel (Panel) were: Professor Eric Neumayer (Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Planning and Resources)) as Chair, Professor Emma McCoy (Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)), Professor Julia Black (Strategic Director of Innovation), Professor Pauline Barrieu and Professor Steve Pischke (APRC), Raphael Wittenberg (Research Committee), and Dr Kieran Oberman (Education Committee).
- 2.2 Four external expert members were recruited to the Panel to assess the comparable standards of the Department with other institutions and to suggest improvements to the Department: Professor Atif Mian (Princeton), Professor Lant Pritchett (Oxford), Professor Miguel Urquiola (Columbia), and Arancha González (Sciences Po). **Annex A** gives their profiles.

3. Approach of the Panel

- 3.1 **Annex B** gives the advance information received by the Panel. **Annex C** gives the two-day Review schedule.
- 3.2 The Panel thanked the Department for its proactive and constructive engagement with the Review and for the detailed, well-structured and clearly articulated Self-Evaluation Document (SED).

4. Key Findings and Recommendations

- 4.1 Overall the SPP has made very significant progress since it was founded in its current form, and the Panel was impressed with how it has developed since its inception and was broadly supportive of its plans for the future. The SPP has now entered a new phase where it is continuing to find its own path as an independent entity

(albeit one that uses significant resources to “buy in” faculty from multiple for the purpose of teaching on its degrees and is very likely to continue doing so if potentially at a somewhat lower level). The Panel was broadly in accordance with its vision for its strategy and profile. However, the SPP must do a better job of clearly articulating this vision, including better clarifying and showcasing its distinctive features and making sure it lives up to the “global” aspect of the vision. The Panel also felt that the SPP should, for the near-to-medium term future, concentrate on consolidating its position rather than aiming for further growth in student numbers.

- 4.2 A key area of the SPP’s vision for moving to the next level as a Department is hiring its own academic research and teaching career track faculty (faculty on the New Academic Career (NAC) track in LSE’s terminology), which was supported by the Panel (at Professor and Associate Professor level only, for the time being). As a first step towards expanding its faculty, the SPP should consider whether some faculty members from other Departments who do much of their teaching in the SPP could be given fractional or full appointments in the SPP. The SPP will be able to free up resources for hiring by reducing the amount of teaching it “buys in” from other departments and potentially by converting (at most two) LSE Fellow posts to NAC positions.
- 4.3 The key issue to be resolved in allowing the SPP to hire new NAC faculty is the process by which appointments are made, given the SPP’s current lack of a sufficiently large professoriate (and absence of Associate Professors) of its own. The Panel considered two basic models for appointing NAC faculty into the SPP via creating a ‘virtual’ Professoriate. The APRC is asked to consider the merits of these two models (see sections 5.7 to 5.10).
- 4.4 The SPP is well-led and well-organised and the leadership should be commended for the progress made in recent years. However, the Panel noted some issues in the SPP’s relationships with other departments and with those faculty who contribute to its activities without being appointed into the SPP itself. In both areas, the SPP needs to take active steps to rebuild relationships and build support for its strategic direction though naturally both sides are called upon in undertaking such endeavours. The Panel recommended that the SPP establishes one or two coordinating committees with membership from contributing departments to improve awareness and communication at both strategic and practical levels, and that it consider ways in which it can build a stronger SPP-centred community that is inclusive of faculty at all levels with different degrees of involvement in the SPP.
- 4.5 The SPP’s educational provision is of very good quality, with mostly satisfied or very satisfied students (and improvements in survey scores in recent years) and clear evidence that it is committed to delivering a high-quality student experience. The main issues raised by its students centred around the fit of the curriculum and optional courses to the diverse student body, and the SPP should ensure that it is doing what it can to resolve tensions in this area.
- 4.6 The SPP has not had a significant Departmental research culture in the past. Going forward, as it recruits NAC staff it must ensure that it builds a strong and supportive research culture as well as cultivating links with disciplinary departments.
- 4.7 The SPP has a unique faculty model and therefore relatively few directly employed faculty. However, it does well to support those faculty it does have and the Panel was pleased to hear that faculty of all kinds understand their roles, are satisfied with their workload and with the environment. Going forward, the SPP must ensure that structures for supporting and empowering faculty continue to be appropriate for the size of the faculty, and must pay close attention to diversity at all levels (reflecting its global ambitions and its diverse student body). It also needs to work with the School and relevant Heads of Department to more systematically feed in to CDR reports and meetings for faculty whose teaching it buys in. It should also make use of its ability to contribute to salary increases for those faculty based in other departments who contribute to its work.
- 4.8 The SED contains a number of requests for additional resources in the areas of faculty and PSS, but the Panel was not keen to support additional unfunded expenditure given the SPP is not under-resourced according to School metrics. The SPP should consider making a case for converting (up to two) LSE Fellow posts to NAC positions to support its recruitment strategy, and could also consider making a case for an additional PSS post in the area of student recruitment. The Panel acknowledged the SPP’s difficult position regarding space and encouraged the School to allocate additional space once this becomes available in the Centre Buildings.

Recommendation 1: The SPP should clarify its strategic vision to highlight its distinctive features and global nature, and consider how this vision to become ‘the most globally relevant school of public policy and public action’ (or similar) can be better showcased to both internal and external audiences, including students and potential donors.

Recommendation 2: The SPP should, in the short- to medium-term, focus on consolidation of its position rather than pursuing further growth in student numbers.

Recommendation 3: The SPP should consider whether any faculty from other Departments with a long-term and significant stake in its work would like to fully transfer into the SPP on an open-ended basis or could be made joint appointments with a fractional role in the SPP either on an open-ended basis or on a fixed-term basis for a number of years. The SPP should also consider reducing, over time, its reliance on “buying in” teaching from other Departments which would free up resources for hiring NAC (or other) faculty directly into the SPP. The SPP should consider whether it wishes to make a case to the Vice President Planning and Resources to convert up to two existing LSE Fellow (or other) posts into permanent NAC posts.

Recommendation 4: In appointing new NAC faculty, a ‘virtual’ Professoriate should be created for decision-making on the appointability of candidates.

Recommendation 5: The SPP and relevant other Departments whose faculty teach on SPP degrees should work together to establish one or more coordinating committees (covering both a strategic level and an operational level, to be chaired by a member of SMC if appropriate) to improve coordination and help information flow.

Recommendation 6: For those located in other Departments but with a significant share of their overall teaching on SPP degrees, the SPP and their home Department should consider coming to a longer-term arrangement (e.g., for three years, potentially renewable) and should either extend full rights and duties to them for the time of their engagement or full consultation rights. In any case, with the involvement of the Vice President Faculty Development the SPP should take steps to build an inclusive culture and community, nurturing the links it has with faculty from other Departments who teach for the SPP.

Recommendation 7: The SPP, working with cognate Departments, should continue to review its curricula to ensure that students have enough choice in terms of electives and that core teaching is at a suitable level for all students given heterogeneity in prior skills and experience and interests of students.

Recommendation 8: The SPP should continue its active global outreach and engagement while ensuring that these engagements support its broader strategic aims. In doing so it should ensure that it is working with rather than competing with existing provisions at LSE, and in ways which further its vision.

Recommendation 9: The SPP should consider how it can enhance and develop its research culture to support existing and future faculty (including potentially instituting a research seminar series), working to engage with interested colleagues from across the School.

Recommendation 10: The SPP should, going forward, pay very close attention to issues of diversity at all levels and make this a priority in any future hiring.

Recommendation 11: The SPP should work with other Departments and the School to ensure that it is systematically feeding in to CDRs and other review and promotion activities carried out in the home Departments of faculty involved in the SPP. It should ensure that it is fully aware of, and makes use of, its ability to offer both one-off payments and additional salary increments during annual contribution pay rounds to faculty based in other Departments to reward outstanding contributions to education and citizenship within the SPP.

Recommendation 12: The SPP should consider, via future Annual Monitoring processes, submitting a potential request for lowering its student intake target (if it so wishes) and should consider a potential request for an additional PSS post in the area of student recruitment.

Recommendation for the School 1: The SPP should be given the right to directly appoint NAC faculty at Professor and Associate Professor levels, including as sole appointments.

Recommendation for the School 2: APRC should take a decision on whether it regards model A or model B (or indeed some other model) as appropriate, always keeping in mind that specific details beyond the fundamental principles implied by any appointment model should be left to the discretion of the Vice President Faculty Development, in consultation with the Vice President Planning and Resources and the Dean of the SPP.

Recommendation for the School 3: The School should give priority consideration to the SPP should additional space in the Centre Building become available if an existing unit were to move out of the building.

Recommendation for the School 4: The Department should be kept under Review until the appointment process of NAC faculty has been clarified and has proven to work successfully in practice and the other recommendations have been put in place. This implies that the Dean of the SPP can ask APRC via the Vice President Planning and Resources to reconsider the appointment model if they regard the agreed-upon recruitment process as not delivering on the strategic objectives of the SPP.

5. Academic Overview and Developments

- 5.1 The SPP has made very significant and in many ways impressive progress since it was established in its current form and is doing very well in many areas of its activity. The Panel was impressed with the growth in student numbers (albeit wondering whether student number expansion has gone a little bit too far) and with the ambition and enthusiasm of the SPP, as well as being broadly supportive of the plans outlined in the SED. The SPP has now moved well beyond where it is the offspring of the Departments which formerly owned the Master of Public Administration (MPA) programme. Instead, it is an independent entity with its own vision and path forward, albeit one that should continue to foster strong links with these other cognate Departments. The Panel noted that this stage of continuing development is naturally likely to result in some tension with cognate Departments, which the SPP together with these cognate Departments as well as the School as a whole must navigate as it continues to develop its activities, consolidates its position and moves forward along the strategic lines it has identified.
- 5.2 The SED outlines a vision for the SPP as “the world’s leading global school of public policy”. The Panel was initially unsure how to interpret this ambition but after further probing agreed that what transpired as being meant by this is likely to be suitable as a distinct vision and identity for the SPP to pursue – but that its articulation must be rendered much clearer. That the SPP should aim to be the most globally relevant school of public policy and, perhaps, “public action” (as suggested by one member of the Panel) is very much a suitable vision and one that the SPP is able to realistically strive to achieve given LSE’s and the SPP’s unique comparative advantages. However, the SPP should articulate its vision in a clearer way that outlines what is meant by “global” and what is truly distinctive about the SPP compared to its peers. The mix in the SPP’s taught offer between rigorous academic and often theoretically orientated teaching and more clearly policy-crafting and practical policy implementation-oriented teaching has moved significantly towards the latter as it has developed its programmes and the Panel now felt that this mix is approximately at the right level. Students were appreciative of both elements of their programmes, and the general feeling across the Panel and those it met with was that being firmly anchored in academic rigour makes the programme attractive and distinctive. However, while the mix and the vision for how it is implemented in practice was clear to the Panel, it was felt that more could be done to clarify this for external audiences, both for students and for e.g. potential donors. The SPP should continue to work both on formulating and refining the vision with a real focus on distinctive elements and on show-casing itself to interested parties, as well as reviewing how it communicates the distinctiveness of its offer. In doing so, it should also ensure that it defines and truly lives up to the “global” aspect of its vision, continuing to work to understand the needs of global audiences in different policy contexts and ensuring that it is providing relevant training and teaching.

Recommendation 1: The SPP should clarify its strategic vision to highlight its distinctive features and global nature, and consider how this vision to become ‘the most globally relevant school of public policy and public action’ (or similar) can be better showcased to both internal and external audiences, including students and potential donors.

- 5.3 The SPP has grown rapidly in terms of student numbers since its inception, and the Panel considered that for the next five-year period it should enter a phase of consolidation. While student number growth has been substantial, recruitment against targets has not always been easily achieved, and the Panel heard the view expressed by some that the quality of students admitted at the margin has sometimes been variable. Accordingly, the Panel recommends that the SPP does not aim to grow student numbers (at least on existing programmes or those that might target the same market) in the short- to medium-term. Instead, it should focus on increasing the number of applications in order to allow it to be even more selective. The Panel is mindful that the relative lack of scholarships compared to its peers does represent a major impediment. It commends the SPP for its efforts and recent success in this regard and agrees that the School needs to revise some of its processes and policies in order to help the SPP make better use of existing scholarship funding. Instead of further growth, the SPP should focus on raising more scholarship funding as well as developing other areas of its provision. Hiring academic career track faculty directly into the Department (as outlined below) and integrating them into an evolving Departmental research culture and Departmental identity will form one aspect of this. With a stronger and more secure foundation the SPP will then be in a good position to further consider its direction at the time of the next Department Review.

Recommendation 2: The SPP should, in the short- to medium-term, focus on consolidation of its position rather than pursuing further growth in student numbers.

- 5.4 The SED submitted for the Review makes a clear request to enable the SPP to move to the next level in its development: for it to be able to appoint academic career-track faculty (faculty on the New Academic Career (NAC) track in LSE’s terminology) directly into the Department and potentially exclusively so (rather than faculty having to be formally based, in part or in full, in other Departments). Broadly, everyone met by the Panel was supportive of the SPP having a larger core group of NAC faculty and being able to directly appoint such faculty, and the Panel agreed that this is an important step in enabling the SPP to further develop over time. The Panel therefore recommends that in order to support its vision and strategy, the SPP be given the right to appoint NAC faculty at Professor and Associate Professor levels directly, including as sole appointments. While there was some disagreement within the Panel around the merits of joint appointments with other cognate Departments, it was broadly felt that making most or even all future appointments solely in the SPP avoids complications and more strongly supports the development of an SPP identity and community and a core NAC faculty who buy into the SPP’s mission. For the time being, the SPP only has three NAC Professors, only two of which are directly involved with the core SPP teaching programmes, and therefore the Panel did not feel that Assistant Professor-level faculty could be adequately supported in terms of career development (nor did the SED ask for this); once the SPP has built up a larger group of core NAC faculty then the hiring of Assistant Professors could be considered at the next Department Review or, with APRC permission, beforehand.

Recommendation for the School 1: The SPP should be given the right to directly appoint NAC faculty at Professor and Associate Professor levels, including as sole appointments.

- 5.5 As a first step towards expanding the SPP’s own NAC faculty, there are already several faculty members from other Departments who do much and sometimes even all or almost all of their teaching in the SPP and are committed to helping it develop; the SPP should look, where possible and in consultation with and consent of the faculty involved and their home Departments, to bring such people into the SPP either full-time and on an open-ended basis or on fractional joint appointments (roughly proportional to their existing teaching commitment) either on an open-ended or a fixed-term basis of, for example, three to five years. This would formalise their membership of the SPP community (giving them full voting and other citizenship rights and a greater sense of belonging) and help in making clear to their current home Departments the citizenship and other informal services they can rightfully expect from such faculty in their own Departments, which the Panel heard can currently be an issue.

- 5.6 The SPP currently “buys in” a total of around 8 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty from other Departments to deliver its teaching. While the Panel was clear that this figure is not likely or necessarily desirable to be 0 FTE now or in the future, this figure will go down in nominal terms if the SPP follows the recommendation in 5.5 above. Beyond that, the SPP will be able to free up resources for hiring new NAC or, if it so chooses, other faculty directly into the SPP through reducing, over time, the amount of remaining teaching it “buys in” and replacing it with teaching by SPP-based faculty. Additional NAC hiring opportunities can also be freed up by converting existing LSE Fellow (or other) positions into permanent NAC posts, with the permission of the Vice President Planning and Resources – up to two could be converted. The Panel did not feel that the allocation of any additional faculty posts is needed at this stage to support hiring, as existing resources should be sufficient to enable hiring for a good number of years to come. Of note, to the extent that the c. 8 FTE of teaching “buy-in” are reduced via hiring new staff directly into the SPP (who are not currently employed by the LSE elsewhere) there is already a net additional cost to the LSE overall which would be covered by LSE. The same applies for converting up to 2 existing LSE fellow posts into NAC faculty lines.

Recommendation 3: The SPP should consider whether any faculty from other Departments with a long-term and significant stake in its work would like to fully transfer into the SPP on an open-ended basis or could be made joint appointments with a fractional role in the SPP either on an open-ended basis or on a fixed-term basis for a number of years. The SPP should also consider reducing, over time, its reliance on “buying in” teaching from other Departments which would free up resources for hiring NAC (or other) faculty directly into the SPP. The SPP should consider whether it wishes to make a case to the Vice President Planning and Resources to convert up to two existing LSE Fellow (or other) posts into permanent NAC posts.

- 5.7 If the SPP is to directly appoint its own NAC faculty, the key issue to be resolved is the process by which appointments are made, and the tension between the SPP’s independence and the need to bring in Professorial oversight to ensure quality control in hiring. The SPP’s very limited NAC professoriate is not currently of sufficient size compared to the size of the Professoriate or, given that Associate Professors often have a say in the appointment of NAC staff below the Professorial level, the size of the combined Associate Professor and Professor staff in other Departments. Although the Panel stressed that recent hiring in the SPP has been very successful and outstanding candidates have been appointed, a larger professoriate naturally leads to more diverse discussion, a wider range of suggestions and a more rigorous and in-depth process with a higher level of scrutiny of potential candidates. The Panel also noted that top candidates may well be attracted by a hiring process that involves full validation or involvement by disciplinary Departments at LSE.
- 5.8 The Panel considered two basic models for appointing NAC faculty into the SPP on a strictly time-limited basis until the next Departmental Review at which point the SPP may well have its own senior NAC faculty of sufficient size. The first model, call it model A, would ask the professoriate of relevant other Departments to stand in and, together with the SPP’s existing NAC Professors, form a ‘virtual’ SPP Professoriate that takes a view on and votes on applicants to NAC posts, following whatever recruitment process they would use for their own hiring (e.g., how applicants are ‘vetted’ and how and what number of reference letters are sought). Departments would be asked to ensure that any candidates are of suitable academic quality, but, crucially, would need to keep in mind the particular requirements and practical orientation of the SPP. For model A to have any chance of being successful it is essential that the Professors in cognate Departments such as Economics and Government understand that being a successful Professor in the SPP typically requires a somewhat different profile from being a successful Professor in their own Departments. The Panel also recommended that, where appropriate, this external validation be recognised by e.g. appointing faculty as “Professor of Public Policy *and Economics*”, by including them as an affiliated member of the relevant academic Department, or through other similar mechanisms, including potentially, where appropriate, making a joint appointment. If it is unclear which is the relevant other Department’s Professoriate for any particular candidate under model A, then this decision is for the Vice President Faculty Development to take in consultation with the Dean of the SPP.
- 5.9 The second model, call it model B, would empower all those Professors of the School currently listed as faculty on the SPP website at <https://www.lse.ac.uk/school-of-public-policy/people> to form and function as a ‘virtual’ SPP Professoriate going forward until the next Departmental review. It is understood that some of the Professors listed there may currently only have a small involvement with the SPP and may well wish to opt-out from being

included in this 'virtual' SPP Professoriate. Conversely, since this list may lack sufficient diversity on one or more dimensions the Dean of the SPP should have the right to propose to the Vice President Faculty Development the inclusion of further suitable Professors from across the School either on a permanent basis (until the next Departmental review) or specifically for a specific recruitment search. Within model B, the recruitment process to be followed (e.g., how applicants are 'vetted' and how and what number of reference letters are sought) would be for the Vice President Faculty Development to decide with a view toward customary practice in most Departments across the School and in consultation with the Dean of the SPP.

- 5.10 Both models have their respective advantages and disadvantages. It would in principle be possible to adopt one model for one recruitment search and the other model for another search depending on the specification of the role. It is unclear at this stage whether the Professoriates of other Departments are willing to take on the extra work that comes with model A, particularly given their Department will not directly benefit from the appointment. In either model, in line with recruitment practices of other Departments there needs to be a smaller Departmental 'search committee' which is pro-active in its recruitment efforts and undertakes the long- and proposed shortlisting of applicants, recognizing that the actual formal shortlisting of candidates is undertaken by a School-level appointment panel. Given that in either model A or B, the NAC Professors of the SPP itself are in the minority for the foreseeable future in terms of decision-making on the appointability of candidates and recommendations made to the School-level appointment panel, which takes the final decisions on who is appointed, the Dean of the SPP should have considerable leeway in deciding on the composition of this 'search committee', which could also, as appropriate, include 'of Practice' and Education Career Track faculty from the SPP as well as NAC faculty from other Departments.

Recommendation 4: In appointing new NAC faculty, a 'virtual' Professoriate should be created for decision-making on the appointability of candidates.

Recommendation for the School 2: APRC should take a decision on whether it regards model A or model B (or indeed some other model) as appropriate, always keeping in mind that specific details beyond the fundamental principles implied by any appointment model should be left to the discretion of the Vice President Faculty Development, in consultation with the Vice President Planning and Resources and the Dean of the SPP.

- 5.11 As the SPP has developed its independence, the Panel felt that relationships between the SPP and the Departments whose faculty provide teaching for SPP degrees have become unnecessarily strained and complicated. Both sides have legitimate issues with failures in coordination and collaboration, particularly in the area of teaching delivery and staffing, and this is an area that causes both an unduly high workload for the SPP and frustration around uncertainty for other Departments. Coordination between the SPP and other Departments does work well in many areas (of which the Panel heard examples), but these tend to be one-off or more "win-win" in nature, such as collaboration on research or events. The Panel noted that the contribution of other Departments is essential to the SPP's teaching delivery. This is an area where structural changes along with a change in the overall culture can make a big improvement in how things operate. The Panel noted the bilateral engagements which the Dean of the SPP had with heads of Department but thought this needed to be supplemented with a more coordinated approach. A committee previously existed which facilitated coordination around teaching arrangements and the Panel felt that this should be reinstated in some form to help information flow and help build relationships and goodwill. Given that the SPP will need to continue to work with other Departments and make use of their faculty going forward, the Panel recommends that one or two coordination (not governance) committee or committees be established with the aim of improving coordination and the relationship between the SPP and relevant related Departments, to operate at both a more strategic level, focussed on helping Departments understand the SPP's strategic direction and how they contribute to its work as well as e.g. developing new courses or sharing developments in other Departments which may in turn interest the SPP, and at a more operational level, focussed on arrangements for teaching delivery, service contribution and staffing (for example, cognate Departments noted their desire to agree longer-term "buy in" arrangements for individual faculty and thus greater stability). It may be more appropriate to separate this business into two separate committees, with representation from the SPP and interested Departments at an appropriate level (e.g. Heads of Department at the former and Programme Directors at the latter) and with the latter group meeting more regularly but the Panel had no strong view on this particular aspect. It was also suggested that the

committee(s) could, if desirable, be chaired by a party representing the wider interest of the School, such as the Vice President (Education) or another member of the School Management Committee (SMC), at least initially.

Recommendation 5: The SPP and relevant other Departments whose faculty teach on SPP degrees should work together to establish one or more coordinating committees (covering both a strategic level and an operational level, to be chaired by a member of SMC if appropriate) to improve coordination and help information flow.

6. Leadership, Management and Organisation of the Department

- 6.1 The Panel commended the leadership of the SPP for having successfully led it through a time of major development since its creation. The Panel was also particularly impressed with the Professional Services Staff (PSS) team, which is well-organised and led and delivers a high quality of service. The Panel heard of a high degree of satisfaction and collegiality among PS staff, LSE Fellows, Education Career Track (ECT) and 'of Practice' faculty who are directly employed by the SPP. The Panel was impressed with the SPP staff and its leadership and pleased to see their high level of engagement and passion for the SPP and its mission.
- 6.2 Given its current staffing model the SPP faces a particular issue in how it organises and involves faculty from other Departments who teach on SPP degrees. The Panel heard that there is currently a divide between those faculty who are directly employed in the SPP and those who are located in other Departments but contribute to SPP teaching. It was felt that this has the potential to devolve into an "us-vs-them" divide over time and the SPP should, accordingly, take steps to more fully include the full range of faculty who contribute to its activities in an inclusive SPP community. The Panel heard that some faculty who have, in some cases, long-standing and significant involvement with the SPP felt disenfranchised and that they have no voice in its working or are somewhat estranged from its activities and feel insufficiently valued for their contributions. On the other hand, the SPP noted that faculty from other Departments who teach on SPP degrees are sometimes perceived as not contributing sufficiently to citizenship and other informal activities within the SPP.
- 6.3 This does represent a real problem and unfortunately causes a feeling of grievance on both sides. The Panel's understanding was that there are some "low-hanging fruits" in this area, such as: always and fully including all faculty who teach on SPP programmes in communications to ensure they are updated on developments, increasing the number of social events of all kinds, facilitating and encouraging co-teaching (as a means of building social bonds) and broader involvement in research activity and seminars or other events. However, the issue will not be resolved with such means only.
- 6.4 A particular challenge will be greater inclusion of those faculty from other Departments with significant teaching (e.g., more than 40% or some other suitable fraction of their overall teaching) within the SPP but who for perfectly valid reasons do not wish to take up any potential offer of an open-ended or fixed-term joint appointment with the SPP (see 5.5 above). Not being either fully or partly formally appointed into the SPP, one could make the argument that they cannot and should not expect the same full set of rights as those formally appointed into the SPP. However, devoting a significant portion of their teaching to the SPP and often on a historically long-term basis does mean that they have a real stake in the SPP and its future direction which should be adequately accounted for. One could make the argument that in all but name these faculty are in effect internally seconded to the SPP for part of their employment. Looked at from this perspective, one could make the argument that they should have the same rights and duties as staff directly employed by the SPP. In any case, for those faculty from other Departments with significant teaching contributions on a historically long-term basis, the SPP should consider coming to a longer-term arrangement (e.g., for three years, potentially renewable) with their home Departments (see also 5.5 above).
- 6.5 One option is for the SPP to unilaterally and, one could argue given the above ambiguity, generously extend full 'citizenship rights' to such faculty in which case the SPP correspondingly could and should expect full citizenship contributions from faculty, pro rata to their significant teaching contribution. Another option is to provide such faculty with full consultation but not voting rights such that they could always voice their views on strategic and major operational matters. Even then, some citizenship contribution would rightly be expected of them as rights should always come with corresponding duties. Either way, it is important that faculty from other Departments with significant teaching within the SPP feel involved with the SPP's mission and valued as important members

of the SPP community. Whichever option is taken at the discretion of the SPP, the SPP should take steps to build an inclusive culture and community, nurturing the links it has with faculty from other Departments who teach for the SPP. The Panel was under no illusion that this will take time and will require good will and real engagement from both sides as well as the involvement of the Vice President Faculty Development.

Recommendation 6: For those located in other Departments but with a significant share of their overall teaching on SPP degrees, the SPP and their home Department should consider coming to a longer-term arrangement (e.g., for three years, potentially renewable) and should either extend full rights and duties to them for the time of their engagement or full consultation rights. In any case, with the involvement of the Vice President Faculty Development the SPP should take steps to build an inclusive culture and community, nurturing the links it has with faculty from other Departments who teach for the SPP.

7. Education, Teaching and the Student Experience

7.1 The SPP's portfolio of taught programmes and its size in terms of student numbers have both grown significantly in recent years. It now has, in addition to the Master of Public Administration (MPA) and MPA dual and double degree arrangements a one-year Master of Public Policy (MPP) and, from 2023/24, a MPA in Data Science for Public Policy. It also has three executive programmes, including one located in LSE Cities. Scores on student surveys are broadly good to very good and have improved significantly in recent years. The SPP is also cognisant of where further work needs to be done. The feedback from students received by the Panel was largely positive, and the Panel felt that overall the SPP's educational offer is strong. It clearly cares deeply about delivering a high-quality and academically rigorous education and student experience with a distinctive policy orientation. Given the heterogeneity of the SPP's student body it sometimes faces issues with heterogeneous student expectations and the fit of the curriculum to varied student demands, and the Panel felt that the relatively minor concerns raised by students in this area should be taken seriously. The SPP should also continue its efforts to provide career support and other similar extracurricular benefits to students, ensuring that it listens to students and provides as attractive an overall offer as possible. Overall, however, the SPP's educational offer is of high quality and there are no major concerns.

7.2 Students on the SPP's programmes clearly value the education they receive, and also showed that they value the contributions of teachers from other Departments to their education (although they did note something of a divide between teachers who come from within the SPP and from other Departments in terms of the level of engagement, which the SPP will hopefully be able to take steps to lessen through stronger community-building). The main issues reported by students centred on the appropriateness of the curriculum (e.g. in terms of the theoretical focus of quantitative courses) and the availability of suitable choices (e.g. for those wanting to specialise in a specific policy area). Given the varied backgrounds of the SPP's students this is not unexpected, but the SPP should ensure it regularly reviews the curriculum with a view to both making sure that core courses are focussed on truly core requirements and deliver on learning objectives for the whole student body, and allowing students as much actual choice as possible (within the constraints of the School and the cohesiveness of the overall programme). It should also ensure that it is managing student expectations regarding access to electives (as well as working with other Departments to broaden access to courses offered by them where possible).

Recommendation 7: The SPP, working with cognate Departments, should continue to review its curricula to ensure that students have enough choice in terms of electives and that core teaching is at a suitable level for all students given heterogeneity in prior skills and experience and interests of students.

8. Research

8.1 Given its limited-size NAC faculty and policy orientation, the SPP has not had a significant internal research culture in the past. The SED outlines two priorities for the SPP in the area of research; the first being recruitment of new NAC faculty and the second being the establishment of the SPP as a hub for impact and for policy-oriented research. The Panel supported the SPP's aim to expand its global outreach and engagement work and suggested to consider developing policy case studies drawing on a broad geographical base in furtherance of the SPP's vision. However, the panel was not keen on the idea of becoming a hub for impact and for policy-

oriented work being done across the School as doing so would likely overlap with, or duplicate, work done elsewhere in the School. The Panel stressed that the SPP should be cognisant of what is already done elsewhere and mindful of the need to work with other units to complement rather than compete with their activities. For example, some of what the SPP would like to do (as a unit) in terms of engagement with global policy-makers and evidence-based policymaking is similar to work carried out by the International Growth Centre (IGC), and similarly there is already a central School service for supporting impact and the creation of impact case studies, so investment in duplicate work may not be desirable. Going forward, the SPP's research work and engagement with both the rest of the School and the global policymaking space will no doubt increase, but it should seek to curate the range of engagement in line with its strategic vision, and to ensure that its activities are carried out in collaboration (where applicable) with other parties across the School.

Recommendation 8: The SPP should continue its active global outreach and engagement while ensuring that these engagements support its broader strategic aims. In doing so it should ensure that it is working with rather than competing with existing provisions at LSE, and in ways which further its vision.

- 8.2 The SPP already has a number of research-active members of faculty, including many of the Professors in Practice and LSE Fellows. Given that it plans to increase the size of its NAC faculty, it will need to ensure that it builds a strong research culture that allows faculty adequate support and a vibrant environment within the SPP as well as strengthening its links with cognate areas of the School to ensure that faculty also have access to a disciplinary network and that, conversely, interested faculty from across the School are able to participate in the SPP's research culture, where appropriate. For example, it could consider instituting a research seminar series or other formal or informal events that allow SPP-based faculty to interact with each other as well as being of interest to scholars from elsewhere in the School. Over time, the aim should be to develop a culture and community that is distinct to the SPP and in line with its strategic aims but integrated into the broader School and attractive for interested faculty from other Departments to be involved in.

Recommendation 9: The SPP should consider how it can enhance and develop its research culture to support existing and future faculty (including potentially instituting a research seminar series), working to engage with interested colleagues from across the School.

9. Faculty Development and Recruitment and Retention

- 9.1 The SPP currently has a unique faculty structure arising from its history. It has only three NAC Professors, with other directly employed faculty being on time-limited contracts as either LSE Fellows or Professors in Practice or ECT staff on open-ended contracts, and depends on faculty from other Departments for much of its teaching. The Panel was happy to hear that despite the unusual environment, Professors in Practice, ECT staff and LSE Fellows within the SPP were generally very happy and collectively they play an important role in forging the success of the SPP for which they should be commended. At all levels, faculty had a good understanding of the SPP and of their role, they praised the collegiate environment of the SPP and were happy with workload as well as with opportunities for undertaking research. Going forward, the SPP will need to be mindful that as it moves from one faculty model to (partly) another, that this level of cohesion and collegiality is maintained.
- 9.2 One area in which the SPP itself acknowledges an issue is the diversity of its faculty; this was also noted by the students seen by the Panel (particularly in contrast to the diverse student population). As the SPP expands the size of its directly-employed faculty, it should pay particular attention to ensuring that it is able to hire diverse faculty who reflect the global ambitions of the SPP and the global nature of its student cohort. As acknowledged in the SED, a proactive approach towards assembling the candidate pool will help and the SPP must ensure that this is core to its approach going forward.

Recommendation 10: The SPP should, going forward, pay very close attention to issues of diversity at all levels and make this a priority in any future hiring.

- 9.3 Another area in which the Panel heard concerns (from faculty employed, in the first instance, in other Departments) was the ability of the SPP to contribute to career development review processes in those home Departments, including the ability to influence review, promotion and reward. This is potentially a serious issue as it relates to relations with the broader SPP community and perceptions around the commitment of outside

faculty to the SPP cause. While the SPP is already able to submit input for consideration in career development review (CDR) meetings (for faculty who teach in the SPP who are housed in other Departments) and is also able to fund additional increments for selected faculty as part of annual contribution pay rounds, the School must ensure that this happens in a significantly more structured and regular way. Working with other Departments and the School's Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee, the SPP should accordingly put in place regular and systematic processes whereby it contributes feedback directly into the CDR process for relevant members of faculty and this is taken into account by other Departments. Working with the School's Vice President Faculty Development, it should also use its available budget for funding either one-off payments or additional salary increments during annual contribution pay rounds to reward outstanding contributions to education and citizenship within the SPP.

Recommendation 11: The SPP should work with other Departments and the School to ensure that it is systematically feeding in to CDRs and other review and promotion activities carried out in the home Departments of faculty involved in the SPP. It should ensure that it is fully aware of, and makes use of, its ability to offer both one-off payments and additional salary increments during annual contribution pay rounds to faculty based in other Departments to reward outstanding contributions to education and citizenship within the SPP.

10. Resources

- 10.1 The SPP has grown rapidly in recent years and while student recruitment has not always been easy, its overall financial position is good and it has made a net surplus contribution to the School in most years and is forecast to do so going forward. The SED contains a number of requests for additional resources in the areas of faculty and PSS (for recruitment, careers support, research support and fundraising), but the Panel was not keen to support additional unfunded expenditure in an area of the School that is both at its limits in terms of student recruitment and not under-resourced according to School metrics. The gradual draw-down of "bought-in" teaching and the potential conversion of (up to two) existing Fellow (or other) posts into NAC posts should allow the SPP sufficient vacancies to fulfil hiring needs for a number of years. To the extent that the gradual draw-down of "bought-in" teaching results in making new appointments directly into the SPP of people not currently employed by the LSE elsewhere (rather than offering joint full or fractional appointments to already existing staff in other Departments), there is already a new additional cost to the LSE that it needs to cover to empower the SPP to achieve its strategic objectives. The same goes for any potential conversion of existing Fellow (or other) posts into a higher-graded NAC faculty post since such conversion would normally occur at a higher than 1:1 ratio, i.e., more than one LSE fellow posts would normally have to be given up to create one NAC post. Therefore, the Panel did not feel that there was a case at this stage for yet additional academic posts. If, beyond this, the SPP wishes to reduce its student:staff ratio, then the only way to do so would be via a lowering of its student intake targets which may also help it meet these targets. If the SPP wishes to go down this route, it should make a case via future Annual Monitoring processes for consideration by APRC.
- 10.2 The SED also requested resources for a number of PSS posts. While the SPP already has designated funding for some specific PSS roles and it already receives income intended to support posts in these areas as part of the super-premium fee allocation, the Panel felt there may be a case for an additional post in the area of student recruitment to ensure that the SPP is able to continue to recruit high-quality students. If the SPP wishes to go down this route, it should make a case via future Annual Monitoring processes for consideration by APRC. While the Panel recognised the difficulty of competing with global peers within current resources, the SPP is not unique in the School in facing this kind of challenge and any further support for e.g. student activities (such as alumni relations or careers advice) would need to be funded by existing income streams or by a future donor-funded endowment.

Recommendation 12: The SPP should consider, via future Annual Monitoring processes, submitting a potential request for lowering its student intake target (if it so wishes) and should consider a potential request for an additional PSS post in the area of student recruitment.

- 10.3 The SPP stressed in the SED and throughout the review meetings its challenging position with regards to space. The Panel acknowledged that this poses significant issues including the lack of adequate offices and insufficient space for students but noted that unfortunately the School is constrained by the total space available within the

Centre Building and there is little that can be done in the short term unless and until a unit were to move out of the building. The SPP should continue to work with the relevant areas of the School to make best use of the space it has available; or to work with the School to find temporary space in other buildings if necessary.

Recommendation for the School 3: The School should give priority consideration to the SPP should additional space in the Centre Building become available if an existing unit were to move out of the building.

11. Best Practice

- 11.1 During consideration of Review reports from the previous round of Reviews, the APRC found that a better understanding and diffusion of best practice arising from Department Reviews and Annual Monitoring would be useful. As such, while the Panel was not explicitly asked to identify best practice in the Department, the following areas of good practice should be considered by the relevant areas of the School for further study or dissemination as relevant: the well-organised and effective PSS team, the high collaboration and collegiality amongst faculty within the SPP on different tracks (NAC, ECT, LSE Fellows and 'of Practice') and the effort the SPP puts into delivering a high-quality educational experience.

12. Review process

Recommendation for the School 4: The Department should be kept under Review until the appointment process of NAC faculty has been clarified and has proven to work successfully in practice and the other recommendations have been put in place. This implies that the Dean of the SPP can ask APRC via the Vice President Planning and Resources to reconsider the appointment model if they regard the agreed-upon recruitment process as not delivering on the strategic objectives of the SPP.

Professor Eric Neumayer, Vice President (Planning and Resources)
Evert Nivari, Senior Planning Officer (Policy and Review)

Annex A: External Review Panel Member Profiles

Professor Atif Mian

Professor Mian is the John H. Laporte, Jr. Class of 1967 Professor of Economics, Public Policy and Finance at Princeton University and Director of the Julis-Rabinowitz Center for Public Policy and Finance at the Woodrow Wilson School. He is also the founder of the Center for Economic Research in Pakistan (CERP). His work studies the connections between finance and the macroeconomy, most recently with a focus on the implications of inequality for the macroeconomy. He is the author of *House of Debt* (with Amir Sufi, University of Chicago Press, 2014) and has published in top journals including the *American Economic Review*, *Econometrica*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *Journal of Finance*, *Review of Financial Studies* and *Journal of Financial Economics*.

Professor Lant Pritchett

Professor Pritchett is a development economist from Idaho. He graduated from BYU in 1983 and received his PhD in Economics from MIT in 1988. He worked for the World Bank from 1988 to 2007, living in Indonesia 1998-2000 and India 2004-2007. He taught at the Harvard Kennedy School from 2000 to 2019, and was, intermittently, the Faculty Chair of the MPA/ID Degree program. From 2018 to 2023 he was the Research Director of the RISE Programme at Oxford's Blavatnik School of Government. He has published over a hundred works with over fifty co-authors and his work spans a wide range of development topics including: economic growth, state capability, education, labor mobility, development assistance (and more). His work has been, at times, influential, and his publications have been cited over 48,000 times.

Professor Miguel Urquiola

Professor Urquiola is Dean of Social Science and Professor of Economics at Columbia University and a faculty member at the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA), where he has served as vice-dean. He has also chaired Columbia's Department of Economics and its Committee on the Economics of Education. Professor Urquiola is a Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) and has held appointments at Cornell University, the World Bank, and the Bolivian Catholic University. He is a member of boards such as that of the Social Science Research Council. His research is on the economics of education and has published widely, including *Markets, Minds, and Money* (Harvard University Press, 2020).

Ms Arancha González

Arancha González Laya is Dean of the Paris School of International Affairs at Sciences Po. She was Minister of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation of Spain (2020-July 2021) and served as United Nations Assistant Secretary-General and Executive Director of the International Trade Centre, the joint trade development agency of the United Nations and the World Trade Organisation (2013 to 2019). Between 2005 and 2013 Ms. González was Chief of Staff to World Trade Organization Director-General Pascal Lamy and his representative (Sherpa) at the G-20.

Annex B: Information Received for the Review

In advance of the Review, the Panel received an Information Pack consisting of the following documents: a briefing note from the Chair, the Department's Self Evaluation Document (SED) and associated annexes, a memorandum on faculty models and scholarship arrangements at peer institutions, a selection of Department Profile data, benchmarking data on its proffered peer set, a summary of student focus groups conducted for the Review, a short statement from Recruitment and Admissions, and CVs of the Department's faculty.

Annex C: Schedule of the Review

The Panel met on Thursday 7th December 2023 for the first day of the two-day Review to consider the material and interview the following individuals and groups: the core Departmental leadership, faculty appointed 100% in the SPP, faculty who provide teaching for the SPP, the taught postgraduates, the Heads of Department of those Departments whose faculty teach in the SPP, and the Professional Service staff. On the second day, Friday 8th December, the Panel met the leadership of the Department more broadly, discussed its initial findings, and related them to the core leadership of the Department. Meetings were held in the Vera Anstey Room on both days. This Panel Report was subsequently produced and has been circulated to SMC and the Dean for comment. The Report plus the comments of SMC and the Dean will be made available to the APRC meeting on 13 February 2024.

School of Public Policy Department Review

November 2023 – March 2024

Department Responses to the Review Recommendations

Recommendations for the Department

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 1: The SPP should clarify its strategic vision to highlight its distinctive features and global nature, and consider how this vision to become ‘the most globally relevant school of public policy and public action’ (or similar) can be better showcased to both internal and external audiences, including students and potential donors.</p>	<p>We accept the recommendation. The report makes clear that the statement ‘the best <i>global</i> school of public policy’ was not sufficiently distinct from being ‘the best school of public policy <i>globally</i>’ – an entirely different aspiration. The statement proposed by the report sounds like an improvement.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: The SPP should, in the short- to medium-term, focus on consolidation of its position rather than pursuing further growth in student numbers.</p>	<p>We accept the recommendation. The key to consolidation will be a continued focus on funded places. The options for this include philanthropy, reform of GSS (as it appears elsewhere in the SED and in the Review Report), and on corporate partnerships with external organisations which regularly fund student places. Having more professional staff to engage in student recruitment will also be key. That said, our approach to consolidation ought to be flexible enough to recognise asymmetries across teaching programmes and to evaluate the potential for growth in our new (and very small) MPA — Data Science programme within the overall departmental intake target.</p>

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 3: The SPP should consider whether any faculty from other Departments with a long-term and significant stake in its work would like to fully transfer into the SPP on an open-ended basis or could be made joint appointments with a fractional role in the SPP either on an open-ended basis or on a fixed-term basis for a number of years. The SPP should also consider reducing, over time, its reliance on “buying in” teaching from other Departments which would free up resources for hiring NAC (or other) faculty directly into the SPP. The SPP should consider whether it wishes to make a case to the Vice President Planning and Resources to convert up to two existing LSE Fellow (or other) posts into permanent NAC posts.</p>	<p>We accept the recommendation, and wish to distinguish among distinct aspects of it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In terms of the first part of the recommendation (the open-ended transfer into the SPP or, in some special cases, joint appointments), we welcome it. Of course, this will require close discussion both with the individuals potentially involved, and with the head of the departments where those individuals are currently based. 2. In terms of the second part (reducing over time our reliance on “buy-in” teaching from other departments), we welcome the recommendation and indeed we are taking steps in this direction. Of course, following through in this recommendation will require more hiring (or transfers in from other departments) into the SPP. This will be a gradual process. The reduction in our reliance on other departments will continue through the lifecycle of this review up to SPP’s next Department Review. 3. As we continue to plan teaching, we will make a case (as suggested in the report) for the conversion of LSE Fellow lines into permanent NAC posts. We welcome this recommendation in particular and the intent behind it. <p>One note of caution, however: our ability to attract academic staff to the SPP (internal movers, joint appointments, new hires) will be conditional on their perception of the SPP as a comfortable working environment. Put simply, they will not want to join the SPP if the SPP cannot offer them individual office space. Our needs in this respect remains dire. We welcome ‘School Recommendation 3’ (The School should give priority consideration to the SPP should additional space in the Centre Building become available if an existing unit were to move out of the building) and look forward to learning the timing and conditions under which it will materialise. At the risk of being reiterative: Recommendation 4, Recommendation 5, and School Recommendations 1 and 2, about future hiring, cannot be implemented unless School Recommendation 3 is resolved satisfactorily.</p>

<p>Recommendation 4: In appointing new NAC faculty, a 'virtual' Professoriate should be created for decision-making on the appointability of candidates.</p>	<p>We agree that a Professoriate is essential for this process. Our response here is directly relevant to 'Recommendation for the School 2', which states that "APRC should take a decision on whether it regards model A or model B (or indeed some other model) as appropriate" for the nature of the SPP Professoriate. This Recommendation is closely tied to 'Recommendation 2 for the School 2'. We offer the following proposals in this area:</p> <p>The review panel raised the issue that the "SPP's very limited NAC professoriate is not currently of sufficient size compared to the size of the Professoriate or the size of the combined Associate Professor and Professor staff in other Departments". As a result, it "considered two basic models for appointing NAC faculty into the SPP on a strictly time-limited basis until the next Departmental Review at which point the SPP may well have its own senior NAC faculty of sufficient size".</p> <p>The first model [Model A] "would ask the professoriate of relevant other Departments to stand in and, together with the SPP's existing NAC Professors, form a 'virtual' SPP Professoriate that takes a view on and votes on applicants to NAC posts...If it is unclear which is the relevant other Department's Professoriate for any particular candidate...then this decision is for the Vice President Faculty Development to take in consultation with the Dean of the SPP".</p> <p>The second model [Model B] "would empower all those Professors of the School currently listed as faculty on the SPP website to form and function as a 'virtual' SPP Professoriate going forward until the next Departmental review...The Dean of the SPP should have the right to propose to the Vice President Faculty Development the inclusion of further suitable Professors from across the School either on a permanent basis or specifically for a specific recruitment search".</p> <p>The review pointed out that "both models have their respective advantages and disadvantages". In the view of the SPP leadership, in both cases the disadvantages outweigh the advantages, for reasons discussed at length in our earlier letter to the panel. We very much welcome, therefore, recent discussions leading to an alternative 'Model C'.</p> <p>An alternative proposal</p> <p>Following discussions between the Vice President Planning and Resources (who was also chair of the SPP review) and the SPP Acting Dean, a 'Model C' was evolved which would take the advantages of Model A (by bringing in professors from cognate departments) and also of Model B (by ensuring that</p>
---	--

Review Recommendation	Department Response
	<p>professors involved with the eventual SPP professoriate had some involvement in it). The disadvantages of Model A (requiring all the professors in the relevant document to take part in SPP hiring whether interested or not) and Model B (in reality, some existing SPP professorial colleagues have a very limited involvement even though on the website, and the list is extremely unbalanced from a gender point of view) could thus be avoided. Most important, the alternative model could assemble a distinguished set of colleagues who are committed to the goal of developing a world-class school of public policy within the LSE and who understand what is required to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Model C would create a virtual SPP professoriate drawing 5 professors each from the Economics and Government departments, plus 1 each from Social Policy, International Development, Philosophy and the European Institute. To these, one would have to add the two existing NAC professors at the SPP and further professors who may be appointed (in full or jointly) during the next five years. This procedure yields a professoriate with 16 members. This size allows the professoriate to grow over the next five years, through further full or joint appointments, without becoming unwieldy. Members of the professoriate from Economics and Government would together have more than half of the membership, and for any academic hiring these departments' professors would constitute a majority.</p> <p>Appointments to the virtual SPP professoriate would be by mutual agreement of the relevant head of department and the Dean of the SPP. The Dean would meet with the relevant head of department and together they would discuss potential candidates with a view toward coming to a consensus. Both the Dean and the relevant head of department would be able to propose a list of potential candidates. No professors would be approached without the Head of Department agreeing. Where no agreement can be reached, the Vice President Planning and Resources would mediate between the Dean of the SPP and the relevant Head of Department. If mediation is unsuccessful, the Vice President Planning and Resources would decide. If, for whatever reason, a Professor resigns from the virtual Professoriate, the replacement would follow the same process as above.</p>

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 5: The SPP and relevant other Departments whose faculty teach on SPP degrees should work together to establish one or more coordinating committees (covering both a strategic level and an operational level, to be chaired by a member of SMC if appropriate) to improve coordination and help information flow.</p>	<p>We accept this Recommendation. These are to be, according to the Recommendation, coordination and not governance committees, and we welcome that. We propose to develop more detailed proposals outside this document and in liaison with SMC.</p> <p>Separate to these coordination instances are the SPP’s internal governance structures. It will be important to ensure that the respective groups (Department Management Committee, Department Teaching Committee, and one or more further internal co-ordinating committees) have clear and discrete remits and that procedures overall remains agile.</p>

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 6: For those located in other Departments but with a significant share of their overall teaching on SPP degrees, the SPP and their home Department should consider coming to a longer-term arrangement (e.g., for three years, potentially renewable) and should either extend full rights and duties to them for the time of their engagement or full consultation rights. In any case, with the involvement of the Vice President Faculty Development the SPP should take steps to build an inclusive culture and community, nurturing the links it has with faculty from other Departments who teach for the SPP.</p>	<p>We welcome the opportunity for long-term arrangements wherever possible, providing our teaching environment with predictability, consistency and clarity. There are several aspects of this recommendation which, in our view, it is useful to consider separately.</p> <p>We agree that predictability would benefit both the SPP and our partner department, so it makes sense to identify cases of successful teaching where longer-term arrangements (e.g., for three years, potentially renewable) would be welcome. Those individuals should of course be entitled to full consultation rights. As mentioned in our Self-Evaluation Document (point 2.8), we aim to convene termly Department Meetings that would include faculty from other departments with a significant share of their overall teaching on SPP degrees. These meetings would serve to offer a platform for consultation on matters relevant to the department.</p> <p>For internal SPP governance, nevertheless, we plan to continue with our Department Management Committee, which has consistently demonstrated effectiveness, agility, and decisiveness in seizing opportunities</p> <p>A different case is that of individuals who not only teach in the SPP but also play a central role in its academic life, provide ample citizenship, and are committed to the institution-building project of the SPP. In our view, the way forward for such cases is the one proposed in Recommendation 3: “The SPP should consider whether any faculty from other Departments with a long-term and significant stake in its work would like to fully transfer into the SPP on an open-ended basis or could be made joint appointment with a fractional role in the SPP.” If and when such a move has been initiated by the SPP, agreed to by the home department of the person making the move, and approved by the Departmental Committee of the SPP, those colleagues would of course enjoy full citizenship rights.</p> <p>We believe it is key to keep these two kinds of cases separate, in keeping with an important principle enunciated by the Review Panel report: “rights should always come with corresponding duties” (P.8)</p>

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 7: The SPP, working with cognate Departments, should continue to review its curricula to ensure that students have enough choice in terms of electives and that core teaching is at a suitable level for all students given heterogeneity in prior skills and experience and interests of students.</p>	<p>We welcome and accept the recommendation. In particular, we support the implicit conclusion of the Review that SPP should continue to recruit students with diverse levels and types of prior learning, which we consider to be a strength of our offer. Our curriculum review has continued even in the period since the review. In terms of core teaching, there are plans in place to reform our full-unit MPA course on Quantitative Methods (PP455), to enable those beginning the degree with strong prior skills to exempt themselves from the AT teaching in favour of another course or, to exempt from PP455 entirely. We are also developing a new option course, known at this time as ‘Metrics 4’ and due to be presented to GSSC for approval in the ST, which will provide an intensive, advanced and applied course for those students at the top end of the ability range within our cohort. More broadly, there are several areas in which additional options courses, targeted primarily at 2nd-year MPAs, could be fruitfully developed. We will continue to work on that.</p> <p>In terms of developing curricula to ensure that students have enough choice in terms of electives, we will continue to work extensively with other departments to provide specialised courses but these arrangements have proven challenging to deliver in practice.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: The SPP should continue its active global outreach and engagement while ensuring that these engagements support its broader strategic aims. In doing so it should ensure that it is working with rather than competing with existing provisions at LSE, and in ways which further its vision.</p>	<p>We accept the recommendation and we are proud of the global outreach that we have accomplished in the first 5-6 years of the SPP. We have always sought to work with existing provision within the LSE rather than in competition. The LSE-Fudan Hub, for example, was set up through the Global Academic Partnerships team thanks to the tireless work of Brendan Smith; we developed a partnership with LSE Cities long before it was part of the SPP; we have worked closely with CFM and STICERD in organising events with global reach. We share the general point behind this recommendation that the SPP’s resources are too limited to be working alone in global engagement terms.</p> <p>Although not part of the Review or its recommendations, we continue to believe that there remains an opportunity for LSE, through the SPP, to develop a set of case studies for teaching purposes (unrelated to being a co-ordinating centre for research impact which we accept is not the way forward). We remain enthusiastic about the development of case studies for teaching in future.</p>

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 9: The SPP should consider how it can enhance and develop its research culture to support existing and future faculty (including potentially instituting a research seminar series), working to engage with interested colleagues from across the School.</p>	<p>We accept this recommendation as a logical progression from Recommendations 3 and 4. As outlined in the Self-Evaluation Document (Point 2.8), our medium-term goal is to establish a Research Committee to direct the SPP's evolving research strategy, cultivate a cohesive research culture, and align with the standard governance practices of cognate departments. A Research Committee would also aim to address the challenge faced by faculty members across LSE who contribute to the SPP but do not regard it as their main research base.</p> <p>As a specific action, our Department Management Committee will discuss convening a research-focused seminar series that addresses policy-specific research topics, with an open invitation to our community of faculty and teachers.</p>
<p>Recommendation 10: The SPP should, going forward, pay very close attention to issues of diversity at all levels and make this a priority in any future hiring.</p>	<p>We accept this recommendation. Indeed, this was a self-identified area of current weakness (SED paragraphs 5.25-5.28) that requires urgent improvement. To reiterate, the nature of our buy-in staffing model limits our ability to make significant strides in this area, but the prospect of further hires on the NAC, described through the Review Report, gives us an opportunity. As we start to make our own hires, we will prioritise this issue.</p>

Review Recommendation	Department Response
<p>Recommendation 11: The SPP should work with other Departments and the School to ensure that it is systematically feeding in to CDRs and other review and promotion activities carried out in the home Departments of faculty involved in the SPP. It should ensure that it is fully aware of, and makes use of, its ability to offer both one-off payments and additional salary increments during annual contribution pay rounds to faculty based in other Departments to reward outstanding contributions to education and citizenship within the SPP.</p>	<p>We accept this recommendation. The new co-ordination committees described in Recommendation 5 will set the groundwork for SPP input into CDRs, review and promotion of those faculty in other departments involved in SPP. It would also be necessary to extend formally that input into the timing of sabbatical leave. Individual discussions on these topics would then take place one-to-one between the Dean of the SPP and the relevant department head. The SPP DM will coordinate with DMs from other departments to ensure that communication lines are fully open regarding input into CDRs and other review and promotion activities.</p> <p>As highlighted in section 5.13 of our Self-Evaluation Document regarding incentives and rewards for staff not directly employed by the SPP, we fully utilise the School's supplement, one-off payments, and additional salary increment schemes, alongside the annual contribution pay rounds. However, it is important to note that the total size of the pot means that any individual member of faculty can receive only nugatory one-off payments, and therefore any financial incentives we provide are still secondary to the promotional opportunities and incentives available from their home department, where research outputs and performance play a much more significant role. The ability of a one-off payment (say, £2,000) to influence the motivation of a professorial colleague is likely to be minimal.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12: The SPP should consider, via future Annual Monitoring processes, submitting a potential request for lowering its student intake target (if it so wishes) and should consider a potential request for an additional PSS post in the area of student recruitment.</p>	<p>We accept this recommendation, and indeed we welcome it. We will consult with relevant teams elsewhere in LSE to define the optimal nature, remit and responsibilities of this additional post, and will revert via annual monitoring meetings in WT 2024 for APRC consideration in January 2025.</p>

Recommendations for the School

Recommendation for the School	Department comment
Recommendation for the School 1: The SPP should be given the right to directly appoint NAC faculty at Professor and Associate Professor levels, including as sole appointments.	We strongly support the recommendation.
Recommendation for the School 2: APRC should take a decision on whether it regards model A or model B (or indeed some other model) as appropriate, always keeping in mind that specific details beyond the fundamental principles implied by any appointment model should be left to the discretion of the Vice President Faculty Development, in consultation with the Vice President Planning and Resources and the Dean of the SPP.	We believe that ‘some other model’ is the optimal way forward and, in our response to Recommendation 4 we have provided detailed and consensus-driven proposals on this point.
Recommendation for the School 3: The School should give priority consideration to the SPP should additional space in the Centre Building become available if an existing unit were to move out of the building.	We strongly support the recommendation and, as noted in our response to Recommendation 4, we believe that the absence of such space in the Centre Building will be a significant impediment to our ability to hire, and therefore to deliver on the objectives of this Review.

Recommendation for the School	Department comment
<p>Recommendation for the School 4: The Department should be kept under Review until the appointment process of NAC faculty has been clarified and has proven to work successfully in practice and the other recommendations have been put in place. This implies that the Dean of the SPP can ask APRC via the Vice President Planning and Resources to reconsider the appointment model if they regard the agreed-upon recruitment process as not delivering on the strategic objectives of the SPP.</p>	<p>The Department Review documents are clear that a department under review cannot make permanent hires. This recommendation states that SPP should be kept under review until the model of hiring 'has been proven to work in practice'. In other words, that we cannot make permanent hires until we have a method, proven through practice, for making permanent hires. We suggest that APRC may wish to put in place an alternative measure of success that would release the SPP from Review.</p>

SMC considered the School of Public Policy Review report at its meeting on 20 February 2024. SMC's considerations are summarised in the minutes of the meeting:

	6. School of Public Policy Departmental Review Report (SMC/140)	
NOTED		Discussed the report, noting that the review included discussions around the SPP's structure and how it works with other areas across the School.
AGREED	6.1	That further discussion was needed around the process of appointment of Professorial and Associate Professorial staff to the SPP.
	6.2	Noted the review report to progress to further discussion at APRC.

LSEE DRU TO RECOGNISED GROUP TRANSFER REQUEST

Background and purpose

LSEE was launched as a DRU in 2013 under the European Institute in order to develop LSE's research on South Eastern Europe. Owing to its history, originally as a spin-off of the Hellenic Observatory, LSEE also reports to (but is not formally reviewed by) the Advisory Board of the Hellenic Observatory. It is currently the only DRU in the European Institute, though there is also one Recognised Group, Contemporary Turkish Studies.

LSEE are applying to cease being a DRU, and become a Recognised Group within the Hellenic Observatory.

Actions Required and next steps

Committee is asked to approve the transferral of LSEE from a DRU to a Recognised Group under the Hellenic Observatory.

Vassilis Monastiriotis

13 March 2024

Request for derecognition as DRU and recognition as a ‘recognised group’ within the Hellenic Observatory Centre

We are requesting that LSEE (LSE Research on South East Europe), currently a DRU at the LSE’s European Institute, becomes ‘derecognised’ from its DRU status and is converted into a ‘Recognised Group’ to be incorporated within the newly established Centre for Research on Contemporary Greece and Cyprus (Hellenic Observatory – henceforth, ‘HO Centre’). We are also requesting that the existing accounts of LSEE are transferred to the HO Centre but that the budget code(s) are maintained so that they continue to fund the group’s activities, as explained below. Further, we are requesting that, as a recognised group, LSEE maintains (a) its email address / account and (b) its website / sub-domain.

As a Recognised Group, LSEE will become part of the Hellenic Observatory – Centre for Research on Contemporary Greece and Cyprus and it will operate there as a de facto research theme, under the overall directorship of the HO Director, Vassilis Monastiriotis (from September 2024). The HO Director will have ultimate control / signing rights for the existing LSEE account(s), once these are transferred to the HO Centre. The current Director of LSEE (Denisa Kostovicova) will act as the new group’s Coordinator / Research Director, having responsibility for its day-to-day activities, communication / collaboration with members of the group and planning of events and other activities, working closely / in liaison with the HO Director. Administrative support for the group will be provided by the PSS staff of the HO Centre. The incorporation of LSEE, as a recognised group, into the HO Centre will strengthen the ability of the group to produce research and KEI activities within its subject area (Southeast Europe). For this reason, it is also essential that the email account and web sub-domain of LSEE is maintained.

We note that the European Institute has been informed about this plan (Research Committee WT2023/24) and it is in support of our request. We also note that the plan has been presented to, and approved by, the Hellenic Observatory Advisory Board (meeting of December 2023).

Vassilis Monastiriotis (LSEE Deputy Director and HO Centre Director-elect)

Proposal for Recognised Group entitled the Social and Public Policy of Inequality, Climate Change, and the Environment (SPICE) Hub

Background and purpose

The Department of Social Policy have submitted an application for a new recognised group, led by Dr. Liam F. Beiser-McGrath.

The Governance of Research policy, annex I, section 2 states that:

Recognised Groups must be approved by and registered with the Department, Institute or Centre to which the activities of the Group are closely aligned. Decisions to register and approve a Group must be reported promptly by the head of the relevant Department, Institute or Centre to the Research Committee. Research Committee will reserve the right to approve or reject the decision of the academic unit to register the Group.

The Department already has three Recognised Groups, the Women in Social and Public Policy Research Hub, the Education Research Group and the Mannheim Centre for Criminology. It does not have any DRUs.

Actions Required and next steps

Committee is asked to note the creation of the SPICE Hub, noting that it reserves the right to approve or reject the Department's decision to register the Group, and to decide any conditions under which the Recognised Group must close.

Proposal for Recognised Group entitled the Social and Public Policy of Inequality, Climate Change, and the Environment (SPICE) Hub

Climate change is one of the defining challenges of our time and is increasingly understood as an integral component for the development of social and public policy in the coming years. In this regard, a cluster of researchers working on this topic within the department has emerged in recent years. Parallel to this, student demand for understanding the relation between social policy and climate change is high with 52 students enrolled in our department's MSc course, many of whom plan to write dissertations on the topic.

Recognising the success of other recognised groups within the department in increasing the visibility of our research both internally and externally, as well as providing avenues for new initiatives and collaborations, we thereby propose establishing a recognised group called entitled the Social and Public Policy of Inequality, Climate Change and the Environment (SPICE) Hub.

The goal of the group is to provide a space for new initiatives relating to research and teaching that contribute to the department's research environment, while consolidating and building upon existing activities of members (e.g. EPG Online Seminar series) that have proven successful. The SPICE Hub will also serve as a way of fostering further collaboration between the Department and CASE, particularly around themes of inequality and exclusion that are central to current questions surrounding climate and environmental policy.

Finally, the group offers an accessible entry point for the “climate curious”, who may be considering moving their research in the direction of this critical societal challenge.

At this stage, the following activities are expected to be pursued by the group:

Online Seminar Series: in collaboration with the Environmental Politics and Governance network we have organised the EPG Online seminar series featuring presentations from researchers all over the world. This also includes in-person viewings (temporarily suspended while located in STC) which have been attended by colleagues within the LSE, from other universities, and MSc students, offering chances for intellectual exchange and network building. Formation of the recognised group will solidify this as a part of the department's research environment.

Work-in-Progress Seminar: the recognised group would also host a work in progress seminar for those researching in the area. While predominantly featuring researchers from the group, there is also the possibility to extend opportunities to researchers from other universities and visiting researchers. Frequency of the seminar will depend upon member demand; however, it is expected that it will run at least once per month.

Masters Dissertation workshop: reflecting the increased demand and interest of students in the topics of climate change and the environment, members of the group are frequently engaging with non-mentee students during office hours in relation to

dissertations. One goal of the research group would be to hold an annual Masters Dissertation workshop for MSc students writing a dissertation on this topic. The one-day workshop, likely in ST, would offer students the opportunity to discuss their work in progress and build community amongst those working on this topic. Depending on the speed at which the group is approved the first of such workshops could be held in ST of AY '23/'24.

Inter-university collaboration: Members of the group presently have contacts with other research groups at other London universities such as King's College's Environment and Public Policy group and UCL's Climate Politics research cluster. Collaborating through an established recognised group will further consolidate these connections, as well as take advantage of funding instruments from other institutions that facilitate inter-university collaboration.

Intra-university collaboration: The group also will help foster intra-LSE collaboration, given the array of faculty working on related research that are spread across different departments and institutes. This is formally achieved through affiliated status, with some indicative faculty already listed, but also can deepen informally with a clear focal point for faculty and researchers who are interested in this research area. This will therefore help establish a base for initiatives such as large cross-departmental grant applications that are increasingly common in the area of climate change and the environment.

Public Presence: Having a centralised presence will help increased external visibility of the research conducted within the department relating to this topic. This will involve the hosting and publicising of research outputs, policy briefs, and media communications thereby helping in knowledge exchange and impact efforts.

The group's activities are primarily funded through a departmental contribution of £800 pa. It is expected that the group will also additionally apply to internal departmental RIF monies for larger-scale research projects/workshops as well as exploring other external sources of funding. For teaching related activity, e.g. Masters workshop, any required expenses would be sourced from the relevant departmental funds.

Group Members (Social Policy):

Dr. Liam F. Beiser-McGrath (Assistant Professor, Chair)
 Dr. Tania Burchardt (Associate Professor)
 Dr. Shekhar Chandra (Fellow)
 Sam Nadel (PhD Student)
 Dr. Virgi Sari (Fellow)
 Dr. Kitty Stewart (Associate Professor)

Group Members (Other Departments/Centres):

Prof. Ian Gough (Visiting Professorial Fellow, CASE)
 Dr. Michael Lerner (Assistant Professor, Government)

Dr. Chiara Sotis (Fellow, Economics)

Dr. Noah Zucker (Assistant Professor, International Relations)