

Imperial College London

Graduate School Master's Quality Committee Medicine, Life Sciences and School of Professional Development

19 November 2012

Confirmed Minutes

Present

Professor Andrew George (Chairman)
Professor Tim Barraclough (Department of Life Sciences)
Professor Steve Gentleman (Department of Medicine)
Professor Kate Hardy (Department of Surgery and Cancer)
Ms Maryam Habibzay – GSA President
Mr Doug Hunt (ICU Deputy President, Education)
Professor Marjo-Riitta Jarvelin (School of Public Health)
Dr Martyn Kingsbury (Educational Development Unit)
Professor Robin Leatherbarrow (Dean for Natural Sciences)
Professor Myra McClure (Dean for Medicine)
Dr Felicity Mellor (Humanities)
Professor Sue Smith (NHLI)
Mr Nigel Wheatley (Academic Registrar)
Professor Denis Wright (Dean of Students)

In Attendance

Ms Sally Baker (Graduate School Manager)

Observing

Ms Rita Andrews (Education Manager, Department of Medicine)

The Chairman welcomed new members to the meeting: Professor Myra McClure, Dean (non-clinical) for Medicine (replacing Professor Nigel Gooderham); Professor Tim Barraclough, representative for the Department of Life Sciences (replacing Dr Simon Leather); Ms Maryam Habibzay, GSA President and Mr Doug Hunt (ICU Deputy President, Education). Ms Rita Andrews, Education Manager, Department of Medicine, was welcomed as an observer to the meeting.

1. Apologies for absence

Professor Debra Humphis (Pro Rector, Education)
Dr Mick Jones (College Tutor)
Ms Natalie Kempston (Academic and Welfare Officer – Medicine)
Dr David McPhail (Deputy Chair)
Ms Helen Pennington (Academic and Welfare Officer – Life Sciences)
Mr Michael Weatherburn (Academic and Welfare Officer – Non Faculty)

2. Terms of Reference and Membership

Members received the terms of reference and membership of the Master's Quality Committees 2012.

MLSDP/MQC/2012/01

It was noted that the Graduate School Management and Strategy Committee had been disbanded and that the Master's Quality Committees would now advise the Senate and the Strategic Education Committee on policy and strategy relating to postgraduate education at Master's level, whilst the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee would have that role in

relation to postgraduate research education.

It was noted that the revised Committee structure had been approved by Senate on 31 October 2012.

3. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2012 were approved.

MLSDP/MQC/2012/02

4. Matters arising

4.1 Minute 8 - Penalties for the Late Submission of Course Work

It was noted that the QAAC had considered a revised policy, and that this would be further discussed by the QAAC in November. It was noted that the revised policy would take effect for the 2013-14 session.

4.2 Minute 7 – Grade Inflation

It was noted that a report from the MQC (HSLM) had been made to the QAAC in June 2012 and that the Committee had been satisfied with the outcomes reported and action proposed.

5. Action taken since the last meeting

The Committee received a report on action taken on behalf of the Committee since the meeting held on 24 May 2012 and endorsed the decisions taken.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/03

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

6. Annual Monitoring (2010-2011)

Members were reminded that the annual monitoring programme had been trialled in the Department of Surgery and Cancer in the 2010-2011 session, in preparation for the forthcoming periodic review of departmental teaching. The Chairman reminded members that the outcome of the annual monitoring review did not result in a grading, but that the minutes should record if the Committee was satisfied with the report or if there were any concerns. The Committee was asked to endorse, or comment on, the follow up action suggested by the reviewers.

6.1 MRes in Biomedical Research (1YFT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-11 cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/04

The Committee noted the extremely positive comments made by the reviewer. In particular the reviewer reported that the course was very well organised and that student achievement was very high. The reports of the external examiners were very complimentary and the reviewer noted that their comments had been acted upon quickly and effectively where necessary. The reviewer commended the academic strength of the course, the welfare support for students and the level of engagement of academic staff.

The Committee agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer. The Committee was satisfied with the report overall and noted that there was no specific follow up action required. It was confirmed that the course should be reviewed again in the regular cycle. The Committee congratulated the course team on the excellent report.

6.2 MRes in Cancer Biology (1YFT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-11 cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/05

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments, and in particular that the course was well organised and that student achievement was high. The reviewer highlighted the course handbook which featured pictures and CVs of course organisers as an example of good practice. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning student numbers, which had been low in 2010-11 but were greatly increased in 2011-12 and cautioned that if too many students were enrolled then it may create problems with finding enough suitable projects. The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were good and that their comments had been acted upon where necessary.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer. The Committee was satisfied with the report overall and noted that there was no

specific follow up action required. It was confirmed that the course should be reviewed again in the regular cycle.

6.3 MSc in Quality and Safety in Healthcare (2YPT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2009-11 cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/06

The Committee noted extremely positive comments made by the reviewer, and in particular that the course handbook was cited as an example of good practice in the way that it very clearly presents what students can expect in terms of teaching, assessment and support. The "Who does What" section which outlines roles and responsibilities of those concerned with the course was particularly commended. The reviewer highlighted the support of students without a first degree and the management of students with mitigating circumstances as examples of good practice. The Committee noted the high number of students who had deferred during the 2009-2010 session and asked the Course Organiser to provide some further detail on these cases.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning academic feedback to students and noted the Course Organiser's clarification that students are given a grade along with written feedback on each assignment. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that feedback to students did not occur within two weeks and that the mechanisms used for providing feedback varied between module leads, and the recommendation that more explicit guidance should be provided to module leads.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were satisfactory and that their comments had been acted upon where necessary.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer. The Committee was satisfied with the report overall and endorsed the reviewer's recommendations for follow up action, and in particular that more guidance should be provided on the timing and mechanisms for providing academic feedback to students. It was confirmed that the course should be reviewed again in the regular cycle.

6.4 MSc in Reproductive and Developmental Biology (1YFT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-11 cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/07

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments on the excellent standing of this course, the high calibre of the student intake and the high level of student achievement. The resolve of the course team to ensure feedback to students within two weeks was cited by the reviewer as an example of good practice and the Course Director was commended for his reliable, hardworking and conscientious attitude. The reviewer highlighted that the location of the course within the IRDB was a real advantage to the students in terms of giving exclusive access to in-house expertise, but commented also that the Course Director should consider inviting external speakers to further extend the range of teaching.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were good and that their comments had been acted upon where necessary.

It was agreed that the Course Director's response had addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer. The Committee was satisfied with the report overall and noted that there was no specific follow up action required. It was confirmed that the course should be reviewed again in the regular cycle. The Committee congratulated the Course Director on the excellent report.

6.5 MEd in Surgical Education (1YFT & 2YPT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-11 full-time cohort and the 2009-2011 part-time cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/08

The Committee noted the positive comments made by the reviewer, and in particular that the teaching and support on this course is generally excellent, and that the Course Organisers are extremely committed. The Committee noted that students on the course are exposed to and taught by senior figures in surgical and medical educational policy, surgical technology, surgery and education, and that the Course Organisers use interesting and different experts to teach and illustrate the acquisition of skill and technical competence. The reviewer commented that this an

interesting and novel approach, well matched to a carefully considered and well aligned pedagogic design, and highlighted it as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the relatively large number of delays and deferrals in the numbers of students completing the course and noted that the Course Organisers are taking steps to try to improve the situation by giving clearer guidance, tightening-up on deadlines and processes and adding some intermediate review stages to help with the project and dissertation. The Committee noted that the Course Organisers were considering introducing a PG Diploma stage to the programme and agreed that this was a sensible option to explore.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were good and that their comments had been acted upon where possible.

It was agreed that the Course Organisers' response had addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer. The Committee was satisfied with the report overall and noted that there was no specific follow up action required. It was confirmed that the course should be reviewed again in the regular cycle.

6.6 MSc in Surgical Science (1YFT & 2YPT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-11 full-time cohort and the 2009-2011 part-time cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/09

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments, and in particular that the course is well run and that the course team have built a good relationship with the student cohorts. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the need for more clarity cover the pastoral arrangements and the suggestion that the course handbook itself should provide greater detail. The Committee noted the Course Organiser's response that pastoral and welfare issues were dealt with by existing course staff and that it was not felt necessary to appoint an independent person to undertake these duties since these were mature students for whom the current structure was well suited. The Committee accepted this response.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the relatively low number of applicants to the full-time course and the high dependence on a single source of funded students for the part-time course. In discussion, the Committee advised that a course which recruited a high percentage of students from a single funding body should be mindful of the sustainability implications should the funding be withdrawn. Likewise, a course which recruited a high percentage of students from a single country should be mindful of the affects that this might have on the overall student experience. The Committee was advised that this had been taken into consideration by the Course Organisers.

The Committee noted the comments from the Course Organiser concerning the on-line application process and inherent difficulties in processing late applications. Late applications were a feature of this course, and other courses which recruited students from clinical backgrounds and who were dependent on the outcome of surgical job applications before submitting an on-line application. The Committee asked members to send additional information on such cases to the Graduate School so that the situation could be investigated further.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were good and that their comments had been acted upon where possible.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer. The Committee was satisfied with the report overall and endorsed the reviewer's recommendations for follow up action: that student representatives of both the full-time and part-time course should be invited to attend the course committee and that appropriate amendments should be made to the course handbooks. It was confirmed that the course should be reviewed again in the regular cycle.

Post-meeting note: that student representatives of both the full-time and part-time course had been invited to attend the course committee.

6.7 MSc in Surgical Technology (1YFT & 2YPT) - Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-11 full-time cohort and the 2009-2011 part-time cohort.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/10

The Committee noted from the reviewer's comments that the paperwork presented had not been particularly comprehensive and that there were details in the submission which were out of date and in some cases gaps and inconsistencies in the paperwork. The Committee noted that the Course Organiser's responses had adequately addressed the discrepancies highlighted by the reviewer.

The Committee noted that the reviewer had found the details of the module assessment to be unclear. The Course Organisers had provided additional detail but the Committee felt that greater clarity was required. The reviewer also highlighted the relatively high number of students who did not complete the course as an issue to be addressed. However, noting that there would be no further student intake on this course, the Committee agreed that no further action was necessary.

The reviewer had highlighted the inconsistency between the format of the written examinations for the full-time and part-time course. The Committee were uncomfortable with this and asked that matter be followed up with the Course Organisers. In subsequent discussion, it transpired that the scheme of examination had been in operation since October 2009, and that students on both programmes had been aware of the different arrangements. During this time there had been no student feedback, nor feedback from external examiners, in which this had been raised as a cause for concern. In the circumstances, and given that there would be no further intake of students to this course, it was agreed that no further action was necessary.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were good and that they considered the course to be run to a high standard, with good organisation.

The Committee noted that the programme would be withdrawn from entry in October 2013 and in the circumstances agreed that there was no further action which could be taken and endorsed the reviewer's findings.

7. New course progress reports [courses new in October 2011]

The Committee received verbal reports on courses new in October 2011. Where the first cohort had completed, the Committee also received entry and exit qualification data in respect of these courses.

7.1 MSc Health Policy [new in October 2011]

The Committee received a verbal report on the first year of the 2 year part-time MSc Health Policy course which had been established in October 2011. Admissions to the course in its first year had met expectations. The majority of students had been funded by the Department of Health. Student performance to date had been strong and initial challenges were reported as being mostly of an administrative nature. Enhancements to the course content had been introduced for the current year, as well as plans for recruiting more international students. The Committee was satisfied with this report.

7.2 MSc Infection (PG Dip, PG Cert) [new in October 2011]

The Committee received a verbal report on the first year of the 2 year part-time MSc Infection course which had been established in October 2011. Admissions to the course in its first year had narrowly missed initial expectations. The majority of students had been funded by their NHS Trusts. The Committee noted that a number of students from the initial intake had still to complete the PG Certificate modules. All of the students who had successfully completed the Certificate stage had progressed to the Diploma. Enhancements to the course curriculum had been introduced for the current year. The Committee was satisfied with this report.

7.3 MSc Medical Robotics and Image Guided Intervention [new in October 2011]

The Committee received a verbal report on the first year of the MSc Medical Robotics and Image Guided Intervention course which had been established in October 2011, and a data report on entry and exit qualifications in respect of the 2011-2012 intake.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/11

Admissions to the course in its first year had been in line with expectations. Student performance had been strong and a high number of distinctions had been awarded. Enhancements to the course timetable had been introduced for the current year. The Committee was satisfied with this

report.

7.4 MSc Paediatrics and Child Health (PG Dip, PG Cert) [new in October 2011]

The Committee received a verbal report on the first year of the 2 year part-time MSc Paediatrics and Child Health course which had been established in October 2011. Admissions to the course in its first year had met initial expectations. Enhancements to the course structure had been introduced for the current year. The Committee was satisfied with this report.

8. New course data reports [courses new in October 2010]

The Committee received entry and exit qualification data for the previous two years in respect of these courses.

8.1 MSc Quantitative Biology [new in October 2010]

The Committee received data on the entry and exit qualifications in respect of the 2010 and 2011 intake.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/12

The Committee noted the high numbers of distinctions and merits awarded and the high number of graduates moving into PhD positions. The Committee was satisfied with this report.

8.2 MRes Clinical Research [merged programme in October 2010]

The Committee received (tabled) data on the entry and exit qualifications in respect of the 2010 and 2011 intake.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/13

The Committee noted the high numbers of distinctions and merits awarded particularly to students studying the full-time programmes. First destination data for graduates of the full-time programme was given where known and it was noted that destination data in respect of students on the part-time programmes, employed in health related professions, would be better assessed later in the year. The Committee was satisfied with this report.

8.3 PG Cert (CAS) Preventive Cardiology [new in October 2010]

The Committee received (tabled) data on the entry and exit qualifications in respect of the 2010 and 2011 intake.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/14

The Committee noted that only a small number of students had so far attended the PG Certificate programme. Only a small number had successfully completed the programme, one of whom had progressed to the Master's programme. The Committee was satisfied with this report.

8.4 Changes to procedures for internal review of Master's level programmes.

8.4.1 Members were reminded that the system of annual course monitoring had been suggested as a way of lessening the burden on course organisers, departments and reviewers. However, experience gained through the pilot exercise had shown this not to be the case and no additional benefits to the annual monitoring process had been identified. Therefore, it had been proposed that the College should return to the 3 year review cycle (with additional reviews when needed).

8.4.2 It was reported that the framework developed for the Master's annual monitoring form would be used as the course review template, and that the course review process would be aligned with the departmental periodic review process, with all courses in a department being reviewed at the same time. The rating system of "GOOD", "SATISFACTORY" and "POOR" as the outcome for course reviews would be re-introduced, where courses receiving a rating of "GOOD" would be reviewed three years later (normally around the time of their department's periodic review of PGT provision), and courses receiving a rating of "POOR" or "SATISFACTORY" would have the timing and format of their next review(s) decided by the relevant MQC.

8.4.3 It was reported that new courses would be asked to provide a short report on their progress in the summer term of their first year of operation, followed by a short report on the entry and exit qualifications for their first student cohort in the autumn/spring term of their second year of operation. This would continue until the course falls into line with the review schedule for their department.

8.4.4 In addition, the routine reports received annually by the Master's Quality Committees in respect of all Master's level courses, would provide regular data for review. The Committees receive details of applications and student numbers, as well as data on examination results and awards, and departmental representatives would in future be asked to comment verbally when these reports were considered. The Committees currently receive the external examiner(s)'

report(s) for all courses and would, in future, receive a cumulative summary of modifications made to courses. Verbal reports from departmental representative on significant themes and issues discussed at staff-student committees would also be given, and the Committee would determine where follow up action was required.

8.4.5 Courses would be asked to consider the following issues annually as part of their course management or departmental education committees:

- What measures have been taken to ensure programmes remain current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline, and practice in its application
- An evaluation of the extent to which the intended learning outcomes are being attained by students
- An evaluation of the continuing effectiveness of the curriculum and of assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes
- What measures have been taken to ensure that recommendations for appropriate actions are followed up to remedy any identified shortcomings.

Departmental teaching committee minutes would be collected as part of the course review process and these questions would then be considered in detail as part of the periodic review. Initially, there will be an interim period when these questions will be considered in the course reviews.

8.4.6 It was reported that this would be allied with better provision of data to departments via the Dashboard reports, so that course organisers can access the data required for course and periodic departmental reviews in a 'ready to use' format.

8.4.7 It was reported that an on-line version of the course review form, accessed via SharePoint, was currently being piloted and that it was hoped to make this available shortly.

8.4.8 After some further discussion, the Committee endorsed the proposed revisions to the procedure, and it was agreed that members should be sent a copy of the proposed form as soon as possible so that they could consult within their departments.

Action: SJB

9. Course Modifications

9.1 MEd in Surgical Education

The Committee considered a request from the Department of Surgery and Cancer for changes to the assessment and the addition of new modules, retrospectively with effect from October 2012.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/15

9.1.1 The Committee approved the request for the introduction of a dissertation progress report which would be weighted toward the final dissertation mark. This would be assessed by means of coursework to be submitted at the beginning of June in the final year of the course.

9.1.2 The Committee considered the request to offer existing modules from the MSc in Health Policy as new optional modules as part of the MEd in Surgical Education. Students following the MEd are required to take one optional module. The Committee supported the proposal to add modules from the MSc Health Policy, but asked for further assurances that the modules would be equivalent in terms of ETCS to the modules currently available in the MEd programme. The Committee noted that students would be required to make up for any differences in ECTS by undertaking a piece of coursework, and asked for confirmation of who would be responsible for the assessment of this course work.

9.1.3 Subsequent to the meeting, satisfactory responses were received in respect of 9.1.2 above and assurances were given that the new modules were equivalent to optional modules on the current programme in terms of ECTS, assessment and academic vigour.

9.1.4 It was noted that the external examiners were supportive of both of the above changes and that student consent had been collected by the Department.

9.1.5 The Committee agreed to recommend that the proposed amendments to the MEd in Surgical Education be approved by the Senate, retrospectively with effect from October 2012.

9.2 MSc in Surgical Science

The Committee considered a request from the Department of Surgery and Cancer for a change to the course delivery, retrospectively with effect from October 2012.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/16

9.2.1 It was noted that the course is currently delivered full-time over one calendar year and part-time over two calendar years where the part-time students complete 70% of the taught course in year one and 30% of the taught course in year two. They complete their written examinations at the end of year two.

9.2.2 It was noted that the Department proposed an alternative part-time option which would allow part-time students to complete the whole of the taught course in year one and undertake the associated examinations at the end of year one. This was in response to the changes in surgical education in the UK.

9.2.3 Students following this proposed new timetable would normally have collected all relevant clinical/surgical data required for their dissertation by the end of term one in their second year. In certain specific circumstances when the student's external surgical institute (work place) relates to the student's surgical specialty and research project, the Department requested that the remaining time allocated could be completed at the external institute, where the student would concentrate on the collation, interpretation and statistical analysis of the data collected, together with writing and preparing their dissertation for submission.

9.2.4 In such circumstances, the Committee was assured that the Department would counsel the students appropriately and that regular contact would be maintained with the course director whilst at the external institution.

9.2.5 It was noted that the external examiners were supportive of the above change and that student consent had been collected by the Department.

9.2.6 The Committee agreed to recommend that the proposed amendments to the MSc in Surgical Science be approved by the Senate, retrospectively with effect from October 2012.

10. Draft Precepts for Master's Programmes

The Committee received draft precepts and supporting documentation for Master's level programmes.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/17

10.1 Members were reminded that the Senate had previously approved precepts for MRes programmes which were due to become effective from October 2013. MRes precepts were originally developed because it had been felt that MRes programmes should be aligned with research programmes. Members were told that, for quality assurance purposes, MRes courses were now considered to be more akin to taught Master's programmes.

10.2 The proposed Master's precepts had been based on the approved precepts for MRes programmes. They would be applied to all postgraduate Master's level programmes and had incorporated and therefore replaced the precepts for MRes programmes. Items in Chapter B11 of the Quality Code had been adhered to where necessary in the Master's precepts.

In discussion, the Committee made the following comments:

Precept B: Offers – should include mention of Special Qualifying Examinations.

Precept C: Induction – should not mention "late arrivals" but refer to students unable to attend the scheduled induction programme.

Precept D: Course Handbook – in discussion the Committee agreed that many course handbooks contained a level of operational detail which course organisers may not wish to make available on an external facing website. In this case, a redacted version of the course handbook should be made available on the course web page and the complete version should be made available to students in a password protected area.

Precept E: Pastoral Care – should also specify that member of staff should be appropriately qualified and experienced.

Precept F: Teaching and Support Staff – should also specify that member of staff should be appropriately experienced.

Precept G: Teaching and Learning – should also specify that these issues should be routinely considered by course management or departmental education committees and recorded in the minutes.

Precept L: Student Representation – should also include the requirement to ensure student representation on all deliberative Committees.

Precept N: Assessment – amend to read that “normally the assessment of an MRes course will require at least one viva.”

10.3 It was noted that it had been proposed that the precepts should form part of the periodic review cycle so that departments were checked for compliance every six years. New course proposals would also be required to describe how the precepts would be met.

10.4 Subject to the amendments recommended above, the Committee agreed that the precepts should replace the MRes precepts and be applied to all Master’s level programmes. The Committee agreed that the precepts should be reviewed as part of the periodic review cycle.

10.5 It was noted that the Senate would be asked to endorse the precepts for Master’s Level courses.

11. Preparation of Model Answers to Examination Questions

The Committee received a proposal from the QAAC that departments should provide their students with model outline answers and illustrative examples of how they might address examination questions.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/18

The Committee considered the policy proposal and endorsed the concept. The Committee agreed with the concern expressed by Senate and agreed with the QAAC proposal that, as a minimum, Departments should provide their students with model outline answers and illustrative examples, where appropriate, of how they might address the question.

12. Discussion of Issues with the Peer Assessment of Coursework

The Committee considered a discussion paper by Dr David McPhail, Deputy Director of the Graduate School, on the peer assessment of coursework.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/19

In general discussion the Committee felt that the element of peer assessment was a useful training for students to experience, but should not normally be used as formative assessment. The Committee felt unable to make any significant comments on the process.

13. External Examiners

The Committee received the nominations to be considered for the Boards of Examiners in the 2012 – 2013 session.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/20

Discussion reported in Appendix 1 [not published with the minutes]

14. Representations Concerning Decisions of Boards of Examiners for 2010-11

The Committee received a report on Representations Concerning Decisions of Boards of Examiners for 2010-2011.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/21

The report had been received by Senate May 2012 and was presented to the Committee for information.

15. Regulations for the award of Taught Master’s Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates

The Committee was asked to consider revisions to clarify the credit transfer arrangements in respect of Master’s level courses.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/22

It was noted that the addition of clause 1.4.2 was required to clarify that students who are granted credit towards an Imperial College award under College APL arrangements are not entitled to a pro rata reduced fee.

It was noted that under 1.3 were required to clarify that students registered for an Imperial College award may not simultaneously undertake stand alone modules from that course which may be available through the School of Professional Development for credits towards the Imperial

College award.

Members were advised that, in the new point 1.3 6 – the reference should refer to 1.3.4 – 1.3.5 (not 1.3.3 – 1.3.4).

Subject to the correction noted above, the Committee agreed that the revisions should be recommended for Senate approval.

16. PG SOLE - Spring 2012

The Committee received a report on the overall results for the Spring PG SOLE.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/23

It was noted that individual reports had been sent to departments at the time and that the overall results were reported here for information and completeness. The Committee noted an improvement in the participation rates overall and agreed that results at individual course level were more informative.

17. Reports from Departmental Representatives

17.1 The School of Public Health asked for advice on requirements for Master's students to come to campus each day during the project period. In particular, the School of Public Health was interested in the status of students who do not carry out laboratory based projects and do not on the whole carry our primary research studies. Most projects in the School of Public Health are secondary analyses of existing data and systematic reviews of the literature, and many students argue that they can work with their data and other electronic information efficiently at a location/site of their choice where there is internet access.

Members were reminded that departments should establish robust mechanisms for keeping in contact with students who were not present on campus each day. After some discussion it was generally agreed that, where it was appropriate for students to work off site during the project period, then they would normally be expected to be working within a reasonable commuting distance of their College campus. In these circumstances, supervisors would be expected to know where they were and to establish a regular pattern of contact. In exceptional circumstances, students who were working further afield should have the arrangements approved by the course organiser. Students who were working overseas should have the arrangements approved in the normal way.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AND/OR DISSEMINATION

18. HEFCE Wider Information Sets

Members were reminded that HEFCE had published a report on the provision of public information about higher education courses. The HEFCE *Provision of Information* report sets out a range of information that institutions must make available on their course web pages for current and/or prospective students. Courses were required to ensure that this wider information is up to date and available on course web pages, including course handbooks, links to surveys, programme specifications and employability statement.

It was noted that several Master's courses do not yet have the HEFCE wider information requirements available on their course web pages, and it was agreed that departmental representatives would liaise with the courses concerned to ensure that the information was up to date by the end of November.

Action: SJB

19. Reports from key College Committees

19.1 Senate: Members were reminded that the latest Executive Summaries from Senate are available [here](#). Members were asked to note that Senate had approved changes to the *Extenuating Circumstances Affecting Academic Performance Policy and Procedures* and accompanying forms [October Senate Paper 07] and changes to the tariff of penalties for major cheating offences [October Senate Paper 07]

19.2 Quality Assurance Advisory Committee: Members were reminded that the latest Executive Summaries from QAAC are available [here](#).

20. Postgraduate Surveys

Members received a note of the Postgraduate Surveys planned for 2012-2013.

It was highlighted that PG SOLE would open on 3 December 2012.

21. Schedule of course reviewers

Members were reminded that course reviews were due for completion in the Spring Term and that they and their alternates would be asked to undertake reviews on behalf of the Committee.

22. Professional Skills Development for Master's Level students

22.1 It was reported that the MasterClass timetable had been expanded to include delivery at the South Kensington, Hammersmith, St Mary's and Silwood Campuses. Members noted that the new Graduate School Teaching Fellow [Dr Helal Ahmed] and the new Graduate School Learning Technologist [Dr Sergio Santos] were in the process of talking to course organisers to develop the programme. It was reported that new courses are being developed piloted and some topics been delivered specifically for groups of Master's courses. Information on the MasterClass programme 2012-2013 can be found at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/graduateschool/currentstudents/professionalskillsmasters>

22.2 It was reported that the Postgraduate Development Unit had attended a number of Master's course inductions at the start of session and that it was hoped that more could be accommodated in future. The induction presentation was also available on line at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/graduateschool/currentstudents/professionalskillsmasters>

22.3 It was reported that the Graduate School had developed a dedicated web page for Master's students and that all Master's level students would now access the same programme via the same web page as follows:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/graduateschool/currentstudents>

23. Postgraduate Recruitment

Members were asked to note the dates of Postgraduate Open Days 2012 – 2015 as follows:

Wednesday 5 December 2012
 Wednesday 4 December 2013
 Wednesday 10 December 2014
 Wednesday 9 December 2015

It was reported that responsibility for organising the PG Open Day had now passed to the Student Marketing and Events Manager (Communications and Development).

24. Any Other Business

24.1 Members received (tabled) **paper 27** in respect of progression rules for the MEd University Learning and Teaching.

24.2 It was noted that in May 2008, Senate had made provision for students registered on the former Certificate of Advanced Studies in Learning and Teaching (CASLAT) to be able to progress to the former MEd University Learning and Teaching (ULT) which was launched in July 2008.

24.3 It was reported that it had recently become apparent that the College had not specifically approved progression rules for candidates starting the CASLAT qualification before January 2009 who had been awarded the CASLAT qualification after January 2009.

24.4 Following the more recent approval of the new structure for the MEd ULT for new entrants with effect from September 2011, it had become necessary to revise the progression rules for this programme so that CASLAT award holders who had not already progressed to the MEd ULT could now progress to the new Postgraduate Diploma ULT.

24.5 The Committee agreed to recommend that the proposed revisions to the progression rules be approved by the Senate.

25. Dates of meetings in 2012-2013

Members were asked to note the dates of meetings in 2012-2013

Monday 28 January 2013

Monday 18 March 2013
Monday 3 June 2013
Monday 29 July 2013

All of the meetings would start at 2.00pm and would take place in the Billiard Room, 58 Prince's Gate, South Kensington Campus.

26. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Monday 28 January 2013, in the Billiard Room, 58 Prince's Gate, South Kensington Campus. The meeting will start at 14:00. The deadline for papers is Monday 14 January 2013.

27. Reserved Business (not circulated to student members)

27.1 Special Cases Panel – Master's Level Programmes 2012-3

Membership of the special cases panel for Master's Level programme was confirmed.

MLSPD/MQC/2012/25

Members were reminded that when the special case panels were set up it was thought to be good practice that the two members being consulted should reach decisions independently without discussing with each other or even knowing who the other was. However when appeals panels consider penalties for students suspected of examination offences the panel discusses penalties by email and so the Registry has now advised that it is alright for members of the special cases panel to discuss with each other rather than consider independently.

27.2 Special Cases Reports

The Committee received a report on special cases made for admissions to Master's level courses

MLSPD/MQC/2012/26