

Postgraduate Research Quality Committee

15 May 2015
Confirmed Minutes

Professor Sue Gibson (Chair)
Mr Hassan Ahmadzadeh (Student Representative)
Dr Tim Albrecht (Chemistry)
Professor Ferri Aliabadi (Aeronautics)
Professor Peter Allison (Earth Science and Engineering)
Dr Bernadette Byrne (Chair of the Postgraduate Professional Development Committee)
Dr Donna Brown (Crick Doctoral Centre)
Professor Peter Cheung [Academic Lead] (Hong Kong University/Imperial Doctoral Programme)
Dr Daniele Dini [for Professor Andrew Amis] (Mechanical Engineering)
Dr Niki Gounaris (Life Sciences)
Professor Andrew Holmes (Electrical and Electronic Engineering)
Professor Debra Humphris (Vice Provost - Education)
Professor Marjo-Riitta Jarvelin (School of Public Health)
Professor Henrik Jensen (Mathematics)
Dr Sylvain Ladame [for Dr Anil Bharath] (Bioengineering)
Professor Peter Lindstedt (College Consul)
Professor Stefan Maier (Physics)
Dr David McPhail (Deputy Chair)
Dr Felicity Mellor (School of Professional Development)
Dr Kevin Murphy (Department of Medicine)
Mr Dean Pateman (Academic Registrar)
Dr Alessandra Rosso (Computing)
Professor Spencer Sherwin [Academic Lead] (Imperial-University of São Paulo Joint Degree)
Dr Mike Tennant (Centre for Environmental Policy)
Dr Mark Ungless (MRC Clinical Sciences Centre)
Dr Ahmer Wadee (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
Professor Xiao Yun Xu (Chemical Engineering)

In Attendance

Dr Marco Aurisicchio (Dyson School of Design Engineering)
Ms Sally Baker (Senior Assistant Registrar, Senate and Academic Review)
Dr Janet De Wilde (Head of Postgraduate Professional Development, Graduate School)
Ms Laura McConnell (Manager of the Graduate School) (for item 7)
Mr Alex Page (International Relations Officer)
Mrs Clare Scheibner (Assistant Registrar, Quality Assurance and Enhancement)

1. Apologies for absence

Professor Andrew Amis (Mechanical Engineering)
Dr Simon Archer (College Tutor)
Professor Erkko Autio (Imperial College Business School)
Dr Anil Bharath (Bioengineering)
Dr David Dye (Materials)
Professor Richard Kitney [Academic Lead] (NTU/Imperial Doctoral Programme)
Professor Paul Langford [Academic Lead] (A*STAR-Imperial Doctoral Programme)
Mr Pascal Loose (ICU Deputy President, Education)
Professor Tony Magee (NHLI)
Ms Nida Mahmud (GSU Chair)
Professor Keith Newton [Academic Lead] (EngD in Non-Destructive Evaluation)
Professor Michael Seckl [and alternate] (Surgery and Cancer)
Dr Mike Templeton [Academic Lead] (EngD in Water Engineering)

Professor Denis Wright (Director of Student Support)

2. Minutes of the last meeting

PRQC/2014/29

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2015 were approved.

3. Matters arising

There were no other matters arising not appearing elsewhere on the agenda.

ITEMS FOR REPORT

4. Joint and Collaborative PhD Degree Programmes Committees

The Committee received minutes from joint research degree programme committee meetings, and student data when available, as follows:

4.1 A*STAR-Imperial Doctoral Programme

PRQC/2014/30

The Committee was pleased to note that the AIP scholars were progressing well and that the programme was running smoothly.

4.2 Malaysia-Imperial Doctoral Programme (MIDP)

The Committee was reminded that the MIDP had been withdrawn for entry and that no new students had been admitted to the programme since January 2012. The Committee was reassured that the College was committed to supporting the remaining MIDP students who were now all in their writing up period.

4.3 Nanyang Technological University (NTU)/Imperial Doctoral Programme

[No Paper PRQC/2014/31]

The Committee noted that there had been seven students on the programme in total, all of whom had now completed their studies and most of whom had submitted their thesis, and that no new students had been admitted to the programme since September 2010. The Committee noted that the Memorandum of Agreement governing the joint degree programme had expired in November 2014 and that no formal intent for renewal and continuation of the programme had been received.

The Committee noted that formal confirmation of the status of the programme was expected shortly.

4.4 National University of Singapore (NUS)/Imperial Doctoral Programme – Minutes of 22 September 2014

PRQC/2014/32

The Committee noted in particular the difficulties caused by the difference in the length of the normal research degree programme at each institution (4 years at Imperial and 5 years at NUS). The issues had been discussed at the NUS-Imperial Board meeting and NUS had resolved to send a clear message to students and supervisors that the joint degree was a 4 year programme.

The Committee was pleased to note that the NUS/Imperial scholars were progressing well and that feedback on the student experience had been overwhelmingly positive.

The Committee noted that the Memorandum of Agreement governing the joint degree programme was due for renewal in September 2015 and that the College would be reviewing the programme arrangements in advance of this date. In the meantime, the College was committed to supporting the current students until the completion of their studies.

4.5 Hong Kong University (HKU)/Imperial Doctoral Programme – Minutes of 22 July 2014

PRQC/2014/33

The Committee was pleased to note that the HKU/Imperial scholars were progressing well and that the arrangements for the joint programme were running smoothly.

The Committee noted that there had hitherto been no student representation on the Joint Degree Programme Committee and that this would be addressed before July 2015. In addition, it had been agreed that the formal board meeting would be followed by an informal lunch meeting to which current students would be invited.

The Committee noted that the joint programme agreement was due for renewal in September 2015 and that the College would be reviewing the programme arrangements in advance of this date. In the meantime, the College was committed to supporting the current students until the completion of their studies.

4.6 Imperial-University of São Paulo Joint Degree - meeting of the Imperial Sub-Committee of the Imperial-USP Joint Degree Committee – Minutes of 10 March 2015

PRQC/2014/34

The Committee noted that there were currently two students on the programme and one student due to commence studies shortly. The Committee further noted that a revised agreement between Imperial and the University of São Paulo was currently in discussion and that the arrangements for the assessment of progression through the programme were also being reviewed.

4.7 EngD in Nuclear Engineering – Minutes of 20 June 2014

PRQC/2014/35

The Committee noted that the recent bid for renewed Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) funding for the Nuclear Engineering Doctorate Centre had been unsuccessful and that other funding streams were being explored to see if the programme could run independently without EPSRC funds. The Committee noted that there had been no new students admitted to the programme in October 2014 and that none were expected in October 2015. The Committee further noted that the current engineering doctorate students would be unaffected by the loss of the EPSRC funding and that the existing centre would continue to support all current students until the completion of their studies.

4.8 EngD in Non-Destructive Evaluation – Minutes of 8 September 2014

PRQC/2014/36

The Committee noted that October 2014 had been the last intake of students in the CDT in Non-Destructive Evaluation. The Committee was pleased to note from the review of progress of the EngD cohorts that excellent outcomes were being achieved across the cohorts.

The Committee noted that a new Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) in Quantitative Non-Destructive Evaluation would begin for the academic year 2015-16, with the first intake of students due to begin studies in October 2015

4.9 EngD in Water Engineering – Minutes of 12 March 2015

PRQC/2014/37

The Committee noted that the Imperial cohorts were progressing well and that the programme appeared to be running smoothly.

4.10 Medical Research Council (MRC)-Asthma UK Centre in Allergic Mechanisms of Asthma 4-year training programme

[Paper circulated subsequent to the meeting] **PRQC/2014/38**

The Committee noted that the MRC Asthma UK Centre in Mechanisms of Allergic Asthma was split over sites at Imperial and King's College London and that there had been a small intake of students annually, split evenly between both Colleges.

The Committee noted that the funding for the Centre had been through one five year renewal (10 years in total) and would not be renewed again by the MRC. The Committee noted that the last entry to the programme had been in September 2014 and that there would be no further students admitted.

Subsequent to the meeting, the postgraduate training report submitted to the MRC advisory board meeting was received, including details on current and submitting students, together with data on admissions, graduation (Masters and PhD) and first destination.

4.11 The London Pain Consortium 4-year PhD programme [statistics only]

PRQC/2014/39

The Committee was reminded that London Pain Consortium 4-year PhD programme had been withdrawn for entry and was no longer recruiting. The Committee noted that the last four students on the programme had started in September 2012 and had moved from their rotation year in September 2013 and were now in their research placement College. One of the students would be finishing in 2015 and three in 2016. There would be no further intake to this programme.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

5. Precept Reviews of Research Degree Provision

5.1 Aeronautics

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Department of Aeronautics, in relation to 2013-2014, presented by Professor Andrew Holmes who had undertaken the review.

PRQC/2014/40

5.1.1 The Committee commended the examples of good practice which had been highlighted by the reviewer including the investment in laboratory and computing research facilities, the PhD Research Colloquium and the appointment of a PGR Champion to support cohort building initiatives.

5.1.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that a lack of detail in some of the Department's responses had made it difficult to judge compliance against some of the precepts, particularly in relation to precepts 1 and 2 (interviewing and admissions) and in relation to precepts 4 and 6 (supervisory arrangements). The Department had subsequently supplied some further evidence and the reviewer had then considered that the Department was fully compliant with these precepts.

5.1.3 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments with regard to the low on-time completion rates at the Early Stage Assessment and Late Stage Review. The Department explained that local administrative issues had partly contributed to this and confirmed that there was a robust mechanism in place to remind students and supervisors of impending deadlines and their responsibilities.

5.1.4 The Committee found that the programme was not compliant with regard to precept 16 [Writing up Stage] as, subject to agreement by the Head of Department, research students may be allowed to continue their experimental work after entering their writing up period. In discussion, the Head of Department made the case that denying laboratory access to students before they had finished their experimental work was detrimental to the overall quality of the PhD and that students were rarely able to afford to extend their registration as this would require the payment of additional fees. In further discussion the Committee acknowledged the differences between undertaking experimental as opposed to computational research, but concluded that the PhD registration period was finite and that the College regulations and the precepts served to lay down a research degree framework for all students. The Department was asked to consider ways of ensuring that students were not encouraged to continue experimental work after moving into the writing up stage and to report action taken to the Committee in 12 months' time.

5.1.5 The Committee agreed that the Department had adequately addressed the remaining comments made by the reviewer, and found that the Department was compliant in all precepts, with the exception of Precept 16 where the Department was considered to be 'Working towards Compliance'. The Committee requested that the Department should provide a progress report on action taken to ensure compliance with Precept 16 in 12 months' time.

Action: Department of Aeronautics

5.2 Imperial – Hong Kong University (HKU) Joint Degree Programme

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Imperial–HKU Joint Degree Programme, in relation to 2012-2013, presented by Dr Alessandra Rosso who had undertaken the review.

PRQC/2014/41

5.2.1 The Committee noted that this programme had started in October 2010 and that this was the first precept review to have been undertaken. The Committee noted that the first students had registered in January 2011 and that none of the students had yet graduated.

5.2.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that the arrangements for maintaining contact between supervisors and students throughout the programme of study were not formally confirmed with the Academic Lead at the time of submitting the Research Plan Confirmation (Precept 6). The Committee found that the programme was not fully compliant with Precept 6 but was considered to be working towards compliance since the arrangements appeared to be in place, and asked that the Academic Lead should take steps to ensure that the roles of the main supervisor and the alternative contact were clearly understood within the first three months of registration.

5.2.3 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the induction programme and the student handbook (Precepts 7 and 8) and found that the programme was not fully compliant with these two precepts as the students were not provided with information specific to the joint degree programme. In further discussion it was agreed that a comprehensive joint degree programme handbook should be produced for the programme.

5.2.4 The Committee agreed that the Academic Lead had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer and endorsed the reviewer's assessment of the programme as 'Compliant' overall. The Committee noted that the programme should next be reviewed in the 2016-17 academic year.

Aide Memoire

In general discussion, the Committee agreed that there was a need for a student handbook template specifically for joint and collaborative programmes which could be adapted at local level to accommodate programme specific information. This would allow consistency of information for students across all joint and collaborative programmes. It was noted that a postgraduate handbook template was already available on the Registry website and that this could be adapted for use by joint and collaborative programmes.

Action: Registry QA Team

5.3 Mathematics

The Committee considered the Precept Review of departmental research degree provision in the Department of Mathematics, in relation to 2013-14, presented by Dr Kevin Murphy who had undertaken the review.

PRQC/2014/42

5.3.1 The Committee noted the evidence of good practice which had been highlighted by the reviewer including:

- Mini-conference days allowing PhD students to present their research to fellow students and staff.
- Prize awards for excellent progress at the Late Stage Review and for the best thesis submitted in an academic year.
- The allocation of student travel budgets which were administered by the student in collaboration with the supervisor. This was to encourage yearly participation in and presentation at international conferences, workshops and summer schools.

5.3.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comment that a very comprehensive student handbook (Precept 9) was provided in both hard and electronic copy to students, but that only minimal information was publically available on line. The Committee asked that the complete handbook should be made publicly available on the Department's website, although advised that any content which was not relevant to external visitors may be removed.

5.3.3 The Committee noted the reviewer's comment that the appeals procedures were explained to students only as required (Precept 12) and the Department had agreed to include guidance on the appeals procedure in the student handbook.

5.3.4 The Committee noted that the percentage of students who completed the progression milestones on time appeared to be low, but accepted that this was not reflected in the Department's thesis submission rate. The Committee noted the robust action which had been taken by the Department to encourage on time completion and agreed that this was satisfactory.

5.3.5 The Committee agreed that the Department had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the Department of Mathematics as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Department would next be reviewed in the 2017-18 academic year.

In further discussion, the Committee noted the comments from the Department about the effective recording of the progression milestone data and noted that this had been considered by “The Postgraduate Lifecycle” work stream in the Operational Excellence programme. The Committee was informed that this was one of the work streams chosen to be piloted, and that Departments would be contacted with the opportunity to be involved in the pilot.

6. Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2015

The Committee noted that the PRES 2015 had been launched on 2 March and had closed on 14 May.

6.1 Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2015 – Results

The Committee noted that the overall response rate for the PRES 2015 was 42.9%, which represented a 0.8% decrease compared to the PRES 2013 participation rate. The Committee further noted that the headline results and final participation rates would be distributed to departments forthwith.

6.2 Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2015 – Action Plans

PRQC/2014/43

The Committee considered the process for producing departmental action plans, together with the proposed action plan template. The Committee noted that the HEA standard benchmarking reports would be circulated across College by mid-June and that departments would be asked to complete an action plan which would be pre-populated with the results data for 2013 and 2015.

Action plans would be considered by the PRQC in the autumn 2015 and a summary of trends and actions would subsequently be considered by QAEC and reported to Senate.

In further discussion it was considered important that departmental action plans should be developed in consultation with student representatives. It was agreed that the survey results and action plan should be discussed at Staff Student Committees (SSC) and signed off by at least one of the student representatives and the SSC Chair as confirmation that this step had taken place. It was recommended that appropriate wording be added to the action plan template.

Action: Registry Surveys Team

7. Working Party for World Class Research Supervision

7.1 The Committee considered the interim report from the Working Party for World Class Research Supervision (as at Friday 24 April 2015) and noted that the report would be presented to a joint meeting of the Vice-Provost Advisory Group for Education (VPAGE) and Vice-Provost Advisory Group for Research (VPAGR) in June.

PRQC/2014/44

The paper was presented by the Graduate School Manager who highlighted activities undertaken by the Working Party during 2014-15, a summary of which is below.

- Student Perspectives - The Graduate School had hosted a student focus group and, using information gathered at that meeting, and in partnership with the Graduate Students' Union, had developed the World-Class Research Supervision Student Survey which had provided all research students the opportunity to share their views on supervision and contribute to the project.
- Departmental Perspectives - The Graduate School Director had met with senior academic representatives (Heads of Department, Postgraduate Tutors and Directors of Postgraduate Studies) from various departments to discuss what constitutes world-class research supervision from a departmental point of view. The Graduate School Director had also given a presentation at the Heads of Department lunch in November 2014.
- International Perspectives - The Graduate School had met with colleagues from Hong Kong University of Science and Technology to discuss supervisory arrangements and also visited the National University of Singapore and Nanyang Technical University to discuss different supervisory models.

- Award Winning Supervisor Perspectives - Recipients of the 2013 and 2014 President's Award for Excellence in Research Supervision and the 2014 Student Academic Choice Award winner for Best Supervision had been invited to share their views of what constitutes world-class research supervision.
- Academic Staff Perspectives - The Graduate School had hosted three academic staff focus group meetings which were an open invitation to all staff who wished to contribute their views of what constitutes world-class research supervision.

The Committee also noted the following observations made by the Working Party:

- 78% of students surveyed were happy with the supervision they received at College. 12% were unhappy with their supervision and 10% were ambivalent about the supervision they received.
- Students would welcome more information about the management style of proposed supervisors and the nature of research groups, for example, the number of students, postdocs and other members of staff associated with the group and how it works as a team.
- Students would like clearer research objectives from the start, and recognised the benefit of the Research Plan Confirmation milestone. Students reported that College assessment milestones were in general a useful way to focus research and take their programme forward. However, they would like clearer guidelines from supervisors and departments on the requirements for assessment. There had been some instances where students had reported that staff did not take the assessments seriously and provided little feedback on progress.
- On the whole, students met with supervisors on a weekly basis and were happy with this frequency. However, they would like the opportunity to provide confidential feedback on the supervision they received and for it be acted on. Students suggested that this could be in the form of an independent board or opportunity given as part of the assessment milestones.
- The role of individual staff within supervisory teams should be clarified and formalised, especially the role of postdocs whose help was greatly valued by students.
- Overall students were satisfied with the academic and wellbeing support they received, but student counsellors and College Tutors had expressed the view that increased awareness of support services amongst supervisors and students would facilitate a more coherent team-based approach to student support. The development of a research postgraduate specific student counselling programme would be well received.
- Many students did not consider themselves to be part of a cohort but those who did found cohorts to be a good support network and suggested that the cohort building programme be extended to as many students as possible at an early stage.

7.2 World-Class Research Supervision Student Survey

The Committee received the results of the World-Class Research Supervision Student Survey and noted that this had already been circulated to departments.

PRQC/2014/45

7.3 Graduate Student Union Solutions Requested by Students

The Committee received a paper from the Graduate Students' Union highlighting Faculty level trends in the data, presented by the Student Representative, Mr Hassan Ahmadzadeh.

PRQC/2014/46

The Committee heard that supervision surveys reflect positively on the average quality of research supervision across the campus, however, it was clear that there were still a small, but significant, number of students who had unsatisfactory supervision.

The Committee noted the following series of suggestions proposed by students to potentially enhance the quality of their supervision:

Milestone-Related Approaches

- Enhance the rigour, clarity and influence of the Early Stage Assessment and Late Stage Review
- Give more flexible timing for certain stages where appropriate and possible
- Streamline the Late Stage Review to make it more convenient for those on track and more critically valuable for those who are struggling

Supervisor-Related Approaches

- Compulsory training for those supervisors with bad feedback from students
- Rewarding good practice as well as providing consequences for bad practice

Postdoctoral-Related Approaches

- Training for those who are involved in the supervision of PhD students
- Acknowledgement of the post-docs role in PhD supervision

Improving Representation

- Form a student-staff committee at each faculty with the Academic Welfare Officer and academic staff which could directly reflect the student feedback through representation channels
- Empower student reps so they could be used as an effective channel for students to discuss supervisor-related problems

Cohort Building

- Develop opportunities for collaboration through cohorts at each department

PG-Focused Counselling

- Develop a program for counselling services particularly for research students and supervisor-related issues

Professional Skill and Development

- Implement a feedback mechanism to enable students to receive feedback about the professional skills and development courses they had taken from the Graduate School and/or their supervisors

7.4 Postgraduate Research Experience

The Committee considered the impact of the current progression milestones and of the professional skills development training requirement on the PGR experience.

PRQC/2014/47

Following lengthy discussion regarding the current agreed milestones it was highlighted that some departments found them useful while others found them to create additional stress, compromising the development and creativity of their students.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment further on the findings of the World-Class Research Supervision survey in order for views to be fed back to the Working Party. A summary of the discussion points is as follows:

- Students require clear guidance and objectives from the very beginning of their research programme.
- Every research student is unique and therefore the supervisory experience would also be unique. Skilled supervisors would tailor their support and guidance to suit individual student needs. The research experience would therefore be very different for most.
- Milestones should be sufficiently flexible to allow for this unique experience to take place. A move away from assessment to progress and review points would be welcome. Milestones should be flexible so as not to hinder students who are progressing well but should also serve as a means to support struggling students.
- Exit points should be seen in a positive light and not as failure. For some students, the PhD is not right and the early milestones facilitate the exit process where required.
- Quality of supervision received should be distinct from the milestones.

- There was general support for a confidential, independent body in which students could raise concern about the quality of supervision they received. However, there was recognition that departments are often best placed to deal with difficulties when they arise as they know the nuances of particular arrangements, students, supervisors and research groups.
- How departments manage supervisors who receive poor feedback is difficult.
- Stress levels in students were increasing. There is need for greater support for staff to be able to deal with students who have mental illness and know when to refer students on. The Committee heard that a new post, Student Health Advisor, was being sought. This position would be filled by a health care professional able to assist students and advise staff, including supervisors, on how to deal with mental health issues.

8. Amendments to Regulations for the award of PhD and MPhil (for students registering in and after January 2011)

[No Paper PRQC/2014/48]

This item was removed from the agenda.

9. Submission data

The Committee considered a report of submission rates for students due to submit for an MPhil or PhD during the period 1 February 2013 to 31 January 2014.

PRQC/2014/49

In general discussion the Committee was asked to consider the relevance and nature of the data presented. Members were invited to submit requests for specific data analysis regarding submissions, with a brief summary of how this data would be useful, to the Academic Registrar to inform the future reporting of this data.

Action: All

This would enable the Academic Registrar and the PRQC Chair to determine the nature of the report in the future.

Action: Academic Registrar and PRQC Chair

In the meantime, it was agreed that trend data looking at submission rates during the period February 2014 to January 2015 would be submitted to the next meeting (November 2015), allowing for the consideration of more recent data. Subsequent to the meeting it was confirmed that a report on data up to September 2015 might be possible.

Action: Deputy Academic Registrar

ITEMS FOR REPORT

10. Imperial Recognised Location (IRL) & Partner Research Institution (PRI) Report 2014/15

PRQC/2014/50

The Committee was asked to note a report of current IRLs and PRIs, specifically noting those which had been recently approved. It was agreed that number of students registered at each location or institution should be included in future reports.

Action: Registry QA Team

11. Postgraduate Professional Development Committee: update

PRQC/2014/51

To Committee received the minutes of the Professional Skills Development Committee held 25 February 2015.

12. Application Statistics - Postgraduate Research Application Numbers for 2015 entry

PRQC/2014/52

The Committee noted a report showing the number of Postgraduate Research applications (excluding MRes) made for 2015 entry by 16 April 2015 compared with the number of applications made at the same point in the previous two years.

13. Applications for Split PhD Registration

The Committee noted that applications for Split PhD registration were now approved directly by the Director of the Graduate School and no longer approved by members of the Special Cases Panel. Members were reminded that all applications should be sent to the relevant Admissions Team in the normal way.

14. Senate:

Members noted that the latest executive summaries from Senate were available here [Senate Executive Summary](#).

15. Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee:

Members noted that the latest executive summaries from the QAEC meetings were available here [QAEC Executive Summary](#).

16. Any Other Business

The Committee noted that Dr David McPhail was stepping down as Deputy Director of the Graduate School at the end of the summer. The Committee thanked Dr McPhail for his valuable contributions and commitment to the work of the Graduate School and of the Postgraduate Quality Committees over the past four years.

The Committee noted that Professor Erko Autio was stepping down as the Director of Doctoral Programme at the Imperial College Business School. The Committee thanked Professor Erko Autio for his contribution to the work of the PRQC in recent years.

The Committee noted that Ms Sally Baker, Senior Assistant Registrar (Senate and Academic Review) would be leaving the College at the end of July. The Committee expressed their thanks to Ms Baker for her dedication to the smooth running of the Committee over many years, and wished her well.

The Committee expressed their thanks to the outgoing student representatives for their valuable contributions to the PRQC over the course of their tenure.

17. Dates of meetings in 2015 - 2016

Wednesday 4 Nov 2015, 2pm – 5pm – Room G01, Royal School of Mines

Friday 4 March 2016, 10am – 1pm – Council Room, 170 Queens Gate

Tuesday 10 May 2016, 10am – 1pm - Council Room, 170 Queens Gate

18. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 4 Nov 2015. The meeting will start at 2pm. The deadline for papers will be 21 October 2015.

19. Reserved Business (not circulated to student members)

19.1 Special Cases Reports

The Committee received reports on special cases considered by the Director of the Graduate School (Paper 54), the Director and Deputy Director of the Graduate School (Paper 55) and by the special cases panel for doctoral programmes (Paper 53).

Special Cases for Admissions [27/01/2015 – 07/05/2015] - PRQC/2014/53

Special Cases for Examiners [28/07/2014 – 23/10/2014] - PRQC/2014/54

Special Cases for Extensions & Late Entry [10/02/2015 - 15/05/2015] - PRQC/2014/55

19.2 Special Cases Panels

Members were reminded of the importance of responding to special cases for admission as soon as possible, and within 2 weeks.