

# Imperial College London

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

---

**3 June 2013**

### **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 Myra McClure (College Consul (non-clinical) Faculty of Medicine)  
Dr Felicity Mellor (Humanities)  
Dr Duncan Rogers (NHLI)  
Professor Sue Smith (NHLI)  
Mr Nigel Wheatley (Academic Registrar)  
Professor Denis Wright (Director of Student Affairs)

#### **In Attendance**

Ms Sally Baker (Assistant Registrar, Senate and Academic Review)

The Committee noted that Dr Duncan Rogers had been appointed as Deputy Director of Taught Courses in NHLI from 1st April and that, since his key area of responsibility was the Master's courses, he had taken over from Professor Sue Smith as the representative on the MQC. The Committee welcomed Dr Rogers.

The Committee expressed their thanks to Professor Smith for her contribution to the work of the MQC over the past several years.

#### **1. Apologies for absence**

Ms Boshuo Guo (Academic and Welfare Officer – Non Faculty)  
Professor Debra Humphis (Pro Rector, Education)  
Dr Mick Jones (College Tutor)  
Ms Natalie Kempston (Academic and Welfare Officer – Medicine)  
Professor Robin Leatherbarrow (College Consul, Faculty of Natural Sciences)  
Dr David McPhail (Deputy Chair)  
Ms Helen Pennington (Academic and Welfare Officer – Life Sciences)

#### **2. Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2013 were approved.

**MLSDP/MQC/2012/59**

#### **3. Matters arising**

**3.1 Minute 4.3 - MRes Biosystematics and 4.4 - MSc Taxonomy and Biodiversity** – it was reported that the Joint Management Committee would be established consequent on the renewal of the Collaborative Degree Programme Agreement. Revised programme specifications had recently been received in respect of the two programmes and it was expected that the revised agreement would now be signed.

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

## **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **4. Internal Course Reviews [2011-2012]**

The Chair thanked the reviewers for having completed this second and final round of reviews in such a timely fashion, and reported that all the reviews of the 2011-2012 cohort had now been completed.

#### **4.1 MSc Modern Epidemiology (1YFT & 3YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 (FT) and 2009-2012 (PT) cohorts.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/42**

#### **4.2 MPH Public Health (1YFT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/43**

It was noted that the same reviewer had been asked to review both of these courses since the two programmes were closely related, and it was agreed that the Committee would consider the two courses together.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that these were very well organised and well supported courses which were well integrated and worked very well together. The reviewer reported that they were both good courses with no problems or concerns.

In particular the reviewer commended the very organised and well-structured nature of these courses and the high level of support provided by the academic and administrative teams. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that the quality of the teaching and the dissertation projects was high and that the processes were clear and well supported. The reviewer commented in particular on the measured and appropriate responses to student feedback, and actions taken by the course team to adjust and improve the course.

In respect of the MPH course, the reviewer highlighted the strong sense of community and cohort identity, and commended this as an indicator of overall good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that requesting weekly student feedback was over burdensome on students, and noted that both courses had now simplified this to end of module feedback and an anonymous on-line feedback box where students could post comments at any time.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that application numbers for both courses remained healthy, but that there appeared to be an element of competition between the two courses. The Committee noted that the Department was aware of this issue and that the increasing integration of the courses was expected to ameliorate this.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had commented positively on both courses and any suggestions made had been thoroughly considered by the Department. One aspect of good practice identified in the MSc Epidemiology was the setting of the mock exam, exam and re-sit exam together helping to ensure parity and consistency. This was done in good time so that the exam papers could be reviewed by the exam board and the external examiner. The MPH external examiner particularly liked the student presentations and the timing of them as it gave a sense of occasion to the end of the MPH programme. He further thought highly of the 'Mini projects' and commented very favourably on the close contact between the academic team and the students.

#### **MSc Modern Epidemiology (1YFT & 3YPT)**

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that no follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **MPH Public Health (1YFT)**

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed the issues raised by the

reviewer. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that no follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.3 MSc Cardio Respiratory Nursing (2YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/62**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a good, well organised course, which had a high pass rate and highly motivated students.

In particular the reviewer commented on the excellent feedback provided to students and highlighted the increased use of VLE for recorded lectures, and for reflective questions for students prior to the taught face-to-face session, as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that there were relatively few merits and distinctions awarded on the course and that this had been attributed to the part-time nature of the course and the fact that students had high levels of professional commitments.

The Committee noted that appropriate follow up actions from the previous course review had been taken.

The Committee noted that the external examiner's report had been positive and that the range of assessment titles and methods employed, and the quality of written feedback provided, had been identified as instances of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the action required in respect of the course handbook, the process of providing student feedback, and the process of ensuring regular contact between the Course Director and students and their project supervisors, and noted from the Course Director's response that this would be addressed.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the lack of PG SOLE data and the Course Director's response that their own internal surveys achieved a better level of participation and therefore more meaningful results. In discussion, it was confirmed that courses had the option of including the College PG SOLE questions in their own internal surveys and providing the results for those questions to Registry. These courses could then opt out of the College PG SOLE surveys.

The Committee agreed that the Department should be asked to provide PG SOLE data (or equivalent) at appropriate intervals in the 2013-2014 session.

The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that PG SOLE data should be collected in the interim period.

#### **4.4 MSc Conservation Science (1YFT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/63**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was an excellent course with high academic standards and that the level of project supervision and the external opportunities on offer were first class.

In particular the reviewer commended the dynamic, enthusiastic and caring nature of the course staff, and highlighted the Reading Group, which stimulates thought and debate, as an example of good practice. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that the students very much enjoyed the course and felt part of its development, and that a strong sense of cohort building was achieved on the course.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the difficulties in the allocation of projects and early planning and noted from the response of the Course Director that this issue was being addressed.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the pass mark and concerns that too

many distinctions were being awarded. The Committee noted the response of the Course Director and confirmed that the course pass mark and merit and distinction boundaries were in line with College regulations. In discussion, the Committee noted the further comments concerning the recognition of “outstanding” students who had achieved a grade of distinction greater than 80% and suggested that the Department should consider establishing a prize to recognise such an achievement.

The Committee noted that the external examiners’ reports were extremely complimentary and had commented positively on the course and that any suggestions made had been thoroughly considered by the Department.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser’s response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as ‘Good’ by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years’ time and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.5 MSc Ecology, Evolution and Conservation (1YFT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/64**

#### **4.6 MRes Ecology, Evolution and Conservation Research (1YFT & 2YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 (FT) and 2010-2012 (PT) cohorts.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/65**

It was noted that the same reviewer had been asked to review both of these courses since the two programmes were closely related, and it was agreed that the Committee would consider the two courses together.

The Committee noted the reviewer’s comments that these two courses continued to be very successful, producing well-trained students, many of whom went on to PhD studies. In particular, whilst noting that the course handbooks were under review, the reviewer commended the well-structured handbooks, commenting that the brief biography of each of the project supervisors and top tips on writing up projects were a useful feature. The reviewer highlighted the increasing use of Blackboard for course administration and work submission as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer’s comments concerning the mechanisms for collecting student feedback and in particular the active discussion at staff-student committees of issues raised by students and mechanisms for solutions and action plans.

The Committee noted that the external examiners’ reports had commented positively on the courses and that where suggestions had been made, these had been thoroughly considered by the Department. The Committee noted that the integration of quantitative methods and teaching throughout both courses had been particularly commended by the external examiners.

The Committee noted that the Department had recently done a significant amount of work to revise the course handbooks to ensure that missing information, and information previously imparted verbally to students, was incorporated. The Committee noted that detailed learning outcomes were still to be included and would be added before the start of the next academic year. The Committee requested that a copy of the learning outcomes should be sent to the reviewer before the start of the 2013 session.

#### **MSc Ecology, Evolution and Conservation (1YFT)**

It was agreed that the Course Organiser’s response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as ‘Good’ by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years’ time and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **MRes Ecology, Evolution and Conservation Research (1YFT & 2YPT)**

It was agreed that the Course Organiser’s response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as ‘Good’ by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years’ time

and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.7 MSc Human Molecular Genetics (1YFT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/66**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was an excellent course which was highly valued by students and which provided an excellent grounding in the discipline, preparing students well for future study or work. In particular the reviewer commended the degree of flexibility offered around projects, allowing the most confident to plan their own projects, whilst providing more support and structure for those who were still building their confidence in this area, and highlighted the excellent mentoring and pastoral care as an example of good practice.

The reviewer highlighted the provision of one to one personalised feedback to students who had failed assessments as an instance of good practice. The reviewer commended the provision of feedback on exit assessments as an innovative extension of this, and the provision of written feedback for passed summative assessments was also highlighted.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that the tone of the course handbook was very supportive and upbeat, sending a positive message to students embarking on the course.

The reviewer highlighted the external examiners' comments concerning the strong, positive relationships between staff and students, and the very effective mechanisms for informal as well as "official" feedback. The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had commented very positively on the course and had highlighted in particular the strong sense of community within the cohort.

The Committee noted the reviewer's concerns that projects had sometimes been inappropriate because they fell outside the remit of the course, and the comments that mechanisms for maintaining contact with students doing external projects, and for obtaining student feedback on external placements were not entirely clear. The Committee endorsed the reviewer's suggestion that a formal requirement for contact between internal supervisor and student at key time points should be established. The Committee noted that the Department had responded to these points and was satisfied that appropriate action was being taken to address these issues.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.8 MSc Medical Ultrasound & MSc Medical Ultrasound [Echocardiography] (1YFT & 2YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the courses in respect of the 2011-2012 (FT) and 2010-2012 (PT) cohorts.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/67**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a unique course offering extensive practical professional experience with high rates of graduate employment in the profession. In particular the reviewer commended the excellent and very detailed course handbook and highlighted that the physics component had been revised since the previous review to meet varying levels of student knowledge and understanding.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that students were an integral part of the clinical and research teams. The reviewer highlighted in particular the logbook of clinical cases with one-to-one teaching, and the system whereby each clinical case was discussed with the tutors and provided constructive feedback as instances of good practice.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports were generally positive and the reviewer had highlighted in particular the one-to-one clinical supervision and teaching, and the nine month research projects, with excellent practical elements, as examples of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's concerns that there was no student representation on the NHLI PGT Committee, despite students having been invited to attend. The Committee noted that the Department was taking additional steps to address this, including adjusting the timing of the meetings so that part time students could attend. The Committee suggested that the Department

should additionally consider using video conferencing or Skype to encourage students to participate, and requested that the Department should provide a verbal report on progress made on this issue in the Autumn 2013.

The Committee noted that PG SOLE data had not been submitted and requested that this should be provided for review. The Committee noted also that data from the monitoring of feedback to students had not been provided and requested that data on the promptness of feedback to students should be provided, in due course, in respect of the 2013-2014 session.

The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that the follow up action agreed above should be pursued in the meantime.

In further discussion, the Committee suggested that the Department should look elsewhere within the Faculty of Medicine for the clinical expertise required to run the Obstetrics and Gynaecology specialism which had recently been withdrawn. The Committee also suggested that the Department should consider the title of MSc Medical Ultrasound [Vascular] for students following the vascular specialism.

#### **4.9 MSc Science Communication (1YFT & 2YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 (FT) and 2010-2012 (PT) cohorts.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/68**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a very good course which attracted a good number of applicants, with the majority of students achieving the award of Merit. The reviewer commented on the very positive student feedback and the excellent student representation on the course committee.

In particular the reviewer commended the very informative handbook, and highlighted the student placements in the science communication industry as an example of good practice.

The Committee endorsed the reviewer's suggestion that the Department should consider appointing a second external examiner to support the current external and to aid succession planning.

The Committee noted that the external examiner's report had commented positively on the course and had highlighted in particular the quality of the marking and feedback given to students as examples of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's recommendation that the external examiner should meet with the student cohort at some stage during their studies. In discussion it was confirmed that this would be considered as good practice but that it was not a formal requirement. The Committee noted the response from the Department that this was not normal practice in the humanities. In subsequent discussion, the Course Organiser agreed that the external examiner would be consulted on this point and that it would be arranged if the external examiner so wished.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.10 MSc Science Media Production (1YFT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/69**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a well organised course with staff and students all being committed to the success of the course. In particular, the reviewer highlighted the engagement of the course director and the "Film" and "Radio" tutors as impressive and noted that the level of student satisfaction appeared to be high.

In particular the reviewer commended the arrangements for the student placements which were very well organised with good supervisory arrangements in place, and commented that the students had found the placements to be a very valuable experience. The reviewer highlighted

the innovative teaching methods on the practical aspect of the course which allowed students to work in an open-plan space and to share skills and experience, and learn from each other, whilst at the same time being guided and advised by a tutor, as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted that the external examiner had commented positively on the course and had highlighted in particular the radio and film production carried out by the students, and the assessment of the written work as examples of good practice.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.11 MSc Scientific, Technical and Medical Translation with Translation Technology (1YFT & 2YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 (FT) and 2010-2012 (PT) cohorts.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/70**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a good course with an international reputation and one which filled a unique niche in the market. The reviewer commented that the course was well organised and delivered to a high standard.

In particular the reviewer highlighted that the course website was clear and accessible and that the course handbook was informative and comprehensive, and endorsed the course organiser's assessment that the hands-on practically orientated modules and the focus on scientific and medical translation were an innovative teaching initiative.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the double marking of assessed work and were happy that the Department's response confirmed that College regulations were being followed.

The reviewer commented that the students and the external examiners all viewed the course as excellent. The reviewer noted from the external examiners' reports that the overall quality of the course and of the students was high, and that the reports had highlighted the fact that this was a mature and strongly performing programme.

It was agreed that the Department's response had addressed the issues raised by the reviewer. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was endorsed by the Committee. It was confirmed that the course would be reviewed again in three years' time and that no additional follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **Post Meeting Note:**

That agreement had been reached for the Translation Studies Unit to move in the autumn 2013 to University College London where it will be located in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities. Students currently registered on the MSc in Scientific Technical and Medical Translation with Translation Technology will obtain an Imperial MSc degree but no more students will be admitted to Imperial. A similar version of the MSc will start at UCL in October 2013 and applicants who applied to Imperial for this course during this session will now be considered for admission to what will be a UCL MSc.

### **5. Course Modifications**

#### **5.1 MRes Clinical Research**

The Committee received a request from the Department of Medicine for changes to the programme with effect from October 2013.

**5.1.1** The Committee considered the proposal for changes to the timing of some of the taught elements of the course, and changes to the assessment to reduce the exams from three to two and to introduce an additional assignment.

**5.1.2** The Committee noted that the proposed changes were in response to student feedback and that current students had been consulted and had consented to the proposed changes. The Committee noted that the Department had provided assurances that current students affected by the changes would be properly supported.

**5.1.3** The Committee approved the proposed modifications with effect from October 2013.

## **5.2 PG Certificate, PG Diploma, MSc in Infection**

The Committee considered a request from the Department of Medicine to suspend entry to the programme for one academic year with effect from October 2013.

### **MLSPD/MQC/2012/72**

**5.2.1** The Committee noted that there had been a drop in applications this year from staff at NHS organisations, following the increase of tuition fees and cuts to NHS budgets, such that the numbers were too low to run the course in the coming year. It was reported that there had been increased interest from overseas organisations and that it was felt that the course may require modification to facilitate their demands and requirements. It was noted that the Department would take the opportunity rethink the programme and re-develop it.

**5.2.2** Committee agreed the request on the basis that the Department had provided an undertaking to support current students, including any students who may be required to re-sit, and on the understanding that there were no students currently holding offers to follow this programme.

## **5.3 PG Certificate, PG Diploma, MSc in Infection Management for Pharmacists**

The Committee considered a request from the Department of Medicine to suspend entry to the programme for one academic year with effect from October 2013.

### **MLSPD/MQC/2012/73**

**5.3.1** The Committee noted that there had been a drop in applications this year from staff at NHS organisations, following the increase of tuition fees and cuts to NHS budgets, such that the numbers were too low to run the course in the coming year. It was reported that the Department had received interest from various pharmacy institutions, but that the current course attendance requirements did not suit the potential candidates who held full-time clinical posts. It was noted that the Department would discuss possible modifications to the course with these pharmacy groups to assess their needs and ascertain whether the current format was suitable, or needed adjusting to suit their demands.

**5.3.2** The Committee agreed the request on the basis that the Department had provided an undertaking to support current students, including any students who may be required to re-sit, and on the understanding that there were no students currently holding offers to follow this programme.

## **6. External Examiners**

The Committee noted action taken by the Chair and Deputy. The discussion is reported in Appendix I [not published with minutes].

### **6.4 Reports from External Examiners 2011-12**

The Committee received the external examiner reports to be considered for taught courses for 2011-12.

### **MLSPD/MQC/2012/56**

The Committee reviewed the comments from External Examiners, together with the responses to the comments from departments. In discussion, the Committee noted issues which were raised as needing attention and took particular note of areas of good practice which were highlighted in the reports. The discussion is reported in Appendix I [not published with minutes].

### **6.5 External Examiners' Summary Report 2010-11**

The Committee considered the postgraduate taught course external examiners' summary report for 2010-2011.

### **MLSPD/MQC/2012/75**

**6.5.1** The report provided a general overview of the postgraduate taught course external examiners' reports received in 2010 – 2011, and highlighted good practice, common themes and key areas of concern identified therein. It was noted that course-specific issues highlighted in the appendix had been considered by the relevant Departments and the appropriate Master's Quality Committees.

**6.5.2** In order to in order to promote the dissemination of good practice throughout the College, members were asked to circulate the document to departmental and faculty teaching committees for discussion and information. It was noted that the report was available on the Registry website at <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/externalexamining>

**6.5.3** It was noted that some external examiners had reported issues related to marking, including that there was little evidence of double-marking and that the marking criteria were not being consistently applied. In discussion the Committee shared examples of their own practices in this regard and it was noted that the QAEC had agreed to the development of a checklist for Departments to use prior to sending scripts to External Examiners. In further discussion, it was reported that the College was developing guidance which was intended to clarify the definition and types of double marking.

## **7. Application Statistics - Postgraduate Application Numbers for 2013-4, 2012-3 and 2011-2 entry**

**7.1** The Committee considered a report of the postgraduate applications numbers for entry in 2013 on 17 May 2013, compared with the same period for the previous 2 years.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/76**

It was noted there had been a 3.24% decrease in taught course applications between 2013-14 and 2012-13, however, overall, there had been an increase of 9.39% from the same point in 2011. In discussion the Committee suggested that it would be helpful to have the total number of applications by year included in the report.

**7.2** The Committee considered a report of the current status of postgraduate taught applications made for 2013 entry.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/77**

The Committee noted the number of pending applications, rejected/withdrawn applications and number of applications with offers made, broken down by offers accepted, offers declined and offers awaiting a response.

Members were asked to share the report with their course and departmental administrators.

## **8. Reports from Departmental Representatives**

There were no verbal reports from Departmental Representatives.

## **9. Action taken on behalf of the Committee**

There was no Chair's Action taken since the last meeting to be reported.

## **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AND/OR DISSEMINATION**

### **10. Programme/Course handbooks**

The Committee noted the list of items to be included in Taught Course Programme Handbooks.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/78**

**10.1** Members were reminded that all of items listed should be included in course handbooks, but that it was for Departments to decide how best to convey this information to students in a clear and transparent manner.

**10.2** Members were reminded that course handbooks must be made available on course webpages for current and/or prospective students. To address concerns about protecting the intellectual property of the course, the course timetable and the details of the external examiners could be restricted to internal access only. After further discussion, it was confirmed that detailed protocols for practicals and specific information on research projects could also be restricted to internal access only. For clarity, the items which should be made available internally only had been highlighted in yellow.

**10.3.** In further discussion many members agreed that it would be useful to have generic text provided centrally in respect of the sections on College level regulations, policies and procedures, but it was reiterated that it was for Departments to decide how best to convey this information to students.

### **11. QAA – UK Quality Code for Higher Education**

**11.1** The Committee noted the publication of Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and

Achievement – see <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/qualitycode>

It was noted that this Chapter addressed the ways in which higher education providers enable students to develop and achieve their academic, personal and professional potential. The Chapter would be used as a reference point for QAA reviews from **January 2014**.

**11.2** The Committee noted the publication of Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints – see <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/qualitycode>

It was noted that this chapter covered effective management of academic appeals and student complaints. The Chapter will be used as a reference point for QAA reviews from **August 2014**.

**11.3** It was reported that the QAEC had established a working party to look at how the College manages its collaborative provision in the light of Chapter B10 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education: *Managing higher education provision with others* (December 2012).

This Chapter supersedes the Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education Section 2: *Collaborative Provision and flexible and distributed learning* (2010) and Section 9: *Work-based and placement learning* (2007).

The new Chapter covers the management of all learning opportunities 'leading or contributing to the award of academic credit or a qualification that are delivered, assessed or supported through an arrangement with one or more organisations other than the degree-awarding body'. It therefore covers placements and collaborative modules (individual modules which form part of an award but that are taught and/or assessed by another institution/organisation) as well as formal collaborative degrees.

## **12. Reports from key College Committees**

**12.1 Senate:** Members were reminded that the latest Executive Summaries from the Senate were available [here](#).

**12.2 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee:** Members were reminded that the latest Executive Summaries from the QAEC were available [here](#).

**12.2.1** It was reported that the Graduate School consultation on the proposed conduct of examination boards policy for Master's programmes had elicited a mixed reaction from departments and also that not all departments had responded to the consultation.

**12.2.2** The QAEC had therefore agreed that the Graduate School could have longer to consult with departments. It was reported that it would not now be possible to introduce changes for postgraduate examination boards for the 2013-4 academic session but that the Graduate School should work towards an agreed format for examinations boards for the 2014-5 academic session.

## **13. Dates of meetings in 2013 - 2014**

Dates of meetings in 2013 – 2014 were noted as follows:

Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> November 2013  
Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2014  
Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2014  
Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2014  
Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2014

All meetings would start at 2pm and would take place on the South Kensington Campus (room to be confirmed).

## **14. Any Other Business**

There was no other business to be discussed.

## **15. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Monday 29 July 2013, in the Ballroom, 58 Prince's Gate, South Kensington Campus. The meeting will start at 14:00. The deadline for papers is Monday 15 July 2013.

**16. Reserved Business** (not circulated to student members)

**16.1 Special Cases Reports**

The Committee received reports on special cases considered by the special cases panel for Master's Level students.

**Special Cases for Admissions - MLSPD/MQC/2012/79**

**16.2 Special Cases Panels**

It was reported that the Registry's Admissions Team were experiencing problems with special case decisions for taught courses, the main problem being delays once the case had been submitted to the Panel members. The Admissions Team reported getting one decision back but not the second and having to chase for a response. On some occasions they had had to send the case to a third Panel member in order to receive a decision. Panel members were therefore respectfully asked to consider cases promptly.