

# Imperial College London

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

---

**18 March 2013**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

---

#### **Present**

Professor Andrew George (Chairman)  
Professor Steve Gentleman (Department of Medicine)  
Dr Niki Gounaris (Department of Life Sciences) [for Professor Tim Barraclough]  
Ms Boshuo Guo (Academic and Welfare Officer – Non Faculty) [unable to attend until 3.30pm]  
Professor Kate Hardy (Department of Surgery and Cancer)  
Mr Doug Hunt (ICU Deputy President, Education)  
Dr Mick Jones (College Tutor)  
Dr Martyn Kingsbury (Educational Development Unit)  
Professor Robin Leatherbarrow (College Consul, Faculty of Natural Sciences)  
Dr Felicity Mellor (Humanities)  
Professor Sue Smith (NHLI)  
Mr Nigel Wheatley (Academic Registrar)

#### **In Attendance**

Ms Sally Baker (Assistant Registrar, Senate and Academic Review)  
Ms Lisa Pomfret (Quality Assurance Administrator, External Examiners)

The Committee welcomed Ms Lisa Pomfret as an observer to the meeting.

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

Ms Maryam Habibzay (GSA President)  
Professor Debra Humphis (Pro Rector, Education)  
Professor Marjo-Riitta Jarvelin (School of Public Health)  
Ms Natalie Kempston (Academic and Welfare Officer – Medicine)  
Professor Myra McClure (College Consul (non-clinical) Faculty of Medicine)  
Dr David McPhail (Deputy Chair)  
Ms Helen Pennington (Academic and Welfare Officer – Life Sciences)  
Professor Denis Wright (Director of Student Affairs)

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

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2013 were approved.

**MLSDP/MQC/2012/41**

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

##### **3.1 Minute 6.3 (19.11.2012) – Annual Monitoring report: MSc in Quality and Safety in Healthcare (2YPT) – follow up**

The Committee was reminded that the Course Organiser had been asked to give some consideration to methods of enhancing recruitment, and that more guidance should be provided on the timing and mechanisms for providing academic feedback to students. The Chair reported that information had been received from the Course Organiser in response to these issues as follows:

(i) that a strategy was being implemented to enhance the marketing, including fliers at conferences as well as adverts in academic journals;

(ii) that a strategy was being implemented to ensure more timely feedback to students taking advantage of the support and systems in place on other courses in the department.

The Committee agreed that the response from the Course Organiser was satisfactory.

### **3.2 Minute 6 - Joint Management Committee Annual Reports or Minutes:**

**6.1 - MRes Biosystematics and 6.3 - MSc Taxonomy and Biodiversity** – the Committee noted that the Collaborative Degree Programme Agreement between Imperial and the Natural History Museum was about to be renewed and that a Joint Management Committee would then be confirmed.

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

## **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

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

#### **4.1 MRes Biochemical Research (1YFT)**

To consider the review of the course in respect of the 2011-2012 cohort.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/42**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a very well structured course which was well organised and runs smoothly. The reviewer reported that many practical improvements had been implemented since the previous review.

In particular the reviewer commended the consideration of student feedback and the interaction between the Course Director, the course team and the students as impressive, and highlighted the response to student comments and queries as an example of good practice. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the individual feedback on report writing techniques and presentation given to students by the Course Director, and comments on the high level of commitment from the Course Director and the course team.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had commented positively on the course and had highlighted in particular the strength of the Management Committee as an example 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. The Committee endorsed the reviewer's recommendation for consideration of enhanced advertising to maintain student recruitment. 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.

#### **4.2 MSc Bioinformatics and Theoretical Systems Biology (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/43**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a well-established course which was well organised and smoothly run. The reviewer reported that recommendations from the previous review had been implemented.

In particular the reviewer commended the productive interactions between students and staff and highlighted the provision made for the consideration of student feedback as an example of good practice. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that there were numerous opportunities for students to give feedback to staff, that the staff actively addressed the points raised and that the students were advised of the outcome of the feedback. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the student handbook, and in particular the reference to the "acceptance of terms of handbook" page which students were expected to sign.

The Committee noted that the feedback from the external examiners' reports had been properly addressed and that appropriate action had been taken.

It was noted that the Course Organiser had been asked to respond to requests for clarification from the reviewer and that a response was awaited. The course had been rated as 'Good' by the reviewer and the grading was nevertheless 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 MRes Biosystematics (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/44**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that, overall, this was a very good course with a high level of student achievement. The reviewer highlighted the sequence of three projects in top research groups, allowing students to develop both depth and breadth in their understanding and research skills, as an example of good practice. The reviewer commented in particular on the opportunity for students to build on their learning in each of the three consecutive projects by receiving feedback on each shortly after completion.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the student feedback which indicated that students had raised concerns about inadequate supervision in one, and in some cases two, of their three projects. This issue had also been reported by one of the external examiners. The Committee noted that students had also reported feeling isolated when working at the museum.

The Committee noted from the Department's response that the course administrator now had more contact with the students in order to ensure that they were satisfied with their supervision and to ensure that any problems or issues could be dealt with at the earliest opportunity. The Committee noted also the comment that the museum had recently increased the number of seminars and training sessions provided for its PhD and post-doctoral community. The Committee noted that, where possible, the MRes Biosystematics students were invited to attend these sessions, to enable them to feel part of the wider student community. The Committee agreed that the department had taken steps to address both these issues and asked that continued efforts be made to ensure that students felt well supported during their studies and experienced a proper sense of belonging.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning amendments to the programme specification and to the course handbook and noted the Department's response that these matters would be addressed.

The Committee shared the reviewer's concern over the joint management of the programme in the light of the imminent departure of one of the two Course Directors and was reassured that a new Course Director would be appointed and was expected to be based at the Silwood Park Campus. The Committee shared the reviewer's concern that the Joint Management Committee had lapsed and was further concerned to learn that it was taking longer than expected to re-establish. The Committee was also concerned to learn of delays affecting the completion of the collaborative degree programme agreement between Imperial and the NHM.

The Committee stressed that the Joint Management Committee must be in place and active before the start of the 2013 academic session.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had been considered to be satisfactory and that the depth of the student projects, frequently leading to work of publishable quality, was considered to be an example of good practice.

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

The Committee stressed however, that the completion of the collaborative degree programme agreement between Imperial and the NHM should be accelerated, and that a Joint Management Committee must be in place and active before the start of the 2013 academic session.

#### **4.4 MSc Taxonomy and Biodiversity (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/45**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a well-designed course, with a good range of projects available and good support from supervisors. The reviewer highlighted the carefully timed field trip, cementing and extending knowledge acquired in the previous two terms before the start of the project, as an example of good practice. The reviewer commented in particular on the expertise offered by the NHM in terms of access to world class collections and to research active scientists.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the level of promptness of feedback on assessed work. Although feedback from students had not suggested that this was an issue, the Committee asked that the Department should adhere more closely to the College guideline of providing feedback on coursework and assessments within two weeks.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning amendments to the programme specification and to the course handbook and noted the Department's response that these matters would be addressed.

The Committee shared the reviewer's concern over the joint management of the programme in the light of the imminent departure of one of the two Course Directors and was reassured that a new Course Director would be appointed and was expected to be based at the Silwood Park Campus. The Committee shared the reviewer's concern that the Joint Management Committee had lapsed and was further concerned to learn that it was taking longer than expected to re-establish. The Committee was also concerned to learn of delays affecting the completion of the collaborative degree programme agreement between Imperial and the NHM.

The Committee stressed that the Joint Management Committee must be in place and active before the start of the 2013 academic session.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had been considered to be satisfactory and that they had commended the course in addressing a niche market of national and Europe-wide significance.

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 follow up action was required in the meantime.

The Committee stressed however, that the completion of the collaborative degree programme agreement between Imperial and the NHM should be accelerated, and that a Joint Management Committee must be in place and active before the start of the 2013 academic session.

#### **4.5 MRes Clinical Research (1YFT and 2YPT)**

The Committee considered the review of the course in respect of the 2010-2012 part-time cohort and the 2011-2012 full-time cohort. The response from the Course Director was tabled at the meeting.

**MLSPD/MCQ/2012/46**

Members were reminded that the current MRes in Clinical Research programme had been launched in October 2010, but that some of the component parts had been running prior to that, and so it had been thought timely to review the course at this stage. Members were reminded that the Translational Medicine course had been running since October 2008 and the Clinical Research Design and Management course since October 2009. It was noted that when the new programme structure had been proposed, the existing courses had been thoroughly reviewed as part of the restructuring process.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a well organised course which attracted positive feedback from students. The reviewer commented in particular that the course was considered to be unique and commended the Course Director and Organisers on this achievement. The reviewer highlighted the many opportunities provided for students to offer feedback on the course as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the course handbook and noted the Course Director's response (tabled) that this would be addressed and that work would be done to present the course information in a more polished format.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the student projects and noted the Course Director's response that work would be done to provide a full list of potential projects for students.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners had been considered to be satisfactory and that the practice whereby students were required to present their dissertation study also as a poster which must then be defended at the oral examination was considered to be an example of good practice.

It was agreed that the Course Director'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.

#### **4.6 MRes Experimental Neuroscience (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/47**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was an excellent course which was well organised and well documented. The reviewer reported that student feedback was gathered very regularly and highlighted the many positive comments on the quality of the supervision received.

In particular the reviewer commended the written survey which provided opportunities for students to submit free text and allowed them to provide discursive feedback.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the regular contact between the Course Organiser and students. The reviewer highlighted the meeting between the students and the Course Organiser half way through each project placement as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted that the external examiner's report had been considered to be excellent and that the rigorous selection and examination processes were considered to be 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 follow up action was required in the meantime.

#### **4.7 MRes Molecular and Cellular Basis of Infection (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/48**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a very good course for a very specific context, the nature of which ensured the continued relevance and quality of the course. The reviewer commented that nature of the course guaranteed a favourable staff/student ratio and the availability of good quality projects and supervision.

In particular the reviewer commented that students were given good feedback on their projects and that the mechanisms used on the course for providing feedback on work and progress were efficient and appropriate.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the description of the student learning outcomes. In discussion the Committee agreed that defined learning outcomes were not essential in this context but suggested that a set of course objectives would help to signpost the goals of each of the teaching sessions for the students.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had been overwhelmingly positively and that they had commented that all aspects of the course were well managed and had highlighted in particular the high level of commitment from the course co-ordinators.

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.

#### **4.8 MSc Molecular Biology and Pathology of Viruses (1YFT)**

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

**MLSDP/MQC/2012/49**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was an excellent course which was well organised and well documented. In particular the reviewer commended the use of Blackboard to make course material available to students and the submission of the six-month project research reports to the External Examiner.

The reviewer highlighted the summary statement submitted by project supervisors giving their evaluation of the performance and ability of each student who carried out their research project in their laboratory as an example of good practice.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the use of plagiarism detection software, and noted the Course Organiser's response that students were aware that their work may be submitted for plagiarism detection.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that student feedback was largely obtained verbally and the recommendation that there should be an opportunity for students to submit more detailed written feedback. The Committee noted the Course Organiser's response that this would be provided in future,

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had been considered to be excellent and that any follow up action which had been required had been taken.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed all of 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 the Course Organiser would be asked to report on the collection of more detailed written feedback from students at the end of the 2013-14 session.

#### **4.9 MSc Molecular Medicine (1YFT)**

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

**MLSDP/MQC/2012/50**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was an excellent course led by a committed group of staff. In particular the reviewer commended the excellent course hand book and the outstanding pastoral support.

The reviewer commented on the high level of student satisfaction and the high standard of student achievement.

The reviewer highlighted the implementation of the interim project monitoring form as an example of good practice. The Committee noted that the mechanism should allow problems to be picked up early on and would provide a good paper trail should there be difficulties at a later stage.

The Committee noted the reviewer's recommendations concerning the need to communicate the results of students' feedback to the students, and noted the Course Organiser's positive response.

The Committee noted that the external examiners' reports had been considered to be excellent and that the interactions between students and external examiners, which allowed students to give direct feedback to the externals, were considered to be an example of good practice. The high level of academic and pastoral support for students was also identified as an area of good practice.

It was agreed that the Course Organiser's response had addressed all of 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.

#### **4.10 MRes Molecular Plant Biology and Biotechnology (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/51**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a good course and that the arrangements for managing and delivering the course were rigorous.

The Committee noted in particular the reviewer's comments on the very low student numbers and agreed that this made it very difficult to build a student cohort and was likely to impact on the student experience. The Committee was informed of several current activities which it was hoped would lead to an increase enrolment numbers, and agreed that the viability of the course was ultimately a matter for the Department to resolve.

The Committee noted that no major problems had been highlighted in any of the external examiners' reports and that any issues which had been raised had been dealt with appropriately.

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.

#### **4.11 MRes Structural Molecular Biology (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/52**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that the course was well designed and in particular that the course website was well laid out and user friendly and that the course handbook was comprehensive and easy to navigate.

The reviewer commended the availability of research projects and external placements as a particular strength of the course and highlighted the responsiveness to student feed-back as an example of good practice. The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the introduction of tutorials, practical sessions and workshops to ensure "hands on" experience which was considered to be an example of innovation in teaching.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments on the small, but stable, student intake. The Committee agreed that the student numbers were probably appropriate for a specialised course and agreed that the recruitment strategy was ultimately a matter for the Department to agree.

The Committee noted that no significant issues had been highlighted in any of the external examiners' reports.

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.

#### **4.12 MRes Systems and Synthetic Biology (1YFT)**

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

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/53**

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments that this was a very good course with dedicated academic and support staff. The reviewer reported that many improvements had been implemented since the previous review when the course had been assessed as satisfactory.

In particular the reviewer commended the practice of all students having a viva examination with an external examiner, and highlighted the appointment of module convenors, each having responsibility for considering student feedback, as an example of good practice.

The reviewer identified the two day annual symposium as an excellent introduction to academic research and highlighted it as an example of good practice. In addition, the reviewer considered the seven month research project to be an excellent aspect of the course.

The Committee noted that the reports of the external examiners were very supportive and that, where an issue had been identified, appropriate action had been taken.

The Committee noted the reviewer's comments on the relatively low number of applications to the course and noted that the course was nevertheless able to attract high quality applicants. The Committee agreed that the recruitment strategy was a matter for the Department to agree.

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.

### **Aide memoire**

The Chair thanked the reviewers for having completed this first round of reviews in such a timely fashion. The Chair reminded members that the revised process was intended to encourage course organisers to be more reflective in their submission and asked for feedback on the revised evaluation process. In discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i) It was felt that Course Organisers had generally been happy with the revised process;
- (ii) There was felt to be an element of repetition between the course review form and the reviewer's response form where the Course Organiser was asked to identify items of good practice (for example from external examiner's reports) and the reviewer was also asked to give details of good practice;
- (iii) Some reviewers felt they were being asked for too much discursive comment when perhaps a series of tick boxes to indicate whether responses to each of the sections were satisfactory or not would be sufficient;
- (iv) It was suggested that the course handbook section (Section 9) should include a check list and course organisers be asked to refer to the page in the course handbook where the relevant information was to be found;
- (v) It was requested that the student feedback included with the review documentation should include the written student comments as well as the overall scores so that reviewers could make a judgement on the nature of the feedback and the action taken. It was requested that Course Organisers should also provide an overall summary of the student evaluations;
- (vi) It was noted that the application and student numbers data that had been provided for the Science Communication Unit and Translation Studies Unit had been incorrect. It was noted that there had some reporting issues due to the recent restructuring of the former Humanities Department and that this had subsequently been resolved. Members were asked to contact Sally Baker if there were other instances of data being incorrect.

## **5. Course Modifications**

### **5.1 MSc Ecological Applications**

The request from the Department of Life Sciences for changes to the programme was withdrawn and reported under item 8 below. **[No paper 54]**

## **6. External Examiners**

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

**6.5** The Committee received the nomination(s) to be considered for the Boards of Examiners in the 2012 – 2013 session.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/55**

The discussion is reported in Appendix I [not published with minutes].

### **6.6 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].

In summary, the Committee agreed that the reports of the external examiners were very positive overall and supportive of the assessment processes and of the standards of student attainment. The Committee noted that a number of external examiners had reported that they had not met with any students registered for the programme and members were asked to remind colleagues that it was considered to be good practice to provide an opportunity for the external examiners to meet privately with a group of some, or all, of the students.



## **6.7 Examination regulations relating to External Examiners**

It was reported that the Senate had approved amendments to the taught course Examination Regulations, with effect from 2013-2014, to specify that academic staff with honorary contracts with the College may not be appointed as taught course external examiners. A question asking Departments to confirm whether proposed new external examiners hold honorary contracts with the College would be added to the nomination form.

## **6.8 Information provided to Master's external examiners**

The Chair reported that undergraduate external examiners were provided with a copy of their Department's undergraduate annual monitoring form, and that QAEC had asked the Graduate School to make a recommendation as to what comparable information could be provided to Master's external examiners from 2013-14.

In discussion members suggested that external examiners should receive a copy of the latest completed course review form; a copy of the course handbook; a copy of the weekly course timetable (if not in the course handbook); and access to any on-line lectures and VLE course materials. The Committee did not think that statistical data was necessary. There was some discussion about the use of an electronic file exchange for this purpose and members commented that external examiners would need to be given Imperial College computer accounts in order to be able to access on-line and VLE materials.

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

The Committee considered the postgraduate application numbers for entry in 2013 compared with application numbers received at the same point last year for entry in 2012.

**MLSPD/MQC/2012/57**

The Committee noted that the overall number of applications to date was slightly lower than in 2013, showing a decrease of 4.89% for taught courses overall and a decrease of 4.93% for MRes courses overall.

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

The Committee received verbal reports from Departmental Representatives not otherwise appearing on the agenda.

### **8.1 Department of Life Sciences - MSc in Ecological Applications**

It was reported that four new modules would be added to the course with effect from October 2013, replacing four current modules which would no longer be taught due to staff departures. It was reported that the modules would be taught jointly by Imperial staff and staff from external institutions and assessed solely by Imperial staff. It was confirmed that the new modules were equivalent to the existing modules in terms of contact hours, methods of assessment and ECTS assignment. Minor changes to the timing and weighting of the projects were also reported.

### **8.2 Department of Surgery and Cancer**

**8.2.1** It was reported that the periodic review of Master's courses in the Department of Surgery and Cancer had taken place on 7 February 2013 and that the final reports of the assessors were awaited.

**8.2.2** It was reported that the Course Organiser for the MSc in Surgical Science would retire at the end of May. At this stage the taught elements of the course and the examinations would be complete. Arrangements to support the current intake of students until they had completed the course were in hand.

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

The Committee received a verbal report on Chair's Action taken since the last meeting as follows:

**9.1** The appointment of external examiners reported under 6.1 – 6.4 above.

**9.2** Revisions to the Ordinance B1 - Degrees and Other Awards Granted by the University - to include the criteria specified for Postgraduate Certificate and Postgraduate Diploma awards.

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

### **10. Postgraduate Surveys – Master’s Programmes**

The Committee received an update on postgraduate surveys for Master’s programmes:

**10.1** The Committee noted the following surveys were due to take place this term:

PG SOLE – module/lecturer: will close on 21 April 2013

PG SOLE – overall course questions: will close on 21 April 2013

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

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

**11.1.1** Revisions to the new Master’s course approval processes were noted, including the requirement for formal approval at Faculty level and the introduction of a template for submitting new course proposals.

**11.1.2** Changes to the QAA review methodology, meaning that Imperial will not now be subject to a mid-cycle follow up to the 2010 Institutional Audit, were noted. Members were informed that the Management Committee had agreed that an internal mid cycle audit report would be undertaken in 2014/15 to measure progress since the College’s 2010 institutional Audit and to start preparations for the next review which would be due in 2016/17.

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

### **12. Course Organiser’s Meeting**

Members were reminded that the Graduate School would be holding a meeting for Postgraduate Taught Course Organisers on Friday 22 March 2013

### **13. Any Other Business**

There was no other business to be discussed.

### **14. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Monday 3 June 2013, in the Ballroom, 58 Prince’s Gate, South Kensington Campus. The meeting will start at 14:00. The deadline for papers is Monday 20 May 2012.

### **15. Reserved Business (not circulated to student members)**

#### **15.1 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/2012/58**