

Postgraduate Research Quality Committee

30 May 2014

Confirmed Minutes

Present

Professor Sue Gibson (Chairman)
Professor Andrew Amis (Mechanical Engineering)
Dr Simon Archer (College Tutor)
Dr Anil Bharath (Bioengineering)
Dr Paul Bruce [for Professor Ferri Aliabadi] (Aeronautics)
Professor Peter Cheung (Academic Lead, Hong Kong University/Imperial Doctoral Programme)
Professor Lesley Cohen (Physics)
Professor Sophia Drossopoulou (Computing)
Dr Stuart Haslam [for Dr Niki Gounaris] (Life Sciences)
Professor Andrew Holmes (Electrical and Electronic Engineering)
Professor Marjo-Riitta Jarvelin (School of Public Health)
Dr Mick Jones (MRC Clinical Sciences Centre)
Ms Natalie Kempston (ICU Deputy President (Education))
Professor Paul Langford (Academic Lead, A*STAR-Imperial Doctoral Programme)
Professor Peter Lindstedt (College Consul)
Professor Tony Magee (NHLL)
Dr David McPhail (Deputy Chair)
Dr Felicity Mellor (School of Professional Development)
Ms Lorna Richardson (Deputy Academic Registrar)
Professor Simon Taylor-Robinson [for Dr Kevin Murphy] (Department of Medicine)
Dr Michael Templeton (Academic Lead, EngD in Water Engineering and MIDP)
Dr Mike Tennant (Centre for Environmental Policy)
Mr Andreas Thomik (GSU Chair)
Dr Ahmer Wadee (Civil and Environmental Engineering)

In Attendance

Ms Sally Baker (Senior Assistant Registrar, Senate and Academic Review)
Professor Chris Cheeseman (Civil and Environmental Engineering) – for items 5.1, 5.2 and 9
Ms Susan Farrell (Postgraduate Education Manager, Surgery and Cancer)
Dr Gillian Forsyth (Doctoral Programme Manager, Business School)
Ms Nida Mahmud (GSU Chair designate)
Mr Richard Monk (Assistant Registrar, Senate and Academic Review)

The Committee welcomed new members.

1. Apologies for absence

Professor Ferri Aliabadi (Aeronautics)
Dr Tim Albrecht [and alternate] (Chemistry)
Professor Erkkö Autio (Business School)
Dr Bernadette Byrne (Chair of the Postgraduate Professional Development Committee)
Dr John Gibbons [and alternate] (Mathematics)
Dr Niki Gounaris (Life Sciences)
Professor Debra Humphris (Vice Provost, Education)
Professor Richard Kitney (Academic Lead, NTU/Imperial Doctoral Programme)
Dr Kevin Murphy (Department of Medicine)
Mr Dean Pateman (Academic Registrar)

Professor Chris Scruby (Academic Lead, EngD in Non-Destructive Evaluation)
Professor Michael Seckl (Surgery and Cancer)
Professor Spencer Sherwin (Academic Lead, Joint PhD Programme with University of São Paulo)
Professor Denis Wright (Director of Student Support)
Professor Xiao Yun Xu (Chemical Engineering)
Professor Robert Zimmerman (Earth Science and Engineering)

2. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2014 were approved.

PRQC/2013/44

3. Matters arising

3.1 Minute 9 – Crick PhD Programme – it was reported that the first cohort of Crick PhD students would register in September 2014, and that 17 of the initial intake of 44 students had been offered places at Imperial. It was noted that the details of supervisor status approval and the honorary appointment process were currently being finalised and that training for non-Imperial supervisors was being developed. It was reported that arrangements for induction and welcome events at Imperial were being agreed.

3.2 Minute 14 – Research Degree Precepts – it was reported that the Chair and Deputy Chair had taken action to approve minor amendments to Precept 16 [Writing Up Stage] to give departments the flexibility to decide the format of the timetable of remaining work which students are asked to submit at 36 months.

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

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

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 – 19 November 2013

PRQC/2013/45

The Committee noted in particular the proposed new structure of the AIP Governing & Academic Board.

4.2 Malaysia-Imperial Doctoral Programme (MIDP) [statistics only]

PRQC/2013/46

The Committee noted that the MIDP had been withdrawn for entry and that no new students had been admitted to the programme since January 2012. The College remained committed to supporting the MIDP students who were finishing their research and writing up.

4.3 NTU/Imperial Doctoral Programme

No paper PRQC/2013/47

The Committee noted that no minutes were available and that no report had been provided.

4.4 NUS/Imperial Doctoral Programme – 6 March 2013

PRQC/2013/48

The Committee noted in particular that the examination issues discussed at the NUS-Imperial Board meeting had subsequently been resolved, although the issue regarding the requirement for all three examiners to be physically present at the viva examination was still a matter of some contention.

4.5 Hong Kong University/Imperial Doctoral Programme – 16 July 2013

PRQC/2013/49

The Committee noted that the programme was running smoothly.

4.6 Imperial-University of São Paulo Joint Degree - meeting of the Imperial Sub-Committee of the Imperial-USP Joint Degree Committee – 1 July 2013

PRQC/2013/50

The Committee noted that there was only one student registered on the programme since the only other student had got an academic job and wished to postpone his studies. Following the

recent collaborative partnership established by Imperial and BG Group, it was noted that more candidates were anticipated.

4.7 EngD in Nuclear Engineering – 23 April 2013 and 4 November 2013

PRQC/2013/51

The Committee noted that the programme was running smoothly.

4.8 EngD in Non-Destructive Evaluation – 9 September 2013

PRQC/2013/52

The Committee noted that the programme was running smoothly.

4.9 EngD in Water Engineering – 18 March 2014

PRQC/2013/53

The Committee was reminded that the EngD in Water Engineering was run through the EPSRC-funded STREAM Industrial Doctorate Centre (now Doctoral Training Centre) for the Water Sector, involving Imperial and four other universities, and noted in particular that the programme management board had been successful in obtaining funding from EPSRC for a further five cohorts of students on STREAM, which guaranteed that the programme would continue recruiting new students at least until 2018.

4.10 MRC-Asthma UK Centre in Allergic Mechanisms of Asthma 4-year training programme

No paper PRQC/2013/54

The Committee noted that no minutes were available and that no report had been provided.

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

PRQC/2013/55

The Committee noted that London Pain Consortium 4-year PhD programme had been withdrawn for entry and that there would be no further intake into the programme. No new students had been admitted to the programme since September 2012, and the College remained committed to supporting the students who were finishing their research and writing up.

In general discussion, the Committee noted that representatives of joint research degree programmes had produced a document outlining the responsibilities attributable to individual staff, and to academic and support departments in respect of managing joint research degree programmes. It was noted that the level of administrative support available to oversee the programmes on a day to day basis was insufficient and that this would be referred for discussion with the Associate Provost (Academic Partnerships) when she had taken up her new position.

5. Precept Reviews of Research Degree Provision

5.1 Precept Review of Research Degree Training in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, in relation to 2012-13, presented by Professor Peter Lindstedt who undertook the review.

PRQC/2013/56

The response from the Department was tabled at the meeting.

5.1.1 The Committee noted the Department's range of cohort building activities at section level (Precept 9) and that further initiatives were under way. The Committee found that the Department was not currently fully compliant with Precept 9 but was considered to be working towards compliance by virtue of the new initiatives planned.

5.1.2 In discussion, the Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the Department's research degrees management structure (Precept 11) and noted the clarification in the Department's response that the PhD Management Group was responsible for liaison between the Department's Research Committee and the staff-student committee. The Committee found that the Department was fully compliant with Precept 11. The Committee further noted the reviewer's comments concerning the frequency of meetings of the staff-student committee (Precept 17) and the Department's response that two meetings a year were considered to be sufficient by the student body. It was suggested that that Department should consider routinely scheduling the staff-student committee a week or two before the Department's Research Committee so that

issues could be fed from one to the other, with a view to moving towards three meetings per year. The Committee found that the Department was not fully compliant with Precept 17 but was considered to be working towards compliance by virtue of the additional meeting planned in the summer months.

5.1.3 The Committee noted the Department's on-time completion rates for the ESA and LSR assessment milestones were low and agreed that the explanations provided by the Department and the steps taken to address the issues identified were satisfactory. The Committee noted that, nevertheless, the Department's overall thesis completion rates were excellent.

5.1.4 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 Civil and Environmental Engineering as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Department would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.2 Precept Review of Collaborative Research Degree Provision in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

The Committee considered the Collaborative Precept Review of the EngD in Water Engineering, in relation to 2012-13, presented by Professor Peter Lindstedt who undertook the review.

PRQC/2013/57

The response from the Department was tabled at the meeting.

5.2.1 The Committee noted that the EngD in Water Engineering is run through the EPSRC-funded STREAM Industrial Doctorate Centre. The lead organisation was Cranfield University and Cranfield had overall responsibility for the management of the programme.

5.2.2 The Committee noted that the EngD programme followed different assessment milestones from those in place for non-collaborative Imperial awards. The collaborative degree students were expected to follow the progression milestones in place prior to direct PhD registration being introduced at Imperial. The Committee noted that each cohort had undergone appropriate progress and review stages and that the programme was therefore compliant with the monitoring arrangements agreed in respect of Precepts 14, 15 and 16.

5.2.3 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments concerning the student feedback mechanisms and student representation (Precept 17). The Committee noted that meetings did take place between the student representatives and the STREAM DTC Director, but that no formal minutes were kept. The Committee requested that formal records of staff-student meetings should be maintained and that these should be made available to students and to staff. The Committee asked the Academic Lead to liaise with STREAM DTC Director in this regard.

5.2.4 The Committee found that the Programme was not currently compliant with Precept 17 and would be asked to take immediate action to address this. It was agreed that the Programme would be asked to report on this precept in 12 months' time.

5.2.5 The Committee agreed that the Department had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the collaborative degree programme as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Programme would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.3 Precept Review of Research Degree Training in the Institute of Clinical Science

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Institute of Clinical Science, in relation to 2012-13. In the absence of the PRQC member who undertook the review, the review was self-presented by the Institute Academic Representative.

PRQC/2013/58

5.3.1 The Committee noted the Institute's excellent completion rates and the many areas of good practice which had been evidenced by the reviewer.

5.3.2 The Committee agreed that the Institute had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee found that the Institute was compliant in all precepts, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the Institute of Clinical Science as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Institute would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.4 Precept Review of Research Degree Training in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, in relation to 2012-13. In the absence of the PRQC member who undertook the review, the review was self-presented by the departmental Academic Representative.

PRQC/2013/59

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

Precept 7 (Induction) – the meetings with the PG Tutor 12 weeks after the students start was considered to be a particularly good idea.

Precept 8 (Student Handbooks) - the student handbook was considered to be very well put together with key information laid out clearly and succinctly.

Precept 10 (Research and Professional Skills Development) - The Department was particularly commended on the initiative to ensure that students and supervisors are required to discuss the specific training needs of the student and that this is logged.

The excellent paper trails which have been established to monitor student progress, from initial interview to completion, were highlighted as good practice, together with the use of Blackboard for the submissions of reports for each of the main assessment stages, which further facilitated accurate monitoring.

5.4.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments with regard to making additional efforts to build specific small group cohorts and accepted the Department's response that student feedback did not, at present, suggest that cohort building activities for smaller groups were in demand.

5.4.3 The reviewer had commented on the fact that the Department's 80% submission rate had not increased since the last review, and noted the Department's response that students and supervisors were being encouraged to focus more strictly on the 48 month deadline.

5.4.4 The Committee agreed that the Department had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee found that the Department was compliant in all precepts, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Department would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.5 Precept Review of Research Degree Training in the Department of Materials

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Department of Materials, in relation to 2012-13, presented by Professor Tony Magee who undertook the review.

PRQC/2013/60

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

Precept 1 (Interviewing) - having a Postgraduate Admissions Tutor involved in the selection process of every student, ensuring parity of standards across the Department, and the 'coversheet' which all staff must use at interview and in recommending an offer, were considered to be good practice.

Precept 5 (Continuing professional development and support for students) – forums such as staff meetings and away days around PGR issues which encourage supervisors to engage with the PGR process were identified as good practice.

Precept 8 (Student Handbooks) – the reviewer commented that the handbook was comprehensive and well-presented and identified the requirement at the RPC stage for students to submit a Gantt chart covering the three year period of the PhD, and again at the LSR stage, as an example of good practice. The Submission and Viva Procedure Flowchart was also similarly highlighted.

Precept 9 (Cohort Building) – the reviewer highlighted the breadth of cohort arrangements as an example of good practice.

5.5.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments with regard to the low on-time completion rates at the ESA and LSR stage and accepted the Department's response that strategies would be considered to deal with these issues.

5.5.3 The Committee agreed that the Department had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee found that the Department was compliant in all precepts, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the Department of Materials as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Department would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.6 Precept Review of Research Degree Training in the Department of Physics

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Department of Physics, in relation to 2012-2013. In the absence of the PRQC member who undertook the review, the review was self-presented by the departmental Academic Representative.

PRQC/2013/61

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

Precept 2 (Offers/Admissions) – the concept of giving priority to matching students to projects offered by new academics was considered by the reviewer to be an example of good practice.

However, in further discussion, the Committee noted that, whilst being aware of the College guidelines on limiting the number of students supervised by an individual supervisor at any one time, the Department did not routinely cap these numbers. The Department assured the Committee that robust procedures were in place to provide supervisory support to students should staff go on sabbatical leave, and that the post docs in the Department regularly provided support for research students.

There was some further discussion concerning the number of students supervised by individual academics and the implications which a heavy supervisory load may have on their ability to provide the support and guidance expected. There were concerns that student access to supervisors may be limited, and/or that delays in processes might occur.

Members commented that in these instances, students were likely to have co-supervisors, and that senior post-docs were regularly involved in providing day to day support for research students.

Some members of the Committee were unaware that the title "Assistant Supervisor" could be used in respect of post-docs who play a role in the supervision of research students and were referred to the eligibility to supervise document [Eligibility for Research Degree Supervision](#) on the Registry web site.

Precept 5 (Continuing professional development and support for students) – the reviewer highlighted the 'supervisor fresher training' workshop initiated by the Department and delivered by the EDU in November 2011 as an example of good practice and noted that the workshop format was now being rolled out to other departments across College.

5.6.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments with regard to the low on-time completion rates at the ESA stage, but acknowledged that the overall submission rate was high.

5.6.3 The Committee agreed that the Department had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee found that the Department was compliant in all precepts, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the Department of Physics as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Department would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.7 Precept Review of Research Degree Training in the School of Professional Development

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the School of Professional Development, in relation to 2012-13, presented by Professor Sophia Drossopoulou who undertook the review.

PRQC/2013/62

5.7.1 The reviewer reported that robust research degree procedures were in place in the School of Professional Development.

5.7.2 The Committee noted the reviewer's comments with regard to the low submission rates, but acknowledged that this was due to short-term extenuating circumstances. The Committee agreed that the School should be asked to submit a report on submission rates in 12 months' time when these external factors would have been resolved.

5.7.3 The Committee agreed that the School had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee found that the School was compliant in all precepts, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the School of Professional Development as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the School would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

5.8 Precept Review of the Imperial-NUS Joint Degree Programme

The Committee considered the Precept Review of the Imperial-NUS Joint Degree Programme, in relation to 2012-13. In the absence of the PRQC member who undertook the review, the review was self-presented by the Academic Lead.

PRQC/2013/63

5.8.1 The Committee noted that the research degree procedures operating in respect of the joint programme were being properly managed following agreements in place between Imperial and NUS.

5.8.2 The Committee noted the good practice which had been identified by the reviewer in respect of Precept 9 (Cohort Building) where the annual workshops held alternately between Singapore and London had been highlighted.

5.8.3 The Committee noted, in respect of Precept 6 (Supervisory arrangements), that the practice of agreeing communication schedules at the time of submitting the Research Plan Confirmation was not yet in place and confirmed that this should be introduced.

5.8.4 The Committee endorsed the reviewer's comments in respect of Precept 18 (Evaluation), that an annual survey of students would be beneficial, and it was agreed that the Academic Lead would take this forward.

5.8.5 The Committee agreed that the Academic Lead had adequately addressed the comments made by the reviewer. The Committee found that the Imperial-NUS Joint Degree Programme was compliant in all precepts, and endorsed the reviewer's overall assessment of the Programme as 'Compliant'. The Committee noted that the Programme would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

In general discussion, the Committee again commented on the need to review the level of administrative support available to oversee the programme on a day to day basis.

6. Follow Up from Precept Reviews of Research Degree Provision

6.1 Department of Surgery and Cancer

The Committee considered the follow up from the precept review of departmental research degree provision in the Department of Surgery and Cancer (2010-2011).

PRQC/2013/64

6.1.1 The Committee received the action plan prepared by the Department aimed at improving the on-time completion of research degree milestones and overall thesis submission.

6.1.2 The Committee was satisfied with the steps being taken by the Department in these areas, and requested that a further report be submitted in 12 months' time to show the results achieved.

7. Follow Up from Periodic Reviews of Research Degree Provision

7.1 Centre for Environmental Policy

The Committee considered progress made since the periodic review of departmental research degree provision in the Centre for Environmental Policy (5 May 2011).

PRQC/2013/65

7.1.1 The Committee noted the progress on achieving compliance with (former) precepts 3 [induction], 6 [PG Committee] and 8 [confidential reports], and consequently with the equivalent current precepts, and was satisfied that the Centre was now compliant in these areas.

7.1.2 The Committee noted that the compliance with achieving the progression milestones had not yet been met but that satisfactory procedures were now in place to ensure that the Centre was working towards achieving compliance in these areas.

7.1.3 The Committee agreed that the Centre for Environmental Policy should revert to the normal review schedule, and would next be reviewed in 2016-17.

8. Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2013

8.1 The Committee considered responses to the PRES 2013 results from the following departments

PRQC/2013/66

- Life Sciences
- Centre for Environmental Policy
- Business School

The Committee agreed that the responses received were satisfactory and that departments should highlight where any changes had been made as a result of their PRES feedback and should publish this on their departmental webpages. The Committee was reminded that the majority of departments had submitted responses to the PRES 2013 results to the October PRQC meeting.

8.2 It was noted that the response and action plan from the Department of Earth Sciences and Engineering had not yet been submitted, but that it was in preparation.

8.3 In further discussion, members highlighted the importance of providing feedback on survey results and actions taken, both to students and staff.

9. New 4 year PhD in Sustainable Civil Engineering

The Committee considered a request from the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering to approve monitoring and progression milestones in respect of the four year PhD programme running under the auspices of the Centre for Doctoral Training in Sustainable Civil Engineering.

PRQC/2013/67

The Committee agreed the milestones outlined in the document presented, noting that the milestones varied from the standard PhD milestones to align with the four year training schedule. It was emphasised that the College requirement for final thesis submission within 48 months of initial registration remained unchanged.

In discussion, the Committee recommended that this model should be adopted by other 4 year PhD programmes where necessary, rather than bespoke arrangements being introduced for individual programmes.

10. Revising Periodic Review and Programme Monitoring

The Committee received a paper containing proposals for revisions to the College's approach to periodic review and programme monitoring.

PRQC/2013/68

It was reported that the most significant revision to the current procedure was the proposal to combine the departmental undergraduate and Master's Level periodic review processes into a single departmental periodic review of taught provision. The implications for the reviews of research degree provision were relatively minor.

It was noted that MRes programmes would normally be considered during the periodic review of taught provision, but that the exception may be when an MRes programme forms the first part of a 1 plus 3 programme, in which case the MRes could be considered as part of the department's research degree periodic review.

It was noted that the proposals would be presented to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee for final discussion, and eventual recommendation to the Senate. New processes would be developed and trialled during the 2014-5 academic session with a view to implementation in 2015-16.

11. Doctoral Proposition

The Committee received a paper defining the doctoral proposition for prospective research students which outlined what they can expect of their education and wider student experience.

PRQC/2013/69

12. Postgraduate Research Programme Handbooks

The Committee received a paper intended as guidance on items to be included in Research Programme handbooks.

PRQC/2013/70

It was noted that the document was not intended to be prescriptive although the contents listed should all be included. Members were reminded that many departments have commendable handbooks and that the QAA Institutional Audit, February 2010, had identified the quality of departmental postgraduate research handbooks as a feature of good practice. The document was therefore provided as a resource for departments.

The Committee agreed that the document should be recommended to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee for approval.

13. Postgraduate Professional Development Committee: update

The Committee received the minutes of the Professional Skills Development Committee meetings held on 12 February 2014 and 23 April 2014.

PRQC/2013/71

13.1 It was noted that the GTA Training Programme was progressing with a view to piloting some sessions in the summer. It was further reported that the programme was designed to align with the Higher Education Academy (HEA) UK professional standards framework equivalent to Level I, and that an update would be provided to the Committee at the next meeting.

14. Application Statistics - Postgraduate Application Numbers for 2014-15 entry

14.1 The Committee received a report of the postgraduate research (excluding MRes) application numbers for entry in 2014 (at 21 May 2014) compared with the same period for the previous year.

PRQC/2013/72

14.2 The Committee received a report of the current status of postgraduate research applications made for 2014 entry (at 21 May 2014).

PRQC/2013/73

The Committee confirmed that they found it useful to receive such reports and agreed that they should continue to be presented for information.

15. 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 2012 to 31 January 2013.

PRQC/2013/74

It was noted that the data covered full time students who had a submission date between 1 February 2012 and 31 January 2013. It was further noted that members of College and Hospital staff registered for an MPhil or PhD and following full-time milestones were excluded from the figures.

Members were reminded that the figures were based on submission dates, and that where a student had been granted an interruption of studies the submission date reflected this. Members were further reminded that late cases approved for submission were nevertheless recorded as submitting late, and not as being within time.

The Committee was concerned to note that, although the 2012-13 submission rate for the College had remained above 80% overall, it had fallen last year for the second successive year.

In discussion, the Committee acknowledged that the reasons for failing to submit were diverse and that, in some cases, non-submitting students were receiving excellent job offers which drew them away from their studies. The Department of Mechanical Engineering reported that submission rates had been affected by a major refurbishment programme and a period of significant building works which had necessitated the relocation of research groups and facilities.

Members were reminded that a retrospective interruption of studies may be applied in cases where the thesis submission is delayed due to laboratory refurbishment or other operational disruption. In such cases, when it became evident that the student would be delayed in submitting their thesis, supervisors should contact the Student Records team for advice.

The Committee noted that one of the actions to support the Doctoral Proposition would be to develop a strategy to improve College submission rates and that an analysis of the reasons for late and non-submission would be undertaken as part of this work.

ITEMS FOR REPORT

16. English Language Entry Requirements for International Students

Members were asked to note the new English Language entry requirements recently approved by the Senate, which would be effective from entry in October 2015.

PRQC/2013/75

17. Senate:

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

18. Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee:

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

19. Any Other Business

19.1 The Committee was informed of new initiatives in the Wellcome Trust Centre for Global Health which links a number of departments across the College and established institutions in Africa, South America and South East Asia, and of opportunities to engage with collaborative research programmes.

19.2 The Committee noted that Ms Lorna Richardson was retiring from the post of Deputy Academic Registrar in June. The Committee expressed their thanks to Ms Richardson for her contribution to the work of the Postgraduate Quality Committees over many years and wished her well in her retirement.

19.3 The Committee expressed their thanks to the outgoing student representatives and the outgoing Directors of Postgraduate Studies for their valuable contributions to the PRQC over the course of their tenure.

20. Dates of meetings in 2014-2015

Friday 7 November 2014
Tuesday 10 February 2015
Friday 15 May 2015

All meetings will start at 10.00am, venues to be confirmed.

21. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Friday 7 November 2014. The meeting will start at 10:00. The deadline for papers is Friday 24 October 2014.

22. Reserved Business (not circulated to student members)

22.1 Special Cases Reports

The Committee received reports on special cases considered by the Director of the Graduate School (Paper 78), the Director and Deputy Director of the Graduate School (Paper 79) and by the special cases panel for doctoral programmes (Papers 76 and 77).

Special Cases for Admissions - PRQC/2013/76
Special Cases during Registration - PRQC/2013/77
Special Cases for Examiners - PRQC/2013/78
Special Cases for Late Entry - PRQC/2013/79

22.2 Special Cases Panels

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