

**SENATE**

**Minutes of Meeting held on 2 May 2012**

**Present:** The President & Rector, Sir Keith O’Nions (Chairman), Professors Alford, Autio, Buckingham, George, Gooderham, Haigh, Kramer, Magee, Matar, Thompson; Drs Albrecht, Broda, McCoy, McPhail, Rogers, Smith; Mrs Cunningham; Mr Heath (Student Representative); with Mr Wheatley (Academic Registrar), Ms Richardson (Deputy Academic Registrar) and Ms Penny (Senior Assistant Registrar).

**Apologies:** Professors Belvisi, Riboli, Richardson, Wright; Drs Buckle, McGarvey, Pike; Mr Parmar.

**In Attendance:** Mr Neilson (College Secretary and Registrar)

**1618 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 22 February 2012 were confirmed.

**1619 Matters Arising**

Minute 1596(2): College Teaching Day

Reported: (1) That at its February 2012 meeting, Senate had been informed that Management Board had approved changes to the College Teaching Day.

(2) That a College Notice had now been issued on this matter. A copy of the Notice was provided in the Senate’s paper.

Further Reported: That Wednesday afternoons had traditionally been kept free from teaching and education activities from 12pm onwards. The Imperial College Union had expressed concern that the College Notice now stated that Wednesday afternoons would from 2012-13 only be kept free from teaching and education activities from 1pm. This change was likely to have an adverse effect on sporting fixtures and other Union activities.

Agreed: That Wednesday afternoons should continue to be kept free from teaching and education activities from 12pm. Senate would make this request to Management Board.

Minute 1602(3): Graduate School Postgraduate Quality Committees, Course Suspensions – Department of Life Sciences, Course Resilience

Reported: (1) That the Senate had agreed, at its February 2012 meeting, that consideration should be given to whether the College’s Master’s course approval and review procedures adequately addressed the issue of course resilience.

(2) That the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee (QAAC) had considered this matter and had agreed that it would be difficult for the Graduate School’s Master’s Quality Committees (MQCs) to monitor course resilience in a meaningful way through the agreed new annual monitoring process for Master’s programmes reported in Paper

Senate/2011/77. The MQCs could (and did) consider whether a course was over dependent on a limited number of key staff when they reviewed new course proposals, but over time there might be incremental changes to personnel that might alter the situation.

(3) That the QAAC had agreed that it would be appropriate to consider the issue of course resilience during the periodic review of Master's courses. Departments would be asked specifically to respond to questions on this subject in the revised Master's periodic review procedure outlined in Paper Senate/2011/77.

## **1620 Rector's Business**

Received: A Report from the Rector (**Paper Senate/2011/72**).

### (1) Leadership of Imperial College London

Reported: (i) That the Council had now begun its search for a Provost of the College. The Provost would be responsible for advancing and delivering the College's core academic mission - education, research and translation.

(ii) That the President & Rector would have oversight of all functions at Imperial, but much of the role would give emphasis to Imperial's external affairs in the UK and overseas.

(iii) That from 30 April 2012 Sir Keith O'Nions had assumed the title of President & Rector. At the end of May the search would commence for a new President & Rector to succeed Sir Keith following his retirement at the end of 2013, at which point the new leadership arrangements would be fully in place.

### (2) Fellows of the Royal Society

Reported: That the following staff had been elected to the Fellowship of the Royal Society:

Professor Michele Dougherty, Department of Physics  
Professor Chris Hull, Department of Physics  
Professor Russell Lande, Department of Life Sciences  
Professor Tejinder (Jim) Virdee, Department of Physics  
Emeritus Professor Timothy Williams, National Heart and Lung Institute  
Visiting Professor Jeremy Burroughes, Department of Physics

Further Reported: That the Senate congratulated these staff on their achievements.

### (3) Sabbatical Officers of the Imperial College Union

Reported: The names of the students elected as Sabbatical Officers of the Imperial College Union for the academic year 2012-13.

## **1621 Pro Rector's Business**

Considered: A Report from the Pro Rector (Education and Academic Affairs) (**Paper Senate/2011/73**).

### (1) Graduate Employment Data

Reported: (i) That the Careers Advisory Service collected graduate destinations data, on behalf of the College, for annual submission to HESA.

(ii) That the 2011 data for undergraduate students covered students graduating in summer 2011. The data for postgraduate students related to those who had completed between August and December 2010. Graduates had been surveyed from January-March 2012 for undergraduates and April-June 2011 for postgraduates.

(iii) That HESA set response rate targets of 80% for UK students and 50% for EU students. Overseas students had not to date been included in the survey but would be from 2012 onwards.

(iv) That overall response rates achieved at Imperial for 2011 were:

Home UG	88.65% (1119 responses from 1262 target population)
EU UG	78% (160 responses from 205 target population)
Home PG	83.85% (795 responses from 948 target population)
EU PG	73.7% (432 responses from 586 target population)

(v) That the employment rates and destinations data for Imperial graduates were outlined in the Senate's paper. The Key Information Sets (KISs) would include graduate employment and average salary data.

(2) Placement and Internship Unit

Reported: (i) That a Placement and Internship Unit had been established within the Careers Advisory Service in January 2012 and was staffed by two Placement and Internship Officers.

(ii) That during the spring term a number of key objectives for the Placement and Internship Unit had been achieved, including the creation of a dedicated web section for the Unit on the Careers Advisory Service website and the organisation of the College's first Internship Careers Fair aimed at small and medium size organisations and charities offering opportunities for summer internships. Further details were provided in the Senate's paper.

(3) Imperial Business Partners Programme Event – 13 March 2012

Reported: (i) That the Imperial Business Partners Programme (IBP) was an initiative to foster closer relationships between Imperial's current and prospective industry partners and the College. A key component of the IBP programme was strategy discussion events, held throughout the year, which brought together high profile industry leaders, prominent members of the College, and invited guests who could bring additional insight to specific discussions.

(ii) That on 13 March 2012, an IBP event had been held within the College. The event had been focused around a round table discussion, led by Professor Julia Buckingham, on the strategic implications of higher student tuition fees for the talent pool for global businesses recruiting in the UK. Special invitations had been extended to Sir Adrian Smith, Director General of Knowledge and Innovation at BIS, Dr Wendy Piatt, Director General of the Russell Group and Professor Lord Winston, Professor of Science and Society. Nine board-level representatives from IBP partners including National Grid, Rolls Royce, AWE and Shell had been present.

(iii) That a visit to the Reach Out lab, where the guests had spoken with sixth form students who were experimenting with solar cell technology and carbon capture, had allowed attendees to meet those who would potentially be affected by the tuition fee changes. At the dinner which followed, guest speaker Professor Lord Winston had shared his views on the government's struggle to understand science and to use scientific

knowledge wisely.

(4) Symposium on Induction Programmes for Teaching and Learning – 28 March 2012

Reported: That at its February 2012 meeting the Senate had been informed that the Educational Development Unit would be holding an event to discuss the progress made by Faculties in developing bespoke personalised training courses for academic staff following the closure of CASLAT. The symposium had taken place on 28 March 2012 and had been chaired by Dr Martyn Kingsbury, Head of the Education Development Unit. Each Faculty had presented on the training programmes they had developed. It had been clear that considerable progress had been made and a number of common themes had emerged, including the importance of observing and being observed, the value contribution of 'teaching stars' and the benefits of training in small groups or one-to-one. A summary of the key points from the session would be made available shortly. The symposium had concluded with a lecture by Professor Christine Ortiz, Dean of Graduate Education at MIT.

(5) University Education in 2012: A Moment for Change? Lecture by Professor AC Grayling – 24 May 2012

Reported: That on 24 May 2012 Professor AC Grayling (Master, New College of the Humanities) would be visiting the College to give a talk on the subject of *University Education in 2012: A Moment for Change?* This would be the inaugural event of the *Perspectives in Education* series, a new, intermittent lecture series which aimed to invite a range of speakers to give their views on current events in Higher Education. Professor Grayling would explore the broad question of where university education was going, and what it did and should provide. Further information was available at:  
<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/edudev/networksandevents/grayling>

(6) Transferable Skills Development: Undergraduate Co-Curricular Committee

Reported: (i) That the Strategic Education Committee had established an Undergraduate Co-Curricular Committee to determine what undergraduate co-curricular options were required and maintain responsibility for the quality assurance and standards of undergraduate co-curricular provision.

(ii) That the first meeting of the Undergraduate Co-Curricular Committee had been held on 26 March 2012, with the Pro-Rector (Education and Academic Affairs) as the interim Chairman. The Committee had outlined its vision for the co-curricular programme to be offered to first year undergraduates in 2012-13. It had emphasised that co-curricular options should enable students to develop the Imperial graduate attributes by complementing what was taught through core subject disciplines. The programme was currently under development and would be presented to Management Board and Senate in due course.

(7) UK Quality Code for Higher Education

Reported: (i) That at its February meeting the Senate had been informed that the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was consulting on 2 sections of the new UK Quality Code for Higher Education – *Part C: Information about higher education provision* and *Chapter B11: Research Degrees*. The QAA had since also consulted on a new *Chapter B5: Student Engagement* (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/student-engagement-draft-for-consultation.aspx>). The College's responses to these consultations were appended to the Senate's paper.

(ii) That the final Part C of the Quality Code had now been published and was available at: <http://www.gaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/Quality-Code-Part-C.aspx>

(iii) That the final versions of chapters B5 and B11 were due to be published by the end of June.

(8) QAA Consultation - Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education: Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers

Reported: (i) That the QAA, working with an external advisory group composed of representatives from higher education providers and sector organisations with an interest in enterprise and entrepreneurship education, had drafted guidance on enterprise and entrepreneurship education, which was available at:

<http://www.gaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/EE-draft-consultation.aspx>

(ii) That the College's response to the draft guidance was appended to the Senate's paper.

(9) International Students Studying in the UK – Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers

Reported: That the Senate had been informed at its November 2011 meeting that the College had responded to draft guidance for UK Higher Education providers, produced by the QAA, on International students studying in the UK. The final guidance had now been published and was available at:

<http://www.gaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Pages/International-students-studying-in-the-UK.aspx>

(10) Olympics

Reported: (i) That advice had been issued to Departments on how to manage Early Stage Assessments for research students due during the main Olympic period.

(ii) That further information was available at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/currentstudents/researchstudents/assessment>

(11) The Wilson Review of Business-University Collaboration

Reported: That Professor Sir Tim Wilson's Review of Business-University Collaboration had now been published. The report recommended that universities should work more closely with the commercial sector to offer students greater opportunities for placements and internships while studying and that universities should also consider charging a reduced fee in the region of £1,000 for the year in industry element of degree programmes. The report was available at: <http://www.wilsonreview.co.uk/>

(12) New Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)

Reported: That Blackboard 9.1 had been recommended and approved as the new VLE for the College. A summary of the recommendation of the VLE working group was provided in the Senate's paper. Particular thanks were due to Julie Voce (ICT) and Omar Matar (Chairman of the E-Learning Strategy Committee). A VLE Migration Group would be established to lead and monitor the transfer to the new system. Migration was expected to take 2-3 years in total with the first phase being complete at the start of the

2012-2013 session.

(13) Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine

Reported: That the Pro Rector (Education and Academic Affairs) had recently visited the Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine in Singapore.

Further Reported: That the Pro Rector had been very impressed with the work being undertaken to establish the School. Regular reports on this project would continue to be made to Senate by the Medical Studies Committee.

**1622 Periodic Review of Research Degree Provision in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering**

Considered and approved: A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/74**).

Reported: (1) That in its review of research degree provision in the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, the Graduate School's Postgraduate Research Quality Committee was advised by four assessors who had visited the Department on the 27 June 2011.

(2) That the reviewers had rated the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering 'compliant' in all but 1 precept and 'compliant' overall. Following the review, the internal Chairman of the panel had reported to the Committee that the Department had now taken action to ensure compliance with all the precepts.

(3) That the Committee had congratulated the Department on its excellent review and had noted that the review panel had found the Department to be very well organised and providing a well-focused and supportive environment for students. The panel had reported that there was a strong sense of student community and evidence of good communication between students and staff. The panel had also found evidence of a highly effective management system used to monitor and support student progression. The review panel had confirmed that these factors had underpinned the success of the Department in training high quality researchers. The panel had also commended the Department on their thorough induction programme and comprehensive postgraduate handbook.

(4) That the review panel had originally found that the Department did not comply with Precept 1, which stated that interview selection panels must comprise at least 1, and normally 2 members of staff in addition to the Director of Postgraduate Studies or Head of Department or their nominee. In response to this, the Head of Department had confirmed that a new admissions procedure had now been established to address this issue and that this had been communicated to staff. Admissions documentation had also been updated so that each completed admission form required 2 signatures.

(5) That the Committee had discussed the submission rate within the Department (82%) which was below the average for the Faculty of Engineering and the College. The Committee had noted that the large number of overseas students in the Department could be a contributing factor to the low rate. However, the review panel had been confident that students present at the review were clear about the timescales for completion of milestones and the Committee had been satisfied that the Department's procedures for identifying potential problems with student progression were robust.

(6) That the Department had reported that they appointed a supervisor and an academic mentor to each student. The academic mentor was also present during all progression assessments. The Committee had noted that in other Departments within the College the

role of the academic mentor was traditionally pastoral. The Department had confirmed that whilst the academic mentor was present at assessments s/he did not take part in the assessment of the student. The Department had also confirmed that the Postgraduate Tutor was responsible for the pastoral care of students within the Department. Students present at the review had confirmed that they were happy with these arrangements and the review panel had found this system to be working effectively.

Agreed: That the Senate was satisfied with the outcome of the review and approved the recommendation of the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee that the Department should report on developments since the periodic review as part of the next Precept Review in 3 years' time.

### **1623 Review of the Malaysia-Imperial Doctoral Programme**

Considered and approved: A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/75**).

Reported: (1) That at its meeting on the 22 February 2012, the Senate had approved, on the recommendation of the Strategic Education Committee (SEC), the withdrawal of the Malaysia-Imperial Doctoral Programme (MIDP), with effect from October 2012.

(2) That the SEC had reported to the Senate that on 28 November 2011 a periodic review of the MIDP had been undertaken following the College's new *Procedures for the Review of Collaborative Research Programmes not owned by Departments*. The SEC had received the report of the review, noting that this would be considered in detail by the Graduate School's Postgraduate Research Quality Committee.

(3) That the *Procedures for the Review of Collaborative Research Programmes not owned by Departments* had been approved by the Senate on the 2 November 2011 and this was the first time that a review following these procedures had taken place. This was also the first time that the new collaborative research degree precepts, endorsed by Senate in November 2011, had been used for a review.

(4) That the College had received positive comments on the new review process from the review panel. However, the panel had suggested that the College should consider revising the timetable for the review so that the panel was given more time for private discussion and reflection. The panel had also recommended that for future reviews, the panel should be asked not to focus solely on the collaborative precepts because this approach might not draw out all the information that a panel should consider in order to establish whether or not a programme was working well.

(5) That in light of Senate's decision to withdraw from the MIDP programme from October 2012, the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee had agreed that it would focus its discussion on how best to oversee arrangements for the remaining students and what lessons could be learned from the experience. The Committee had noted that the MIDP had been introduced at a time when the College was new to such international collaborations and that since then new procedures had been established to ensure similar issues did not arise.

(6) That the review panel had commended the excellent support for students registered on the programme provided by the International Office and the recently appointed Academic Lead (July 2011). The panel had also found that the Imperial supervisors had provided good supervision to students during their time at the College.

(7) That the reviewers had reported a number of issues with the MIDP and had rated the programme as 'working towards compliance' overall. There had been a lack of academic oversight of the programme until the recent appointment of an Academic Lead. Additionally the length of funding period for the programme (36 months) was insufficient

and should have been longer to take account of the fact that students were required to study at 2 institutions, in 2 different continents. The review panel had also found that there were delays in carrying out student progress reviews because the time when students were able to attend the College was not flexible. The review panel had reported cases where the Malaysian supervisors were not fully engaged with the programme.

(8) That the panel had reported that there was poor quality control of the recruitment process, leading to the admission of some weaker students. Some students had reported that when they arrived at Imperial it was difficult for them to find suitable living accommodation.

(9) That the Committee had agreed that in future such programmes should not be introduced without proper consideration and external review. The Committee had recommended that these types of collaborations should focus on particular themes and must relate to the College's education and research strategies. They should be real collaborations, not manufactured 'shotgun weddings'. The Committee had agreed that it was extremely important to appoint an Academic Lead early on in the process and that procedures should be put in place so that the Academic Lead could monitor all staff responsible for students registered on such programmes. Additionally, the Committee had agreed that clear mechanisms for acquiring feedback from students should be established and that the responsibilities of supervisors, both at the College and at its partner(s), should be set out clearly.

(10) That the Committee had noted that students registered for the MIDP were funded for a period of 3 years. The review panel had reported that most students struggled to complete their programme within this time span, especially given the challenges of carrying out research across 2 institutions, in 2 different countries. The Committee had agreed that the MIDP was not sufficiently flexible to take account of such issues. It was noted that the NTU, HKU and NUS joint PhD programmes all allowed a longer time period for completion of study.

(11) That the issue of bonded students on such programmes had also been discussed by the Committee and it had been agreed that every effort should be made to uncover whether students would be required to pay back their costs if they failed to complete their PhD in the allotted time. The use of scholarships on such programmes was preferable.

(12) That the Academic Lead had confirmed that the recommendations of the review panel were being implemented and that bi-weekly updates on student progress were now being provided to the supervisors at each institution. The Academic Lead had also confirmed that whilst 1 or 2 students had now completed the programme, there were approximately 12 students currently enrolled on the MIDP. These students were mainly based in the Faculties of Medicine and Engineering. The Academic Lead had confirmed that whilst there was no active recruitment to the programme, there may be 1 or 2 more enrolments before the programme was officially withdrawn in October 2012.

(13) That the Committee had been concerned that the remaining students on the MIDP were well supported and had agreed that the Joint Research Degree Programme Committee (JRDP) should take an active role in ensuring this. The Committee had therefore agreed that the Academic Lead for the MIDP, in consultation with the International Office, should submit an annual report on student progress to the JRDP, which would in turn report on this matter to the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee.

Agreed: That the Senate accepted the report and approved the recommendation of the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee that the Academic Lead for the MIDP, in consultation with the International Office, should submit an annual report on the progress of the remaining students on the programme to the JRDP.



## 1624 Inappropriate Relationships between Staff and Students

Considered: A Report by the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/76**).

Reported: (1) That although there was guidance for staff on declaring personal and familial relationships, and essentially avoiding relationships with students, there was no equivalent guidance for students.

(2) That in order to address this matter, the QAAC recommended that the Senate approve and recommend to Council the addition of a new regulation to the Regulations for Students, with immediate effect. The proposed regulation was outlined in the Senate's paper.

Further Reported: That some Senate members felt that the some of the wording proposed in the draft regulation was ambiguous.

Agreed: That QAAC should revisit the wording of the regulation, and present a revised draft to the next Senate meeting. It might be useful for the Committee to consider the regulations other universities had in place on this subject.

## 1625 Quality Assurance Advisory Committee

Considered: A Report by the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/77**).

(1) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B7: External Examining

Reported: (i) That the Senate had been informed in February 2012 that the Committee had reviewed the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, *Chapter B7: External Examining* and had agreed action to be taken in order to ensure that the College addressed each Indicator within the chapter.

(ii) That action now taken to address the points made in the Chapter included:

- (a) The development of Guidelines to Departments on the Nomination and Appointment of External Examiners, to take effect for the 2012-13 session.
- (b) Revisions to the External Examiner Nomination Form, with immediate effect.
- (c) The introduction, with immediate effect, of a procedure outlining the action that external examiners could take to raise issues with the College. The procedure recognised that while the College generally had positive interactions with its many external examiners, very occasionally an external examiner might have a particular concern that they wished to raise outside the confines of the general reporting arrangements. The procedure outlined the action to be taken in such cases.

(iii) That these documents were available at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/externalexamining>

(iv) That the Committee had also agreed amendments to the Examination Regulations concerning the appointment and role of external examiners, to take account of the requirements of the Quality Code. These included a requirement that external examiners should not normally hold more than 2 taught course external examiner appointments at any one time.

(v) That the Committee had particularly considered the statements in the UK Quality Code that institutions 'should not appoint as external examiners individuals whose home institution is one of the College's collaborative partners' or 'anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question'. The Code also stated that universities should not 'appoint more than one external examiner from the same department of the same institution'. QAAC had agreed that while such statements should also be incorporated in the College's regulations, it would be for the Studies Committees/Graduate School Master's Quality Committees to consider the risk associated with such appointments on a case by case basis. The Committee had agreed, for example, that it would be acceptable to appoint an external examiner whose home institution was one of the College's collaborative partners, provided that the appointment was to a programme within a different College Department to the one in which the collaboration existed. The Committee had also agreed that it would be acceptable for the College to appoint external examiners from the same Department of the same institution, provided they were appointed to different College degree courses.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, changes to the Examination Regulations concerning the appointment and role of external examiners, as outlined in the Senate's paper, with effect from October 2012.

(2) Online Publication of Theses

Considered and approved: In light of the Senate's approval of recommendations regarding the online publication of theses at its November and December 2011 meetings, amendments to the 'Availability of Theses' section of the *Regulations for the award of PhD and MPhil, Regulations for the award of MPhil and PhD* and *Regulations for the award of MD (Res)*, as outlined in the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

(3) Amendment to the Examination Regulations - Secrecy of Examination Papers

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the addition of the following statement to the undergraduate and Master's Examination Regulations concerning the secrecy of examination papers, with immediate effect:

*In any revision classes prior to examinations staff must take care not to release information about actual questions on the examination.*

(4) Research Degree Assessment Appeal Committee

Reported: (i) That the Committee had approved *Procedures for dealing with appeals by research students against a decision by their Department not to confirm their registration for PhD at the early or late stage assessment*, which would replace the *Procedures for dealing with appeals by research students against a decision by their Department or Division not to transfer their registration from MPhil to PhD*. The Procedures had been revised to reflect the new process for research degree registration and corresponding assessment milestones. The composition of the Appeals Committee had also been revised.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the revised procedures outlined in the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

(5) Routine and Periodic Review of Master's Programmes

Reported: (i) That the Committee, in consultation with the Graduate School, had reviewed

the routine and periodic review procedures for Master's courses and had agreed that the Graduate School's current internal routine review of programmes should be replaced by an annual monitoring process. External examiners' reports and a summary of course modifications would form part of the annual monitoring procedure and the Graduate School's Master's Quality Committees would consider the annual monitoring reports each spring with 2 reviewers for each course providing an executive summary to the Committee.

(ii) That new Master's courses would also undergo a more in-depth review in their second or third year of operation (as was the case for undergraduate courses). Details of this second stage review, and a full annual monitoring procedure, would be developed in due course.

(iii) That the Graduate School had also consulted widely with Departments over proposed changes to the periodic review of Master's courses and postgraduate research provision. Specifically, the Graduate School had asked whether these reviews should be kept separate or combined into one single periodic review of all postgraduate education in each Department. The Graduate School had found only limited support for combining the reviews and had therefore recommended that these be kept separate.

(iv) That subsequently, the Registry had developed, in consultation with the Graduate School, a revised procedure for the periodic review of Departmental Master's courses.

(v) That where possible, this procedure mirrored that of the undergraduate periodic review procedure. It was proposed that periodic reviews of Master's courses would take place during the spring and summer terms when the annual monitoring process was complete and so that the review panel was able to meet with students who had completed at least the majority of their course. Additionally, where the majority of a Department's Master's courses were accredited, the periodic review would normally take place between 6 and 12 months after accreditation so that where possible the material prepared for accreditation could also be used for the periodic review, thus reducing the burden placed on Departments.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the revised *Procedure for the Periodic Review of Departmental Master's Courses*, outlined in the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

#### (6) Preparation of Model Answers to Examination Questions

Reported: (i) That at its meeting on 14 December 2011, the Senate had received a report of the Committee's consideration of the 2010-11 undergraduate external examiner summary report and the 2009-10 Master's external examiner summary report. In response to a question from the Imperial College Union at that Senate meeting regarding whether the College could develop a policy outlining good practice in the preparation of model answers, it was agreed that QAAC would explore this and report back to Senate.

(ii) That the QAAC had considered this issue and had agreed that it would be difficult to develop College-wide guidelines on what model answers should comprise because some Departments required candidates to provide descriptive answers, whilst others required exact answers to questions. The Committee had also agreed that, in some cases, particularly with regard to MCQ examinations which had only a limited pool of answers, it would not be practical to provide students with an unlimited quantity of model answers.

(iii) That the Committee did however agree that Departments should develop clear and transparent policies on providing model answers to students and to external examiners. Board Chairmen would be responsible for ensuring that their Department's policy was consistently and fairly applied. The Committee had also agreed that there should be a minimum expectation that students would be provided with the previous 3 years' model

answers. Furthermore, where an examination was being used for the first time, Departments should provide students with examples of how they might answer the questions.

(iv) That the Committee had agreed that a question would be added to the external examiner report template which asked externals to comment on the quality of model answers provided to them.

Further Reported: That while Senate members had agreed that external examiners should be provided with model answers to examination questions, some members were concerned about the recommendation regarding the provision of model answers to students.

Agreed: That the QAAC should reconsider this matter. The Studies Committees and Graduate School's Master's Quality Committees should also be consulted.

(7) Grade Inflation and Over-Generous Marking

Reported: That the Committee had considered a report from the Deputy Director of the Graduate School on his review of grade inflation and over-generous marking which had been carried out in response to comments made by some external examiners. The Committee had agreed that whilst there was no evidence of grade inflation and over-generous marking in the Master's courses reviewed by the Deputy Director, it was important to review marks awarded to Master's students. Henceforth, an annual report on the number of pass, merits and distinctions awarded by each Master's course would be produced.

(8) Student Surveys

Reported: That the Committee had considered the results of autumn 2011 PG SOLE and had been pleased that the participation rates were better than in the previous year's survey. However, the Committee had noted the wide range in participation rates between Departments.

(9) Turnitin Pilot Report

Reported: That the Committee had considered a pilot study using Turnitin to check PhD students' 9-month reports for plagiarism which had been carried out in 2011 by the Departments of Chemical Engineering and Materials. Both Chemical Engineering and Materials had said that they would use Turnitin in the future. The Committee had agreed that Departments should be encouraged to use Turnitin for checking 9-month PhD reports if they considered that this would be useful within their subject areas. Departments that chose to use Turnitin should inform their students of their intention to do this. All Departments should ensure that students received appropriate guidance and training on avoiding plagiarism.

(10) Continuing Professional Development Quality Committee

Reported: That the Committee had received the annual report from the Continuing Professional Development Quality Committee.

(11) Eligibility for Research Degree Supervision

Reported: That the Committee had agreed amendments to the College's document *Eligibility for Research Degree Supervision*, which described the principles of supervision and in particular emphasised that all students should have adequate and regular access to their supervisors. The document recommended that limits should be placed on the number of students that an individual could supervise which would be dependent upon the

nature and size of the research group. The document also described the types of people who might or might not act as supervisors and provided advice on joint supervision with staff at other universities and arrangements when supervisors departed to other institutions or had periods of extended absence. A glossary of supervisor terms was also included. The document was available at

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/policiesandprocedures/examinationassessment>

(12) Roles and Responsibilities

Reported: (i) That the Committee had approved amendments to the following roles and responsibilities documents:

- (a) College Tutor
- (b) Hall Senior
- (c) Assistant Warden
- (d) Warden
- (e) Sub Warden
- (f) PG Tutor
- (g) Director of Postgraduate Studies
- (h) Research Degree Supervisor
- (i) MSc Course Organiser

(ii) That the Committee had also approved 2 new roles and responsibilities documents:

- (a) Disabilities Liaison Officer
- (b) Research Degree External Examiner

(iii) That all roles and responsibilities documents were available at the following link:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/goodpractice>

**1626 Engineering Studies Committee**

Considered: A Report by the Engineering Studies Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/78**).

(1) Reorganisation of Undergraduate Courses and Examinations

(i) Department of Earth Science and Engineering

Withdrawal of MSci Environmental Geoscience

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the withdrawal of the MSci Environmental Geoscience course from 2012 to new students.

Noted: That there was an ongoing aim in the Department of Earth Science and Engineering to simplify the degree schemes. All modules in the MSci Environmental Geoscience degree were available to students studying the MSci Geology degree. Students currently registered on the MSci Environmental Geoscience degree were not affected by this change.

Renewal of Exchange Agreements

Reported: That the Committee had approved the renewal of the Department's exchange agreements with the University of Utrecht and the University of British Columbia.

(ii) Department of Materials

Withdrawal of BEng Materials with Year Abroad

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the withdrawal of the BEng Materials with Year Abroad course from 2012 to new students.

Noted: That while a few students each year started this course, few completed it, preferring instead to transfer to other courses within the Department. Students wishing to spend time abroad could opt for an MEng programme.

(iii) Department of Mechanical Engineering

MEng Mechanical Engineering Sandwich: Change of Award Title

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, that the MEng Mechanical Engineering Sandwich course be renamed MEng Mechanical Engineering with a Year in Industry with immediate effect to bring it in line with other Year in Industry courses offered in the Faculty.

Noted: That there would be no change to the structure of the course and current students would be given the option to transfer to the new course title.

Approval of Exchange Partner

Reported: That the Committee had approved a proposal to establish an exchange link with Ecole Centrale, Paris.

(iv) Department of Aeronautics

Approval of Exchange Partner

Reported: That the Committee had approved a proposal to establish an exchange link in the Department of Aeronautics with the National University of Singapore.

(v) Department of Chemical Engineering

Renewal of Exchange Agreements

Reported: That the Committee had approved the renewal of the Department's exchange agreements with ENSIC; INP Lorraine in Nancy, France; IQS, Ramon LLull in Barcelona; and the University of Sydney.

(vi) Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Mathematics Teaching

Reported: That the Committee had approved a proposal for the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering to take over the delivery of Mathematics teaching for first and second year students, with effect from October 2012.

Renewal of Exchange Agreements

Reported: That the Committee had also approved the renewal of the Department's exchange agreement with Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya in Barcelona.

(vii) Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering

Scheme for Award of Honours: Minor Amendment

Reported: That the Committee had approved a proposal for a minor amendment to the Scheme for Award of Honours. The change related to the weightings assigned to the second year course.

Renewal of Exchange Agreement

Reported: That the Committee had also approved the renewal of the Department's exchange agreement with University of Rome Tor Vergata.

(2) Periodic Review of Undergraduate Teaching in the Department of Chemical Engineering – Follow-Up Report

Reported: That the Committee had received a report from the Department of Chemical Engineering detailing actions taken following the Periodic Review of the Department's undergraduate teaching in 2010. The Department had confirmed that it had put in place a number of measures to tackle issues raised in the review, in particular personal tutoring arrangements and the quality and timeliness of feedback. The Committee had been satisfied with the report.

(3) Survey Results

Reported: That the Committee had considered the results of the Autumn SOLE survey.

(4) Summary of External Examiner Reports for Undergraduate Degrees in 2010-2011

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered the 2010-11 undergraduate external examiner summary report and had noted that as was the case last year, external examiners had reported that the quality and standards of undergraduate degree programmes at Imperial had compared favourably to other institutions within the UK and that in some cases standards were above those of students studying at other institutions of which external examiners had had experience. External examiners had reported that programmes had continued to be coherently structured and appropriately taught for the level and subject area. It was largely felt that exam processes, including meetings of the Boards of Examiners, were handled efficiently and fairly.

(ii) That the Committee had noted that in response to this summary report, the QAAC had made a request for the Studies Committees to ensure that all Departments whose external examiners had reported issues relating to grade inflation and over generous marking were taking appropriate action and that where external examiners had reported that they did not receive timely responses to their queries on draft examination scripts, or did not receive material to be reviewed in good time, that the individual Departments concerned had put in place mechanisms to ensure that these issues would not happen again.

(iii) That in response to this request, the Committee had received verbal reports from the Department of Aeronautics, the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering and the Business School on how these issues were being addressed. The Committee had been satisfied that action was being taken where appropriate.

(5) Undergraduate Examination Failures 2010-11

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered a report detailing undergraduate

examination failures in 2010-11. This report had been revised since the previous meeting of the Committee and now excluded those students sitting examinations for a second time. The Committee had been content with the new format of the report.

(ii) That the Committee had focused its attention on Departments in the Faculty where the failure rate in a particular year of the course had exceeded 10% especially where this had occurred in the second or subsequent year:

- (a) Aeronautics first year – 11.6%
- (b) Civil and Environmental Engineering first year – 22.2%
- (c) Mechanical Engineering first year – 10.3%
- (d) Mechanical Engineering second year – 10.7%

(iii) That the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering had provided an action plan for reducing the number of failures, which was appended to the Senate's paper. The Committee had been pleased with the action taken by the Department.

(iv) That the representative from the Department of Mechanical Engineering had stated that although the failure rate in the first 2 years of the course was high, it was better for weak students to fail early on in the course rather than in later years.

(v) That the Department of Aeronautics would report to the next Studies Committee meeting as the representative had been absent.

## **1627 Science Studies Committee**

Considered: A Report by the Science Studies Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/79**).

### **(1) Undergraduate Examination Failure Rates 2010-11**

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered the revised report on undergraduate examination failure rates for 2010-11 and had been pleased that no Departments within the Faculty of Natural Sciences had a failure rate exceeding 10%.

(ii) That the Committee had however felt that the report did not present useful information in its current format and had made recommendations for how the data might be better presented.

### **(2) Undergraduate External Examiner Summary Report 2010-11**

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered the 2010-11 undergraduate external examiner summary report and had noted that as was the case last year, external examiners had reported that the quality and standards of undergraduate degree programmes at Imperial had compared favourably to other institutions within the UK and that in some cases standards were above those of students studying at other institutions of which external examiners had had experience. External examiners had reported that programmes continued to be coherently structured and appropriately taught for the level and subject area. It was largely felt that exam processes, including meetings of the Boards of Examiners, were handled efficiently and fairly.

(ii) That the Committee had noted that in response to this summary report, the QAAC had made a request for the Studies Committees to ensure that all Departments whose external examiners had reported issues relating to grade inflation and over generous marking were taking appropriate action and that where external examiners had reported that they did not receive timely responses to their queries on draft examination scripts, or did not receive material to be reviewed in good time, that the individual Departments concerned had put in place mechanisms to ensure that these issues would not happen again.



(iii) That in response to this request, the Committee had received verbal reports from the Department of Chemistry, the Department of Mathematics and the Business School on how these issues were being addressed. The Committee had been satisfied that appropriate action was being taken.

(3) Undergraduate Annual Monitoring 2010-11

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered the 2010-11 undergraduate annual monitoring form from the Business School and had noted that no major changes to any undergraduate Business courses were made during the 2010-11 session and that none were planned for 2011-12. The Business School had reported that the programme team had been actively monitoring the timeliness of feedback provided to students and that action was being taken when agreed timescales were not met by staff. The Business School would submit its procedures for dealing with borderline candidates to the May meeting of the Committee.

(ii) That the external examiner reports, and the Business School's responses to them, had also been considered. The minutes of the Committee's discussion of the reports were appended to the Senate's paper.

(4) BSc Physics and Music Performance

Reported: (i) That the Committee had approved the revised agreement between Imperial and the Royal College of Music (RCM) to offer the BSc (Honours) Physics and Music Performance, noting the following:

- (a) The course was now a joint degree programme rather than an Imperial degree with RCM teaching input.
- (b) A Joint Board of Examiners had been established for the programme.
- (c) The course would be overall subject to the academic regulations of Imperial though music elements would also be subject to the regulations of RCM. Where there were any discrepancies between the two Parties' regulations, Imperial's would take precedence except in relation to the conduct and assessment of the music modules.
- (d) Appeals against the decisions of the Boards of Examiners would initially be dealt with in accordance with Imperial's *Procedure for Consideration of Representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners*. However if the appeal related solely to an RCM element of the examination, this might be referred to RCM to be considered in accordance with the RCM's general regulations for students.
- (e) Allegations of non-academic misconduct in breach of Imperial or RCM's Regulations (including issues relating to abusive or unreasonable behaviour, damage to property, use of computing facilities etc.) should normally be investigated by the relevant Party in accordance with their disciplinary procedures.
- (f) Allegations of academic misconduct by a student on the programme (including cheating, plagiarism, conduct affecting the security of examinations or other conduct of a similar character) should be dealt with by Imperial in accordance with Imperial's *Cheating Offences Policy and Procedures* unless the case related solely to the music element of the programme, in which case RCM's general regulations for students applied.
- (g) Any complaint raised by a student on the programme should be dealt with by the university against whom the complaint had been raised, according to the appropriate procedures. Complaints regarding the overall programme should be

dealt with by Imperial.

(h) Cases of unsatisfactory progress should be dealt with in accordance with Imperial's *Student Withdrawal and Appeals Procedures*, in agreement with RCM.

(ii) That the revised agreement had now been signed by both Parties.

(5) Approval and Renewal of Exchange Agreements

Reported: (i) That the Committee had approved a new exchange link between the Department of Life Sciences and the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain, for students studying for the BSc Biology with a Year in Europe or the BSc Biology with Spanish for Science degrees.

(ii) That the Committee had agreed that the following exchange agreements could be renewed:

Department of Life Sciences:

- (a) Université Paul Sabatier (Toulouse III)
- (b) Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon
- (c) Université Paris-Sud (Paris XI) Orsay

Department of Physics:

- (a) Université Paris-Sud (Paris XI) Orsay

Department of Mathematics:

- (a) Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon

(6) Re-organisation of Undergraduate Courses

(i) Department of Mathematics

Reported: That the Committee had approved revisions to the Scheme for the Award of Honours; amendments to the third and fourth year weightings; revisions to the Department's ECTS templates; and the Department's procedures for dealing with borderline candidates.

(ii) Department of Chemistry

Reported: (a) That the Committee had approved an exemption from the Scientific and Technical Translation module (3 ECTS credits) for one MSci Chemistry with French for Science student.

(b) That the Committee had also approved an increase in the threshold which students on the Chemistry with Research Abroad and Chemistry with a Language for Science courses needed to achieve at the end of Year 2 in order to proceed on these courses. The threshold would be increased from 60% to 65%. The increased threshold would be introduced for students entering Year 2 from 2013 onwards.

(iii) Department of Life Sciences: Biochemistry / Biotechnology

Reported: That the Committee had approved four new modules in the Department of Life Sciences and consequent revisions to relevant programme specifications and the Scheme for the Award of Honours.

## 1628 Graduate School Postgraduate Quality Committees

**Considered:** A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Quality Committees (**Paper Senate/2011/80**).

### (1) Pre-Sessional Careers Course

**Reported:** (i) That the Master's Quality Committee for Business, Engineering and Physical Sciences had considered a proposal from the Business School for the establishment of an optional 2-week pre-sessional Careers course for their MSc in Management programme from September 2012.

(ii) That the course would be specifically targeted at those students interested in applying for consulting jobs which typically had early deadlines and were extremely competitive. Students who attended the pre-sessional careers course would be exempt from attending the compulsory careers courses on the MSc in Management during the rest of the year. The Business School had stressed that it was not seeking to alter the start and end dates of the MSc programme.

(iii) That eventually the Business School hoped that the course might also be offered to students who were interested in applying for consulting jobs from its other programmes (in particular the MSc in Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Management; the MSc in Strategic Marketing and the MSc in Economics and Strategy for Business).

(iv) That the Master's Quality Committee had satisfied itself that the Business School had understood and could cope with any logistical problems that arose with offering a pre-sessional course. The Committee had also satisfied itself that the Business School had the staffing and resources to deliver the course successfully.

**Approved:** On the recommendation of the Committee, the establishment of an optional pre-sessional course for MSc in Management students with effect from September 2012.

### (2) Major Modification: MSc in Computing (Specialism)

**Considered and approved:** On the recommendation of the Committee, the introduction of a Machine Learning pathway on the MSc in Computing (Specialism), with a new award title of MSc in Computing (Machine Learning) for students taking the pathway, with effect from October 2012.

### (3) Minor Retrospective Modifications

**Considered and approved:** On the recommendation of the Committee, minor retrospective changes to 4 Master's programmes as outlined in section 3 of the Senate's paper, subject to receiving student consent for the changes where this was outstanding.

### (4) Suspensions

#### (i) Department of Computing: MSc in Computing (Specialism)

**Considered and approved:** On the recommendation of the Committee, the suspension of the *Biomedical Applications* pathway and the *Theory* pathway in the MSc in Computing (Specialism) with effect from October 2012.

(ii) Department of Life Sciences: MSc in Conservation and Forest Protection; MSc in Entomology; and MRes in Integrated Crop Pest and Disease Management

Reported: (a) That the Department of Life Sciences wished to suspend entry to the MSc in Conservation and Forest Protection, MSc in Entomology and MRes in Integrated Crop Pest and Disease Management in October 2012 due to key teaching staff leaving the College.

(b) That these suspensions followed shortly after the suspensions of the Department's MSc in Ecological Applications, MRes in Entomology and MSc in Integrated Pest Management for entry in October 2012, which had been approved at the February Senate.

(iii) That the Head of Department of Life Sciences had noted that while the suspension of these 6 courses might seem like a major change, in reality the courses largely formed a single course 'suite' in Crop Protection, which many shared lectures and practical classes. Over the past 3 years an average of 36 students a year had taken the suite of courses.

(iv) That the Department was currently recruiting new staff and following such appointments would consider whether to retain any aspects of the Crop Protection Suite. In the meantime 2 new Master's courses in the Division of Ecology and Evolution – the MSc in Quantitative Biology and the MRes in Biodiversity, Informatics and Genomics - were attracting a good number of applicants.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the suspension of the MSc in Conservation and Forest Protection, MSc in Entomology and MRes in Integrated Crop Pest and Disease Management for entry in October 2012.

(5) Withdrawals

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the withdrawal of the MSc in Epidemiology part-time mode of study and the Master of Public Health part-time modes of study with effect from October 2012.

Noted: That these part-time options were currently suspended in both cases: Master of Public Health since entry in October 2010 and MSc in Epidemiology for entry in October 2012. During the period of suspension there had been negligible interest from potential applicants for part-time study. The vast majority of applicants were seeking full-time Master's study.

(6) Code of Practice for MRes Courses and MRes Precepts

Reported: (i) That now that the College had re-designated MRes courses as research programmes, the Graduate School's Master's Quality Committees had agreed a Code of Practice and precepts for MRes courses to ensure that the courses were compliant with the QAA Code of Practice for Research Programmes. MRes courses would be reviewed for compliance against the MRes precepts as part of the new annual monitoring procedure (but not every year). It was intended that flexible interpretation of the precepts would be used.

(ii) That at the time of approving the Code of Practice and precepts the intention had been that they would take effect from 2012-13, however, it was now apparent that it would be appropriate to allow Departments an additional period to change their existing practices in line with the new precepts.

Endorsed: On the recommendation of the Committee, the Code of Practice for MRes Courses and MRes precepts outlined in the Senate's paper, with effect from 2013-14.

(7) Minor Modifications

Reported: That the Graduate School's Master's Quality had approved minor modifications to 2 courses, as outlined in section 7 of the Senate's paper.

**1629 Undergraduate Examination Failures**

Considered: Revised statistics relating to undergraduate examination failures for session 2010-2011 (**Paper Senate/2011/81**).

Reported: (1) That the Registry had reviewed the presentation of the report on undergraduate failures which had been presented to the December 2011 Senate and had removed from the report resit candidates, a category that had erroneously been included.

(2) That the Studies Committees had been invited to focus their attention on Departments where the failure rate in a particular year of the course had exceeded 10%, especially where this had occurred in the second or subsequent year. In 2010-11 the Departments with failure rates exceeding 10% were Aeronautics (first year 11.6%), Civil and Environmental Engineering (first year 22.2%) and Mechanical Engineering (first year 10.3% and second year 10.7%). The Engineering Studies Committee had reported on its consideration of this matter earlier in the meeting.

(3) That Registry staff were considering ways of improving further the presentation of these data.

**1630 Representations Concerning Decisions of Boards of Examiners 2010-2011**

Considered: (1) A report by the Academic Registrar outlining the representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners dealt with in 2010-11 (**Paper Senate/2011/82**).

(2) That under the *Procedure for Consideration of Representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners*, the College would consider representations made on the grounds of administrative error, where there was concern that the examination might not have been conducted in accordance with the relevant Regulations or where there was new evidence of circumstances which might have adversely affected a candidate's performance which had not been available to the Board of Examiners at the time it made its decision. For the purposes of this report, arithmetical mark checks (concerning possible administrative error), which were carried out by Examination Officers in each Department, were separated from full representations which were considered by the Board of Examiners.

(3) That representations from candidates for research degree examinations were not covered in the report. These were reported on an ad hoc basis to Senate.

Further Reported: That there appeared to be an error in the data provided in section 1 of the report. This would be investigated and a revised report issued as an attachment to these Minutes.

**1631 Scholarships Panel Report**

Considered: A Report from the Scholarships Panel (**Paper Senate/2011/83**).

Reported: (1) That as part of a series of measures to improve the provision of scholarships, the Management Board had agreed in November 2011 to establish a Scholarships Panel to maintain oversight over scholarships strategy, organisation and governance. Chaired by the College Secretary, the first meeting had taken place on 29

March 2012. The main objective of the meeting had been to confirm the principles and procedures for allocating the 2012-13 Rector's Scholarships, which were currently the focus of the College's regular giving fundraising activities.

(2) That in relation to the Rector's Scholarships, the Panel had agreed an income policy to ensure that the financial commitments made to students could be honoured in future years and a set of allocation principles (i.e. making awards primarily merit based, and not allocating on the basis of protected criteria or fee status).

(3) That following a record year of College regular giving fundraising, it had been agreed to allocate £980,000 for Rector's Scholarships in 2012-13 to be spent across all categories of student (undergraduate, Master's and PhD), taking the total number of scholarships awarded from 85 to 117.

(4) That the Panel had proposed that the Fees, Financial Aid and Access Working Group should examine the interface between undergraduate scholarships and the College's financial aid package. In addition, further work would be required to ensure appropriate selection procedures for 2012-13 and future years, as well as to evolve the future messaging to donors, in line with Panel decisions.

#### **1632 Prizes and Medals Established/Amended**

Considered: Recommendations concerning new prizes, as detailed in **Paper Senate/2011/84**.

Approved: The establishment of the Kenneth Camm Prize; the MSc Finance and MSc Risk Management and Financial Engineering Best Project Prize; and the Routledge Education Prize.

#### **1633 DSc Committee**

Received: A Report by the DSc Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/85**).

Reported: (1) That the DSc had been awarded in April 2012 to Professor Andrew George, Professor of Molecular Immunology in the Department of Medicine and Director of the Graduate School, for his work in the field of Transplant Immunology.

(2) That this was the third Imperial DSc degree to be awarded since regulations for the degree were agreed by Council in July 2009.

#### **1634 Prizes and Medals Awarded**

Reported: The award of scholarships, prizes and medals, as detailed in **Paper Senate/2011/86**.

#### **1635 Staff Matters**

Received: A Note by the Rector (**Paper Senate/2011/87**).

#### **1636 Representations Concerning Decisions of Examiners**

Received: A Note by the Academic Registrar (**Paper Senate/2011/88**).

#### **1637 Appointment of External Examiners 2011-12**

Received: The names and affiliations of External Examiners for undergraduate and Master's level degrees in 2011-12 appointed since the last Senate meeting (**Paper**

**Senate/2011/89).**

**1638 Full-time Equivalent Student Loads**

Received: Statistics of the student load on all academic and academic service units at the College for the current session (**Paper Senate/2011/90**).

**1639 Sessional Fees for Home and Overseas Students**

Received: Details of the tuition fees approved for home and overseas students for the 2012-13 session (**Paper Senate/2010/91**).

**1640 Strategic Education Committee**

Received: The Executive Summary of the meeting of the Strategic Education Committee held on 15 March 2012 (**Paper Senate/2011/92**).

**1641 Award of Degrees and Diplomas**

Reported: That under the provisions of University of London Ordinance 9(2) and Imperial College London Ordinance B1(1), and with the terms of SM 8 of October 1998, that the Academic Registrar had acted on behalf of the Senate in approving the awards for undergraduate and postgraduate degrees for candidates who had satisfied the examiners in the examination and satisfied all other necessary requirements for the award of the degrees, and that degrees had been conferred on these candidates, the date being as indicated on the award.

**REPRESENTATIONS CONCERNING DECISIONS OF BOARDS OF EXAMINERS 2010-2011****Note by the Academic Registrar**

This report outlines the representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners dealt with in 2010-11. Representations from candidates for research degree examinations are not covered in this report.

Under the *Procedure for Consideration of Representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners*, the College will consider representations made on the grounds of administrative error, where there is concern that the examination may not have been conducted in accordance with the relevant Regulations or where there is new evidence of circumstances which might have adversely affected a candidate's performance which was not available to the Board of Examiners at the time it made its decision. For the purposes of this report, arithmetical mark checks (concerning possible administrative error), which are carried out by Examination Officers in each Department, are separated from full representations which are considered by the Board of Examiners.

**1. Arithmetical Mark Check**

Arithmetical mark checks (concerning possible administrative error) are carried out by Examination Officers in each Department, in accordance with the *Procedure for Consideration of Representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners* –

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/policiesandprocedures/complaintsappeals>

Degree Level	Department	Checks requested	Mark(s) amended	Mark(s) unchanged
UG	Aeronautics	4	0	4
	Biochemistry	2	0	2
	Civil Engineering	2	0	2
	Computing	8	1	7
	Electrical Engineering	6	0	6
	Materials	1	0	1
	Mathematics	48	1	47
	Medicine	5	0	5
	Physics	2	0	2
<b>UG Total</b>		<b>78</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>76</b>
PGT	Bioengineering	2	1	1
	Computing	1	0	1
	ICBS	6	0	6
	Medicine	1	0	1
<b>PG Total</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>85</b>

**2. Representations Concerning Decisions of Boards of Examiners**

Representations are submitted to the Registry and are initially considered by senior Registry staff. If it is agreed that there are sufficient grounds for appeal, the appeal is passed to the Chairman of the Board of Examiners for consideration under the *Procedure for Consideration of Representations concerning decisions of Boards of Examiners* –

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/policiesandprocedures/complaintsappeals>



Degree Level	Department	Representations received	Did not proceed to Examiners - No grounds for appeal as determined by senior Registry staff	Forwarded to Examiners	Examiners amended original decision	Examiners confirmed original decision	Appeal to Pro-Rector	Representations Panel established	Appeals upheld by Panel
UG	Aeronautics	5	1	4	3	1			
	Biochemistry	1		1		1	1		
	Biology	1		1		1			
	Bioengineering	1		1	1				
	Biomedical Sciences	1		1		1	1		
	Chemical Engineering	3	1	2		2			
	Chemistry	1		1		1	1		
	Civil Engineering	2	2						
	Computing	7	4	3	2	1			
	Electrical Engineering	1		1	1				
	Materials	2		2	2				
	Mathematics	12	2	10	8	2			
Mechanical Engineering	2		2	1	1				
Medicine	2	2							
Physics	6		6	3	3	2	1	0	
<b>UG Total</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
PG	Bioengineering	3	2	1	0	1			
	Civil Engineering	1		1	0	1	1		
	Business School	17		17	10	7	3	1	0
	Medicine	5	1	4	1	3	2	1	0
	NHLI	1		1	1				
Physics	1		1	1					
<b>PG Total</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>77</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>