

Confirmed minutes of meeting held on 01 November 2017

Present:

Ms Sophie Aicher (SA), Prof Paul Aylin (PA), Prof Laki Buluwela (LB), Dr Alison Cambrey (AC), Prof Dan Elson (DE), Ms Michele Foot (MF), Mr Gerry Greyling (GG), Ms Jo Horsburgh (JH), Dr Jeremy Levy (JL), Prof Tony Magee (TM), Dr Michael McGarvey (MM), Dr Duncan Rogers (DR), Dr Sophie Rutschmann (SR) [Chair], Mr Anwar Sayed (AS), Ms Hailey Smith (HS), Ms Anita Stubbs (AS), Mrs Nousheen Tariq (NT) [Committee Secretary], Ms Renay Taylor (RT), Ms Eleanor Tucker (ET), Dr Jeffrey Vernon (JV), Ms Men-Yeut Wong (MYW).

In attendance:

Dr Mike Barrett (MB), Ms Heather Hannah (HH), Mr John Crook (JC), Ms Lottie Stables (LS), Mr Craig Walker (CW).

Apologies:

Miss Lisa Carrier (LC), Miss Susan English (SE), Mrs Rebekah Fletcher (RF), Ms Christine Franey (CF), Prof Nigel Gooderham (NG), Prof Sue Smith (SS), Ms Kiu Sum (KS).

1. Welcome and apologies for absence	
REPORTED:	<p>1.1. Apologies were received as above.</p> <p>1.2. HH attended in relation to paper 10, seeking approval of major programme modifications.</p> <p>1.3. CW and JC attended to present paper 08 on the College Exam Timetabling policy.</p> <p>1.4. MB attended to present paper 07 on the Blackboard Migration.</p> <p>1.5. LS attended in relation to paper 11 on the FoM Summer School.</p> <p>1.6. The Chair welcomed TM in his role as PEB representative for the Graduate School.</p>
2. Minutes	
2.1. Paper 06: Minutes of Previous Meeting (13 September 2017)	
CONSIDERED and AGREED:	<p>2.1.1. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved without changes.</p> <p>2.1.2. Point 5 should have been noted as an action – FB to look into lower tuition fees for nurses. An update will be available at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to follow up on point 5 from the Sept meeting.</p>
2.2. Matters Arising	
REPORTED:	<p>2.2.1. MYW confirmed that the penalty for late submission of assessed work, when submitted after 24 hours, is a mark of zero</p>
3. Paper 07 - Blackboard Migration	
REPORTED:	<p>3.1. MB presented the paper on plans to migrate Blackboard and expressed that the dates of the migration will be problematic for some courses, and workarounds are being looked out. Alternative methods for submissions will be presented.</p>

	<p>3.2. He asked that departments who use Blackboard for PGR review forms, move these submission dates by a week. Administrators will be asked to make their students aware.</p> <p>3.3. Any Blackboard submission during migration may need to be resubmitted afterwards. For PGT students, communications are being sent out via as many channels as possible.</p> <p>3.4. ET said this is a big problem for MSc Genomics, and although she is working together with ICT, there is no good solution. The migration dates also affect markers who provide their marking on Blackboard.</p> <p>3.5. MB confirmed that if the migration is not successful, the old Blackboard will remain. The migration is timed specifically for prior to start of the undergraduate term. Any comments for the project board should be sent to MB.</p> <p>3.6. SR asked MB to ensure that she and NT are copied into communication related to the migration, so they may liaise with programme teams, and allow them to consider altering student submission deadlines.</p> <p>ACTION: MB to ensure SR and NT are copied into future correspondence related to the Blackboard migration.</p>
--	---

4. Paper 08 - Examination Timetabling Policy

<p>CONSIDERED:</p>	<p>4.1. JC presented some slides explaining the College Space Sharing project. The three main areas are Academic Timetabling, Exam Timetabling and Room Booking. He also presented paper 08, which included an Interim Examination Timetabling Policy.</p> <p>4.2. Paper 08 outlines the background, progress, and future plans to ensure suitable and good quality space is provided to run examinations.</p> <p>4.3. HS recommended that CW and JC look into and include eExams in the policy.</p> <p>4.4. It was also noted that the policy states under 10c, that academics should leave the venue soon after commencement of exams, when in fact there are many cases where academics need to stay or be available quickly for queries. CW said this may be changed following further consultation. MM felt options should be provided rather than have a blanket statement, which is not helpful.</p> <p>4.5. SR suggested making the policy clearer by defining a minimum time period between exams on the same day. She also asked that the policy includes special conditions such as students requiring extra time or separate rooms, and care is taken to ensure special set up is not at a different site to a student's next exam on the same day. Neither of these are in the policy at the moment.</p> <p>4.6. Other factors not currently part of the policy were discussed, such as multi-user rooms, room set up for exams, and lack of exam desks on some sites, especially at South Kensington.</p> <p>4.7. JC reported that an updated paper will be available for further consultation, and slides presented today will be circulated.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to obtain and circulate slides</p>
--------------------	--

5. Paper 09 - Strategic approval of major modifications: MSc Genomic Medicine	
CONSIDERED and AGREED:	<p>5.1. DR and ET presented the proposal to remove the viva and reduce the length of the project. This is a part time programme and current students have been consulted.</p> <p>5.2. MM had reviewed the proposal on behalf of PEB, and was in favour of the changes.</p> <p>5.3. SR felt that 20% for the peer assessment was a little high, and that some quality control on peer assessment should be introduced, such as strong marking criteria. JH also asked that if students were choosing their own questions, what would be the level of quality of these questions?</p> <p>5.4. MM noted that the supervisor mark contributes to the final mark, and that perhaps this was not permitted. DE noted that both Dept of Bioengineering and Dept of Surgery and Cancer count the supervisor marks towards the final mark.</p> <p>5.5. JV had also reviewed this proposal and asked why the viva has been dropped as opposed to the poster presentation. SR suggested, that if the HEE funding is approved, this can be considered in order to give variety in assessment.</p> <p>5.6. The proposal was granted strategic approval subject to the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on quality assurance of the peer assessment. • Confirmation that collaborators are happy with changes. • Re-consider the inclusion of a supervisor mark towards summative assessment, and if retained, ensure good quality assurance. <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ET to arrange for the above changes to be made, and send NT a tracked change version of the proposal, for forwarding to PEB reviewers. • NT to confirm modifications approval from the Dean's Management Group. • ET to arrange for updated proposal to be submitted to Programmes Committee for College approval. • MYW to check regarding supervisor mark contributing to the final mark, and report back to PEB.
6. Paper 10 - Strategic approval of major modifications: MSc Paediatrics and Child Health	
CONSIDERED and AGREED:	<p>6.1. HH and AS presented the modifications proposal.</p> <p>6.2. This programme has been cancelled due to poor recruitment. The programme is being improved and will be modular with all modules offering 7.5 ECTS. Year one will cover general principles, with year two offering specialist modules. These specialist modules will also be offered as short courses. Staff and external examiners have been consulted on the changes.</p> <p>6.3. DR and JV had reviewed the proposal. DR observed that this was a good programme that had been running since 2011 and the proposal outlined changing the timings of the modules in the hope this would increase student numbers.</p>

	<p>6.4. HH reported that the maximum number of students in the past has been 16 students registered for the certificate. However the average number has been 8. She explained that the main competitors are Kings and UCL, but the advantage with the Imperial programme is the part-time option. Changing some of the modules to optional is hoped to make the programme more attractive. Current applicants are being consulted.</p> <p>6.5. DR however felt that it was unclear how the changes would increase applications. JV had looked at the UCL and Kings competitor programmes and felt the Imperial website layout and interface was not as strong, to the extent that it could discourage applicants. UCL content was more attractive and easier to find, and the module titles were more relevant and appealing to the target audience. If the Imperial programme includes the same modules, perhaps consideration should be given to changing the module names, or make an attempt to highlight these areas. An attractive addition could be International child health and genetics in children.</p> <p>6.6. AS confirmed that the academic lead is planning on making improvements of this kind, but at present they need an interim offering to be approved, in order to update the programme webpage.</p> <p>6.7. JV asked for the programme team to review the allotted ECTS and ensure content and assessment is updated accordingly. AS confirmed that all lecturers are reviewing their learning outcomes, and will align assessment accordingly. JV will email his comments to HH and AS.</p> <p>6.8. SR pointed out that since the programme offers 8 elective modules, in the scenario that 16 students were enrolled and each module attracted 2 students, it would not be feasible to run every module. SR felt it was important to manage student expectations in this regard, and make it clear what the minimum number of students is in order to run an elective module.</p> <p>6.9. JH asked that 10-12 over-arching learning objectives are identified. This will help with some of the recommendations from DR and JV.</p> <p>The proposal was granted strategic approval subject to the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight the range and authenticity of assessment in proposal • Ensure the ECTS load is reflected in assessment • Reduce (no more than 10-12) and improve the programme level learning outcomes • Review the new core module suitability for certificate (year 1) students <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AS to arrange for the above changes to be made, and send NT a tracked change version of the proposal, for forwarding to PEB reviewers. • NT to confirm modifications approval from the Dean's Management Group. • AS to arrange for updated proposal to be submitted to Programmes Committee for College approval.
<p>7. Paper 11 - Revolutions in Biomedicine Summer School 2017 and 2018</p>	
<p>REPORTED and AGREED:</p>	<p>7.1. RT summarised paper 11 on the FoM Summer School, which provided a steady income, this year being £100,000, which will be used to fund the Dean's Masters Scholarships and the Dean's Prizes.</p>

	<p>7.2. Feedback from students on the summer school has been positive. Marketing initiatives include an early bird discount, block booking discounts as well as summer school scholarships.</p> <p>7.3. There was discussion about difficulties in securing department input for delivering the summer school teaching. The paper includes a proposal for proportional Masters scholarships, dictated by level of department involvement in the summer school teaching.</p> <p>7.4. Discussion included the proposal to use more GTAs for the teaching, that clarification was needed that all research themes are sought, and the need to make the weighting of the teaching clearer for departments.</p> <p>7.5. RT suggested blocking off specific days for each department, to which all department reps agreed. DE felt that allocating fixed days would be helpful. Departments would also be asked to help identify keynote speakers.</p> <p>7.6. AC asked that the proposal is sent to PEB department reps, and a week is allowed for consultation and comments.</p> <p>ACTION: JV to arrange for the whole structure and proposal for the summer school to be sent to PEB PGT administrator and academic reps for consultation.</p>
<p>8. Paper 12 - Graduate Training Assistants in FoM</p>	
	<p>8.1. LB reported that the GTA workshops ran specifically for FoM students, delivered by the Graduate School. 50 students were trained at two parallel workshops on 16 October.</p> <p>8.2. Once trained, students are currently directed to the Graduate School website for teaching opportunities. However a FoM website is needed, and departments are asked to send contact names for the website. These individuals will be responsible for informing the Graduate School about teaching opportunities, and responding to queries from GTAs.</p> <p>ACTION: Education Managers to send department contact names to NT, for the FoM GTA website.</p>
<p>9. Paper 13 - Hepatitis B vaccination: update</p>	
	<p>9.1. AS presented paper 13 regarding a global shortage of the Hepatitis B vaccine.</p> <p>9.2. SR had spoken to Claire O'Brien in Occupational Health, and suggested that labs should focus on best practice, rather than vaccinate all students and staff. She suggested that the following guidelines be sent to programme organisers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inform all potential supervisors of the vaccine shortage. 2. When project calls are sent out, ask supervisors to identify if students will be working on human samples, or in a lab with human samples. They should also indicate if samples are high risk (see High risk work section in the email from Occupational Health below) 3. The project description should highlight the kinds of samples, and allow students to make an informed choice. 4. Lab managers should be informed and inductions revised accordingly:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lab inductions to specify that students should not help other students who are working on high risk samples, if they have not been vaccinated. b. Lab inductions to specify that vaccines have been reserved for post-exposure emergencies. Supervisors and students should be advised to report accidents immediately. <p>5. Advise all supervisors and students to inform the programme should the project change, and to be aware of potential new exposure to human samples that may be high risk.</p> <p>9.3. JL highlighted how the vaccine shortage was a major issue in clinical settings too.</p> <p>9.4. MYW asked that student handbooks are amended, and the current shortage is mentioned.</p> <p>ACTION: SR to email guidance to all programme organisers</p>
10. To Raise:	
10.1. New College Policies	
REPORTED:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. MYW reported that the deadline for major modifications of 31 March had been approved by Programmes Committee for this year only. Modifications can be implemented in October 2018 as long as all applicants have been consulted with. b. From next year, QAEC approval in March would be the deadline for major modifications.
10.2. PG Research Update	
DISCUSSED:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. LB reported that the 'How to be a Strong Applicant' event will run on 8 November. This is a panel discussion providing advice and tips on applications and interviews, which was very popular last year. PEB members were asked to encourage students to register. b. 'Everything you need to know about applying for a fellowship' will run again in May 2018, led by Head of the PostDoc Centre Dr Liz Elvidge. This is aimed at late stage PhD students. c. 5 x Dean's EPSRC PhD Studentships will be made available again. Students will commence in October 2018. These will be discussed at the Doctoral Degrees Forum (DDF) in early December. d. Any comments on the above, should be sent to department Directors of PGR Studies for discussion at DDF.
10.3. College Meetings and Committees - update from members on recent meetings:	
REPORTED:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. FEC & VPage: SR reported that FEC has not yet met, and OLIG was cancelled. b. Programmes Committee: In SS's absence, MYW reported that the PG Dip MSc Digital Healthcare Leadership was approved subject to approval from the Provost Board for the collaboration with Edinburgh University.

	<p>c. FoM SSLC: JV confirmed that with the majority of the masters student reps now in place, a meeting was due to take place at the end of the term.</p> <p>d. Curriculum Review: A curriculum review has been requested by Simone Buitendijk for all programmes. Content, learning outcomes and assessments are to be reviewed and improved. Improvements should support active learning. For example, consideration should be given to whether content aligns with learning outcomes, whether assessments are authentic. There is no schedule as yet, but once the Teaching Fellows are appointed, a timeline will be decided with departments. For programmes who have already modularised or improved, there may not be any further paperwork to be completed for the curriculum review in terms of modifications. The deadline for change approvals will be March 2018, however more time can be given for programmes that need more time.</p> <p>e. Student Recruitment & Monitoring Group – GG reported that the previous meeting was cancelled.</p> <p>f. Departments PG Education Committees – no highlights to report.</p>
<p>10.4. Good stuff!</p>	
<p>REPORTED and AGREED:</p>	<p>a. SR asked whether recruitment application numbers should be considered at PEB to help keep on track towards forecasts. These can be included in PEB papers as monthly reports for each programme and department, with offers broken down and to include graphs and additional information such as deposits paid. Department reps were happy with this suggestion.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to arrange inclusion of application number reports in future PEB meetings.</p> <p>b. JL reported for the Clinical Academic Training Office (CATO) - 18 medical pre-doctoral fellowships have been awarded, research themes are cross departmental in areas such as Dementia, Omics and Acute illness. CATO has won 6 new lectureships across the same research themes. Advert as just opened for clinical PhD programmes, 6 in the Wellcome programme, 2 with Lee Family Scholarships. Furthermore, for non-medical programmes (not for doctors), 4 x PhDs, 3 x lectureships have been shortlisted.</p>
<p>10.5. Risks and Problems</p>	
<p>REPORTED:</p>	<p>a. AC queried the procedure for confirming a John Hopkins as collaborator on the MSc Patient Safety programme for Feb 2018. MYW can provide guidance.</p> <p>b. MSc Genomic Medicine, if successful in the latest bid, will require more modifications, aiming for December Programmes Committee for College approval. SR agreed to take Chair's action for PEB approval, if needed.</p>
<p>11. Any other business</p>	
<p>REPORTED:</p>	<p>a. DE asked about students not registering, sometimes so late that their registration cannot be back-dated by the Registry Department. This is mainly for PhD students with clinical supervisors. NHLI has this</p>

	<p>problem too. JL said he will work on this and try to improve via inductions.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to add late registering PhD students to the next Doctoral Degrees Forum agenda, and invite JL to this meeting.</p> <p>b. SR mentioned a possible additional PEB meeting in December/January. The updated application fees paper will be circulated and discussed.</p>
REPORTED:	<p>c. Next two Programmes Committee dates are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 Dec 2017 – paper deadline 28 Nov • 27 Mar 2018 – paper deadline 06 Mar
<p>Date for next meeting: Wednesday 07 February 2018, 15.00-17.00 (Room 119, SAF, SK Campus)</p>	