

Faculty of Medicine Postgraduate Education Board
05 September 2018, 15.00-17.00
Room SALC 6, Sherfield Building, South Kensington

Confirmed minutes of meeting held on 05 September 2018

Present:

Prof Paul Aylin (PA), Ms Alison Cambrey (AC), Miss Lisa Carrier (LC), Prof Dan Elson (DE), Ms Jo Horsburgh (JH), Prof Tony Magee (TM), Dr Michael McGarvey (MM), Dr Sophie Rutschmann (SR) [Chair], Mr Anwar Sayed (AS), Ms Rebecca Smith (RS), Prof Sue Smith (SS), Ms Eleanor Tucker (ET), Dr Jeffrey Vernon (JV), Ms Men-Yeut Wong (MYW)

In attendance:

Dr Toby Athersuch (TA), Ms Fiona Bibby (FB), Ms Valentina Kskhafa (VK), Mr Nic Leeuwis (NL), Ms Katie Stripe (KS), Mrs Nousheen Tariq (NT) [minutes],

Apologies:

Ms Sophie Aicher (SA), Ms Hayley Atkinson (HA), Dr Nikki Boyd (NB), Prof Laki Buluwela (LB), Miss Susan English (SE), Mrs Rebekah Fletcher (RF), Ms Michele Foot (MF), Ms Christine Franey (CF), Prof Nigel Gooderham (NG), Mr Gerry Greyling (GG), Prof Jeremy Levy (JL), Dr Duncan Rogers (DR), Ms Anita Stubbs (AS), Ms Kiu Sum (KS),

1. Welcome and apologies for absence	
REPORTED:	<p>1.1. Apologies were received as above.</p> <p>1.2. The Chair welcomed RS as a new member of PEB, who will take over from ET as maternity leave Education Manager for NHLI from October.</p> <p>1.3. The Chair welcomed NB as a new member of PEB, who will share EDU representation with JH.</p> <p>1.4. KS attended to present and explain her new role as Curriculum Review eLearning Technologist. Agenda point 7.</p> <p>1.5. NL attended to present Paper 36.</p> <p>1.6. TA attended to present Paper 37.</p> <p>1.7. NT tabled Paper 40.</p> <p>1.8. VK attended to discuss GDPR. Agenda point 3.</p>
2. Paper 34: Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising (01 Aug 2018)	
CONSIDERED and AGREED:	<p>2.1. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved without changes.</p> <p>2.2. All actions have been completed.</p>
3. Paper 35: General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)	
REPORTED:	<p>3.1. Paper 35 has been included for information to board members, and forms part of College guidance on GDPR.</p> <p>3.2. Valentina Kskhafa is the FoM GDPR Project Manager and asked that the Retention Schedule is circulated to board members.</p> <p>3.3. VK has received questions in advance of this meeting:</p> <p>3.4. Exam marks are needed when writing references for previous students. How long is it permitted to keep these? It was advised that the current year plus 6 years is allowed according to the retention schedule, and staff</p>

	<p>should raise anything that is not clear with VK so she may follow up and seek clarification with the archives unit</p> <p>3.5. Keeping emails is recognised as an issue, as we rely on emails for most of our records and information. The College Data Protection Officer (DPO) is in the process of setting an agreement or policy on emails. It will likely be 6-7 years, with the intention that older than that should be stored centrally in a repository, such as SharePoint, with access given only to those who need it. This rule would also apply to documents such as application forms downloaded from eAdmissions and saved to local drives.</p> <p>3.6. It is especially important to store sensitive data centrally and not in emails, such as correspondence related to health issues.</p> <p>3.7. MM asked whether the 6 year limit was a legal requirement or a College policy. VK will respond after checking with the DPO.</p> <p>3.8. Medical education research – VK has discussed this with GG and will attend the October Masters’ Management Liaison Group (MMLG). It would be important to understand the type of data being used, and what we mean when we say ‘anonymised’ data.</p> <p>3.9. VK suggested circulation of the Registry guidance for contacting applicants.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to circulate the Retention Schedule.</p> <p>ACTION: VK to check with the DPO regarding the 6 year retention policy for emails, and advise on whether this is a legal requirement or College Policy.</p>
<p>4. Paper 32: Personal Tutoring</p>	
<p>REPORTED:</p>	<p>4.1. This paper was originally scheduled for the previous PEB and was postponed to this meeting due to lack of time at the August board.</p> <p>4.2. The Graduate School has introduced the requirement of a compulsory academic tutor and separate welfare tutor for every student from October 2018. This needs to be corrected in the leaflet in paper 32, as this guidance became clear after the paper was drafted.</p> <p>4.3. JV has liaised on postgrad tutoring with department Education Managers. He ran through his recommendations for tutoring provision from Oct 2018, outlined in paper 32. An independent welfare tutor not related to the course was felt to be important.</p> <p>4.4. Programmes will need to identify and assign tutors, and ensure they obtain appropriate training provided by the EDU. This is compulsory for personal tutors who joined Imperial after the training became a requirement for new lecturers.</p> <p>4.5. JV offered to provide refresher training for those who have already under taken EDU training, or those needing a refresher. MM noted that the Faculty have a large number of very experienced tutors who have not completed training, and that it was not possible to provide tutors as outlined at such short notice.</p> <p>4.6. It was suggested that departments and programmes should identify a welfare tutor for Oct 2018 start, and ensure they attend the training or refresher, rather than aim for a larger number at this stage. Considering the short turnaround time, perhaps training could be completed by Christmas.</p> <p>4.7. There was discussion about holding EDU training at St Mary’s Hammersmith and South Kensington, and agreed that this could be</p>

	<p>arranged as long as good uptake could be guaranteed to ensure appropriate use of EDU resources. It was noted that the training takes a full day and is usually capped at 24 participants, somewhat dependent on room size.</p> <p>4.8. Shorter and online training provision can be looked into for future, to avoid the commitment of a whole day, and JV has discussed this with Katie Ippolito in the EDU.</p> <p>4.9. It was noted that Faculty Tutors were not aware of this new requirement or that it would be introduced from October, and there was further concern about experienced tutors not knowing whether training is a requirement or not. JV confirmed that the updated leaflet does make this clear.</p> <p>4.10. This paper does not cover PGR tutors, however JV will follow up on this.</p> <p>4.11. TM has not been involved in the Graduate School work on personal tutors, however will speak to Prof Sue Gibson (Head of Graduate School) and Laura Lane (Manager of Graduate School) about the impracticalities, and feedback to JV.</p>
<p>AGREED:</p>	<p>4.12. Recommendations 1 and 2 in paper 32 are approved.</p> <p>4.13. Recommendation 3 suggesting tutors attend inductions is not practical and should be re-worded. Tutors and the tutoring system must either be identified to students at induction or on Blackboard together with tutor photographs.</p> <p>4.14. Recommendation 4 that all current and potential tutors attend training will need further discussion and sufficient training provision is to be organised. Recommendation 4a needs to be re-worded, according to what can be realistically achieved.</p> <p>ACTION: JV to send to EMs and DPSs a list of staff who have completed tutor training</p> <p>ACTION: JV to update the leaflet to include Graduate School's requirement of a compulsory academic tutor and separate welfare tutor for every student from October 2018.</p> <p>ACTION: JV to circulate to PEB the updated Postgrad Student Welfare leaflet</p> <p>ACTION: JV to amend Recommendation 4 of the guidance to introduce flexibility for this year to personal tutor provision.</p> <p>ACTION: JV will arrange a meeting between Faculty Tutors, Graduate School and the EDU on how to enable tutoring provision, including training courses to meet demand.</p>
<p>5. Annual Monitoring Reports and PTES (discussion)</p>	
<p>REPORTED and CONSIDERED:</p>	<p>5.1. In the 2018 PTES, Imperial has ranked bottom and in the last quartile for the area of assessment and feedback.</p> <p>5.2. Following the results of the 2016 PTES, depts drew up action plans, but not all plans were implemented. We need to take this forward, before College are left with no choice but to impose a policy, therefore we need a Faculty response to our PTES results.</p> <p>5.3. It was suggested that each programme have a feedback champion, looking at what is currently in place, what it means, and how to improve it,</p>

	<p>and perhaps also have a department feedback champion that this is reported up to.</p> <p>5.4. The low scores could partly be attributed to changes to assessment and feedback due to modularisation, which is not necessarily a negative cause. The same could be true when changes are implanted following curriculum review.</p> <p>5.5. MM suggested that College do some analysis to establish the reasons as it's a College wide problem, not just FoM. Evidence based changes are likely to be most effective.</p> <p>5.6. JV urged programmes to consider improvements that can be made to the feedback we provide students, and DE reported that Dept of Surgery and Cancer feedback score had improved, however other areas such as identification of student projects had scored low.</p> <p>5.7. SR asked that depts analyse their PTES data.</p> <p>5.8. It was felt that the lower score compared with competitors was apparent, nevertheless we do have a high positive response to our assessment and feedback PTES question.</p> <p>5.9. JV felt that assessment and feedback need to be looked at separately, not just as part of the PTES response.</p> <p>ACTION: JV to issue feedback guidance to include suggestions and models of feedback.</p> <p>ACTION: Departments to produce their PTES action plans. Following this, JV to prepare a Faculty report.</p>
<p>6. Paper 36: 2018 FoM Summer School Report</p>	
<p>REPORTED:</p>	<p>6.1. The Summer School, Revolutions in Biomedicine, was introduced in 2015 and ran with 23 students, with following cohorts increasing to between 50-60, and this year 71 students enrolled.</p> <p>6.2. This short course runs for 4 weeks in July, and the 2018 course received positive feedback on both the academic and social programme.</p> <p>6.3. The course has generated approximately £130,000 net profit, most of which will be used to fund the Dean's Masters' Scholarships. The exact profit will be known, once all costs have been accounted for.</p> <p>6.4. Consideration should be given to part fund the recently announced Commonwealth Shared Scholarships.</p> <p>6.5. For 2019, the same structure is proposed whereby each department will contribute one teaching day (theme) and one keynote speaker, and DoM will additionally run the Mini Research Lab Project.</p> <p>6.6. JV will look at the 2018 feedback, and suggest some themes to pick from, to departments.</p> <p>6.7. If themes can be agreed with departments in time, the intention is to open applications in Nov/Dec</p>
<p>7. Introduction to role of Curriculum Review eLearning Technologist</p>	
<p>REPORTED:</p>	<p>7.1. KS joined the FEO Postgrad Team in June, as the Curriculum Review eLearning Technologist. This is a part time 2 days per week post, supporting all four depts to develop online initiatives resulting from masters' programme level curriculum review. She is gradually meeting all programme teams.</p>

	<p>7.2. KS gave a presentation summarising the number of courses using Blackboard, Panopto and Leganto reading lists.</p> <p>7.3. She will also support set up of Blackboard across all postgrad programmes, and has created a menu of all the terms in Blackboard with an explanation of what it means, and will explore other platforms that can be used to support student learning enhance.</p> <p>7.4. An improved design on Blackboard was demonstrated, and KS is working with department programme teams to implement it from the start of term.</p> <p>7.5. Programmes will have access to KS's time once Curriculum Review of their programme has been completed.</p> <p>7.6. DS was aware that Panopto includes many features which are not necessarily known of, but it was important to remember that staff do not have time to engage with this and other platforms such as Leganto, without support on the ground</p> <p>7.7. SR reported that we will be bidding for funds for an instructional designer, and leaning technologists – programmes completing CR will have access to this team.</p> <p>7.8. Furthermore, additional information can be disseminated, according to needs, and KS will also run workshops at different campuses.</p>
<p>8. Paper 37: Major Modifications: MRes Biomedical Research – suspension of Toxicology Science Stream</p>	
<p>CONSIDERED and AGREED:</p>	<p>8.1. TA presented paper 37. This stream is currently suspended for the 2018 intake</p> <p>8.2. The intention was to encourage industry and charities to provide placements for these students. However, negotiations have been difficult.</p> <p>8.3. Toxicologists at Imperial have either left or moved to part-time contracts.</p> <p>8.4. This stream was piloted with one student from the main stream with an interest in Toxicology, who undertook a project with an industrial partner. This was successful with both the student and for building collaboration.</p> <p>8.5. In order to run for the 2020 intake, TA needs to have commitment in time for the 2019 recruitment cycle, and will speak to collaborators in the meantime.</p> <p>8.6. Previous students interested in the stream were given toxicology projects within College.</p> <p>8.7. MYW confirmed that the maximum duration for a programme to be suspended is three years.</p> <p>8.8. March 2019 is the deadline for this new stream to be reinstated, as this is the College's new programmes and major modifications deadline.</p> <p>8.9. Approval was granted to suspend this stream for a further year, until the 2020 intake.</p> <p>ACTION: TA to submit the suspension request to Men-Yeut Wong for Programmes Committee approval.</p>
<p>9. Paper 38 - Traffic Light Feedback Log</p>	

REPORTED and AGREED:	<p>9.1. NT presented paper 38, explaining that the Traffic Light Feedback log forms a compulsory part of the College's Academic Feedback Policy. However not all programmes had completed the log.</p> <p>9.2. Members felt time would be better spent on efforts to improve the Faculty's Assessment and Feedback PTES score, rather than concentrate on the Traffic Light Feedback log.</p> <p>9.3. Reporting of the log to FEC and QAEC is required, however it was noted that in order to meet the deadline for the first FEC of the academic year, it would not be possible to enter the assessments which take place in September.</p> <p>9.4. MM questioned the purpose of the log. For example, the SOLE survey was originally promoted as a tool for teachers but is now sometimes used within disciplinary discussions.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to submit the log to FEC after removing the marker name columns</p> <p>ACTION: SR to send a covering letter with the log</p>
10. Standing item: Good, Bad and Coming up	
REPORTED:	10.1. No items.
11. Paper 39 - 2018-19 Board Members and Terms & Conditions	
REPORTED and AGREED:	<p>11.1. Member names have been updated</p> <p>11.2. New PGT student reps will join PEB from the Oct/Dec meeting onwards</p> <p>11.3. The terms and conditions now include PEB quality assurance responsibility which is delegated by the Faculty Education Committee (FEC).</p> <p>11.4. The updated terms and conditions were accepted.</p>
<p>Date for next PEB meeting: Wednesday 24 October 2018, 15.00-17.00, Room 127, Sir Alexander Fleming Building, SK Campus</p>	