

Faculty of Medicine Postgraduate Education Board
12 December 2018, 15.00-17.00
Room 127, Sir Alexander Fleming Building, South Kensington

Confirmed minutes of meeting held on 12 December 2018

Present:

Prof Paul Aylin (PA), Mrs Nikki Boyd (NB), Ms Alison Cambrey (AC), Prof Dan Elson (DE), Mrs Rebekah Fletcher (RF), Ms Danielle Kurtin (DK), Mr Emmanuel Okwelogu (EO), Prof Tony Magee (TM), Dr Michael McGarvey (MM), Dr Sophie Rutschmann (SR) [Chair], Ms Anita Stubbs (AS), Mrs Nousheen Tariq (NT) [Committee Secretary], Dr Jeffrey Vernon (JV),

In attendance:

Dr Paras Anand (PaA), Dr Anne Burke-Gaffney (ABG), Dr Pat Cover (PC) Dr Suzanne Barr (SB), Prof Steve Gentleman (SG), Dr Latha Ramakrishnan (LR), Dr Stefano Sandrone (StS), Dr Mark Sullivan (MS).

Apologies:

Ms Hayley Atkinson (HA), Prof Laki Buluwela (LB), Miss Lisa Carrier (LC), Miss Susan English (SE), Ms Michele Foot (MF), Ms Christine Franey (CF), Prof Nigel Gooderham (NG), Mr Gerry Greyling (GG), Dr Jo Horsburgh (JH), Prof Jeremy Levy (JL), Dr Duncan Rogers (DR), Ms Rebecca Smith (RS), Prof Sue Smith (SS), Ms Men-Yeut Wong (MYW)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence	
REPORTED:	<p>1.1. Apologies were received as above.</p> <p>1.2. The Chair welcomed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New PGT student reps DK [enrolled on MSc Translational Neuroscience], and EO [enrolled on MSc Genes Drugs & Stem Cells – Novel Therapies] • Programme leads in attendance for approval of curriculum review modifications PAn, ABG, PC, SB, SG, StS, MS
2. Paper 55: Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising (24 Oct 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. JV has arranged a meeting with EDU to discuss personal tutor training provision.</p>
3. Paper 56: Curriculum Review Update	
REPORTED:	<p>3.1. LR reported on progress of waves 1 & 2 programmes undergoing Curriculum Review, and the planned timelines for programmes in wave 3</p> <p>3.2. It was noted that all programmes are required to complete Curriculum Review approvals by March 2019</p> <p>3.3. Approval paperwork will be submitted to College reference panels prior to submission at PEB. The purpose is to provide advice on improvements, and paperwork can also be submitted in draft format at this stage. Together with input from EDU and Registry Quality Assurance, this will ensure that our postgraduate proposals are approved without issue.</p>

	3.4. LR thanked programmes for their hard work and encouraged programmes yet to submit their approvals, to ask the FEO Curriculum Review team for support and guidance.
4. Paper 57: Strategic approval of major modifications: MSc Digital Health Leadership	
REPORTED:	4.1. DS explained that this modification would allow current diplomas students wishing to continue to the MSc, to complete their project over one year as opposed to six months. 4.2. SS had reviewed the proposal and full supported this modification. 4.3. The question of funding for the project was raised, and AC stated that although the project is not funded, once registered for the MSc, students would be eligible for postgraduate loans, and their employer could also fund that part of their degree.
AGREED:	4.4. The proposal is approved by PEB ACTION: The programme team should now submit the proposal for College approval to MYW for attention of the Programmes Committee
5. Paper 58: Strategic approval of major modifications: MSc Health Policy	
REPORTED:	5.1. The modification relates to module 4, where the 3000 word essay will be replaced with a 1500 word reflective essay following small group work. This will enable students to pursue more active learning. 5.2. Taking into consideration that the cohort is increasing in size, currently over 70, a shorter essay will enable quicker marking and facilitate good quality feedback. 5.3. There was some discussion about how the group based learning will be delivered and DE clarified that student would be required to submit individual essays. 5.4. This module includes some Team Based Learning, together with formative assessment, however the paperwork is not consistent, and assessment is referred to as summative in parts. 5.5. SR asked that the programme team ensure assessments are adequate for the module size.
AGREED:	5.6. The proposal is approved by PEB, subject to clarification of the points above. ACTION: Programme team to submit updated paperwork to NT, for PEB Chair's action prior to submission to Programmes Committee.
6. Strategic approval of major modifications - Curriculum Review	
REPORTED:	6.1. The PEB chair's summary on Curriculum Review proposals and the full reviews, including comments from College reference panel, were sent to programme teams. The Chair summarised the findings of the reviews including the recommended changes that should be implemented prior to submission to the January and February Programmes Committee. 6.2. The proposals were reviewed by the College Reference Panel, the FEO Curriculum Review Team [Latha Ramakrishnan and Anna-Maria Jones], and Bojan Cvijan from the Registry Quality Assurance team.

	<p>6.3. SR prepared the PEB summaries, which JV reviewed prior to PEB.</p> <p>6.4. Review Design Forms: SR urged programmes to consider completing these forms. Programmes can use these to explain the rationale behind changes and decisions or why a change has not been implemented. This addresses some questions ahead of time, prior to Programmes Committee.</p>
REPORTED:	<p>6a. Paper 59: MRes Translational Neuroscience</p> <p>6.5. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. Some modules have been improved well, however others still need improvements, and previous review recommendations appear to have been ignored. The points are minor but still need addressing.</p> <p>6.6. There was discussion regarding module 4 where the programme team were asked to provide more details on the alignment of the written assessments with the learning outcomes. It was felt that SAQs and essays might not be appropriate to test the proposed ILOs, and that emphasis should be given to authentic assessment. StS clarified that essays were maintained due to the mixed backgrounds of students.</p> <p>6.7. SS had reviewed the proposal and felt the learning outcomes were good but assessments need improvement.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.8. Assessments should be structured 40% written and 60% authentic assessments.</p> <p>6.9. Up to 15 ECTS are permitted at Level 6, however these must be limited to one or two modules and not distributed across all modules.</p> <p>6.10. The programme modifications were approved subject to implementation of recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary.</p> <p>ACTIONS: MRes Translational Neuroscience programme team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes. • Make the recommended changes, as outlined in the PEB summary. For modules 2, 3 and 4, send tracked change documents • Re-submit your proposal to PEB. Send to NT and SR by 17 December. • Submit proposal paperwork for the January Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong and Bojan Cvijan by 19 December.
REPORTED:	<p>6b. Paper 60: MSc Genes Drugs and Stem Cells (Novel Therapies)</p> <p>6.11. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. The programme modification proposal was good quality, at the expected Level 7 and included authentic assessments.</p> <p>6.12. Minor changes were suggested in the summary. The programme specification document needs some tidying, such as rules around progression as well as explaining why there is no diploma exit point.</p> <p>6.13. Modules need clarity on length of the assessments and the implications for prompt feedback and marking.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.14. The programme modification were approved subject to implementation of recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary.</p>

	<p>ACTIONS: MSc Genes Drugs and Stem Cells (Novel Therapies) programme team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Re-submit proposal with tracked change documents to PEB. Send to NT and SR by 17 December. • Submit proposal paperwork for the January Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong and Bojan Cvijan by 19 December.
REPORTED:	<p>6c. Paper 61 - MRes Experimental Neuroscience</p> <p>6.15. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. The proposed programme modifications reflect graduate attributes, provide progression between projects, include authentic assessments, and the supervisors' assessment has now been removed.</p> <p>6.16. Further recommended changes are minor</p> <p>6.17. JV asked how the essay requirement had been changes and SG explained that this had been changed to a grant application and teamwork activity.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.18. The programme modifications were approved subject to implementation of recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary.</p> <p>ACTIONS: MRes Experimental Neuroscience programme team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Re-submit proposal with tracked change documents to PEB. Send to NT and SR by 17 December. • Submit proposal paperwork for the January Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong and Bojan Cvijan by 19 December.
REPORTED:	<p>6d. Paper 62 - MRes Medical Robotics & Image Guided Intervention</p> <p>6.19. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. Reviewers noted improvements had been made, but significant work is still needed such as bringing in Imperial graduate attributes, weave the creative and design elements of the programme into the learning outcomes.</p> <p>6.20. The programme team should review the essay and written exam in conjunction with improved programme learning outcomes.</p> <p>6.21. There was discussing about changing some of the learning outcomes to Level 6.</p> <p>6.22. NB noted that although modules are small the assessments sometimes felt heavy.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.23. Up to 15 ECTS are permitted at Level 6, however these must be limited to one or two modules and not distributed across all modules.</p> <p>6.24. The FEO CR team can meet the team to advise on alternative options to exams. JV is happy to join this meeting.</p> <p>6.25. The programme modifications were not approved, and the programme team were asked to resubmit for the January PEB.</p>

	<p>ACTIONS: MRes Medical Robotics & Image Guided Intervention programme team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before Christmas, meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Make tracked changes and re-submit updated paperwork for the 22 January PEB meeting. Send to NT and SR by 8 January. • Submit finalised proposal for the February Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong by 29 January.
REPORTED:	<p>6e. Paper 63: MSc Molecular Biology & Pathology of Viruses</p> <p>6.26. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. It was suggested that ILOs be better phrased and aligned to Level 7. It was noted that some assessment types were repeated, that formative assessments were innovative and could perhaps be used as summative. The programme should also consider a Certificate exit point.</p> <p>6.27. MM noted that one barrier to implementing improvements was resources, and that diversity in the module leads is needed. He felt there were limitations on how work can currently be carried out and that future iterations of the course will implement additional changes.</p> <p>6.28. SR advised that whichever assessments are chosen, these must demonstrate that the learning outcome has been achieved, and therefore ensuring learning outcomes align to assessment was important.</p> <p>6.29. SR advised that the programme team use the redesign form to provide further explanation and rational. It would be best to meet with the FEO CR team as they can share improvements that other programmes have made which would work for this programme too. The team will ensure that a strong case is made for keeping some of the assessments.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.30. The programme modifications were not approved, and the programme team were asked to resubmit for the January PEB.</p> <p>ACTIONS: MSc Molecular Biology & Pathology of Viruses programme team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before Christmas, meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Make tracked changes and re-submit updated paperwork for the 22 January PEB meeting. Send to NT and SR by 8 January. • Submit finalised proposal for the February Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong by 29 January.
REPORTED:	<p>6f. Paper 64: MSc Molecular Medicine</p> <p>6.31. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. It was noted that the programme is mainly pitched at Level 7, the structure is simple but interesting and the learning outcomes are challenging.</p> <p>6.32. The content of the redesign form and documents do not match, and will need correcting, and there are redundancies between learning outcomes and assessments.</p> <p>6.33. An explanation of why this programme is not an MRes, would be needed.</p>

	<p>6.34. The reviewers have made good suggestions, however recommended changes are minor.</p> <p>6.35. The programme is asked to consider a Certificate exit point. It was noted that space was a barrier, however this could be offered as an honourable exit for students not able to continue with the full MSc.</p> <p>6.36. PAn noted that the programme will consider changing to an MRes but not at present. SR observed that strategically this may be dis-advantageous as the programme would become very similar to the MRes Biomedical Research.</p> <p>6.37. SS asked the programme to change the description of modules from 'compulsory' to 'core', otherwise it will become compensatable.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.38. The programme modifications were approved subject to implementation of recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary.</p> <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Re-submit proposal with tracked change documents to PEB. Send to NT and SR by 17 December. • Submit proposal paperwork for the January Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong and Bojan Cvijan by 19 December.
REPORTED:	<p>6g. Paper 65: MSc Reproductive and Developmental Biology</p> <p>6.39. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. It was noted that the modules were good quality but significant changes are needed.</p> <p>6.40. Ensure LOs are level 7, and rather than provide descriptions, ensure these describe skills and knowledge.</p> <p>6.41. A variety of assessments should be included, and the number of assessments needs to reduce, both for summative and formative assessments.</p> <p>6.42. All the learning outcomes do not need a summative assessment, these can be formative, however the purpose of formative assessments should be clear.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.43. The programme modifications were not approved, and the programme team were asked to resubmit for the January PEB.</p> <p>ACTIONS: MSc Reproductive and Developmental Biology programme team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before Christmas, meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Make tracked changes and re-submit updated paperwork for the 22 January PEB meeting. Send to NT and SR by 8 January. • Submit finalised proposal for the February Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong by 29 January.
REPORTED:	<p>6h. Paper 66: MRes Clinical Research</p> <p>6.44. SR presented the PEB summary and recommendations following review of the proposal paperwork. It was noted that the description of programme had significantly improved and that a Certificate exit point had been introduced.</p>

	<p>6.45. Some reviewers, including the College Reference Panel noted that some modules were not Level 7.</p> <p>6.46. The programme will consider volume of marking, and it was noted that most assessments are in-course assessments.</p>
AGREED:	<p>6.47. The programme modifications were not approved, and the programme team were asked to resubmit for the January PEB.</p> <p>ACTIONS: MRes Clinical Research programme team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before Christmas, meet with Latha Ramakrishnan or Anna Maria-Jones from the CR team for guidance and support in making the recommended changes as outlined in the PEB summary. • Make tracked changes and re-submit updated paperwork for the 22 January PEB meeting. Send to NT and SR by 8 January. • Submit finalised proposal for the February Programmes Committee to Men-Yeut Wong by 29 January.
7. Standing item: Good, Bad and Coming up	
	<p>7.1. SR noted that it has come to her attention via a recent student appeal on her programme that Panopto recordings are permitted as evidence. Upon checking, this has since been confirmed by Registry.</p> <p>7.2. MM confirmed that currently there is no policy around recordings or Panopto, however it can be used by College for any purpose, including appeals, complaints, promotions etc.</p> <p>7.3. SS asked the Board to consider this from a student perspective and that by restricting use, we may be perceived as protecting staff who do not provide adequate teaching.</p> <p>7.4. EO asked whether recordings of students should also be considered. Could recordings be used to question their performance. Members of the board felt that the key factor here would be that an exam is run according to the correct procedure and policy.</p> <p>7.5. DK emphasised the important of Panopto recordings for students, and how much they appreciated them.</p> <p>ACTION: SR will circulate a draft letter outlining what is currently permitted, to PEB members for input. DPSs can send the final letter to their programme leads.</p> <p>7.6. The January PEB date has been changed to 22 January, and members would have received an updated Outlook invite from NT.</p> <p>7.7. SR reported that the recent FoM Postgraduate Education Transformation bid was successful and presented some slides to show the broad structure of the team, who are yet to be appointed. It is intended that the short courses will be income generating.</p> <p>ACTION: NT to circulate SR's slides to PEB members.</p>
Items for Information	
RECEIVED:	8. Paper 67 - Review of the 2017-18 PGT and MRes Application Cycle Received by the Board
REPORTED:	9. Paper 68 - 2018 Summer School Report (updated) 9.1. The final costs have been calculated, and the profit from the Summer School was confirmed as £150,000.

	<p>9.2. SR reported that some of the income will be used to develop an online statistics module for students. The remaining income will be used to fund approximately 10 masters programme studentships.</p>
REPORTED:	<p>10. Paper 69 - Standing items report</p> <p>10.1. SR summarised some matters noted in the Standing Items Report:</p> <p>10.2. Master's projects - students had explained that they did not like the project allocation process, and students from the same programme last year were happy with the process.</p> <p>10.3. SR is keen to scope the time and effort spent in getting projects, and will circulate a survey in due course.</p> <p>10.4. MM felt that since there was a finite number of projects available, a top down message from College encouraging academics to provide projects, would be helpful and that this had not been done.</p> <p>10.5. SS suggested that we convey to the new Vice Dean Martin Lupton the need for a strategic overview, as we expand both the BMB and masters programmes, an overarching strategy of how we will find enough projects is vital. The Faculty want all students to have a good experience including BSc intercalated students.</p> <p>10.6. Sr reported that at FEC a vision was discussed, and members asked how we decide what provision we want for postgraduate medicine, and to think about the future workforce we want to help develop. SR explained that she feels postgraduate provision should mainly expand with online provision, and that it was important to maintain quality of campus programmes.</p> <p>10.7. SS reported that the Global Online Masters in Public Health was approved. Four programmes were also approved for the Curriculum Review modifications.</p> <p>10.8. It was noted that due to Undergraduate Curriculum Review, we would lose the SAF computer labs which would be refurbished to flat space.</p>
	<p>11. Department Education Committees - minutes Department of Medicine Education Committee minutes received by the Board</p>
<p>Date for next PEB meeting. Please note the <u>change in date and time below</u>. PEB will take place on a Tuesday and start at 13.00:</p> <p>Tuesday 22 January 2019, 13.00-15.00, Room 127, Sir Alexander Fleming Building South Kensington Campus</p>	