

**GRADUATE SCHOOL**  
**MASTER'S QUALITY COMMITTEE**  
**(BUSINESS, ENGINEERING & PHYSICAL SCIENCES)**  
The minutes of the Graduate School Master's Quality Committee  
(Business, Engineering & Physical Sciences)  
held on  
Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2013

---

**Present:**

Dr David McPhail, Graduate School Deputy Director & Department of Materials (Chair)  
Dr Tim Albrecht, Department of Chemistry  
Dr Simon Archer, College Tutor  
Professor Lesley Cohen, Department of Physics  
Dr John Gibbons, Department of Mathematics  
Professor Andrew Holmes, Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering  
Mr Doug Hunt, ICU Deputy President (Education)  
Dr Pat Leever, Department of Mechanical Engineering  
Professor Kang Li, Department of Chemical Engineering  
Mr Nicholas Ng, Student Representative for Engineering  
Mr Simon Schillebeeckx, Student Representative for the Business School  
Dr Fariba Sadri, Department of Computing  
Professor Richard Thompson, College Consul for Natural Sciences  
Dr Nick Voulvoulis, Centre for Environmental Policy  
Mr Nigel Wheatley, Academic Registrar

**In attendance:**

Dr James Wilton-Ely, Dr George Britovsek & Mr Paul Dingwall, Department of Chemistry (for item 4.1)  
Professor James Sefton, Business School (for item 4.2 and 7.1)  
Ms Sophie White, Senior Assistant Registrar (Secretary)

**Apologies:**

Professor Sergei Chernyshenko, Department of Aeronautics  
Dr Rob Dickinson, Department of Bioengineering  
Ms Maryam Habibzay, GSA President  
Professor Debra Humphris, Pro Rector (Education)  
Professor Andrew George, Director Graduate School  
Professor Bassam Izzuddin, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering  
Professor Richard Jardine, College Consul for Engineering & the Business School  
Professor Howard Johnson, Department of Earth Science & Engineering  
Dr Marco Mongiello, Business School  
Mr Ross Webster, Student Representative for Physical Sciences  
Professor Denis Wright, Director of Student Affairs

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome and Apologies

Dr David McPhail welcomed members to the meeting, and apologies, as listed above, were noted.

### 2. Committee Minutes

#### 2.1 Master's Quality Committee (Business, Engineering & Physical Sciences)

Paper A

The minutes from the Master's Quality Committee (Business, Engineering & Physical Sciences) held on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013 were approved.

### 3. Matters arising from the minutes

Matters arising not appearing elsewhere on the agenda were discussed.

3.1 Further to minute 3.2 regarding the production of central guidelines for the use of peer assessment, it was reported that Professor Andrew George intended to put a paper on this to the Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee in due course.

3.2 Further to minute 3.3 regarding the review of the definition of second marking, it was confirmed that Mr Nigel Wheatley, Dr David McPhail and Professor Andrew George would be meeting to discuss this on the 10<sup>th</sup> June and would provide a revised definition at the next meeting.

3.3 Further to minute 4.18, following Chair's Action, it was reported that Senate had now approved the MRes in Medical Device Design and Entrepreneurship with effect from October 2013.

3.4 Further to minute 7.3.1, it was reported that a case study on improving application numbers would be available at the next meeting.

3.5 Further to minute 7.2.3 concerning the course review of the MA/MSc in Industrial Design Engineering, Dr McPhail confirmed he was following up the points raised with the Course Director, Professor Peter Childs.

3.6 Further to minute 8.12, it was noted that the Business School were in the process of discussing the use of free choice for examination questions and they would make a response to the Master's Quality Committee in due course.

### 4. New Course Proposal

#### 4.1 MRes in Catalysis: Chemistry & Engineering

Paper B

The Committee considered a proposal from Department of Chemistry for a new MRes in Catalysis: Chemistry & Engineering to be introduced from October 2013.

4.1.1 Dr James Wilton-Ely, Dr George Britovsek and Mr Paul Dingwall presented the proposal and explained that catalysis underpinned a huge range of modern chemical transformations. It was embraced as a "green technology" as it can limit waste and improve selectivity as well as provide re-use of the catalytic agent itself. Given the widespread use of catalysts in large scale processes the interface between chemistry and engineering becomes critical. The EPSRC had recently identified catalysis as a "growth area" and had included the area in a recent call for new CDT programmes.

Imperial was a partner in the new £10M Catalysis Hub based at Harwell and both the Chemistry and Chemical Engineering departments have submitted a joint CDT bid in Catalysis in collaboration with Oxford Chemistry and UCL Chemical Engineering. The presence of the MRes course would strengthen the bid considerably and the MRes could form the basis of the first year of a 1+3 CDT programme.

**4.1.2** It was noted that the proposed MRes course aimed to provide students with a sound understanding of the many facets of catalysis, including the engineering aspect. Students on the course would be challenged to develop their own ideas on how to focus academic and industrial research to meet the pressing challenges in catalysis. It was envisioned that the graduates of the programme would go both directly into industry and into PhD programmes.

**4.1.3** It was noted that the MRes would be a 12-month full-time programme and would include both taught and research project elements. There would be a 9-month multidisciplinary research project, taught courses in the major fields of catalysis (from both chemistry and engineering perspectives), critical appraisal of research papers in Journal Clubs, specialised lecturers in transferable skills, research seminars and group discussion sessions.

**4.1.4** The Committee approved the course and agreed to recommend it for Senate approval with effect from October 2013.

**4.2 Two new courses from the Business School - MSc in Finance & Accounting and the MSc in Investment & Wealth Management**

**Paper C  
& Paper D  
& Paper Di**

The Committee considered a proposal from the Business School to introduce two new courses with effect from September 2014.

**4.2.1** Professor James Sefton presented the proposal and it was explained that the Business School wished to revise their existing MSc in Finance to make it more technical, appealing to more research based students as well as in order to help improve their placement in the rankings of Finance programmes. The two proposed programmes would be based on the MSc in Finance model with students sharing a common first term and some modules. However, the proposed courses would be more market orientated. The Business School hoped the changes would ensure the sustainability of the Business School's income and profit from the Finance programmes; widen their current application pool; improve the student experience and diversify their programme offering which would be likely to lead to further growth.

**4.2.2** It was noted that the aim of the MSc in Finance & Accounting was to provide a balance of professional, quantitative and analytic skills which would enable students to choose from a wide variety of careers in the financial sector as well as accountancy and management consultancy.

**4.2.3** It was noted that the aim of the MSc in Investment and Wealth Management was to provide a thorough grounding in quantitative finance with an understanding of, and skills set for, the application of financial theory in practice. The programme was intended to equip students for work in Asset Management, Hedge Funds, Wealth Management, Investment Banks, Sovereign Wealth Funds and Investment Advisory roles.

**4.2.4** Professor Sefton further explained that both courses would be a good strategic fit with the Business School and would build directly on their reputation for providing world class Master's programmes in finance.

**4.2.5** It was noted that the programmes would be 12-month full-time programmes which would start in September at the same time as the existing MSc in Finance. The programmes would consist of a mixture of compulsory and optional modules plus either an applied financial report or research project. Students would be given the opportunity to take in-year re-sits in line with the Business School's existing MSc in Finance.

**4.2.6** The Committee welcomed the programmes but had the following few concerns and recommendations which they wanted to see addressed before the programmes could be recommended for Senate approval:

- **Resources**

The Committee requested further clarification on what additional staffing would be made available to support the course. In particular, they wanted confirmation that PhD students would not be asked to deliver lecture courses. The Committee also wanted to know the type and how much teaching activity would be carried out by GTAs and whether the Business School had any guidelines on the use of GTAs, in particular whether there was a maximum number of hours per week allowed. The Committee were also concerned that it was proposed to have one Course Director for all the finance programmes. They were concerned that this individual may be too stretched and wanted reassurances as to how this aspect of course management would be handled.

- **Personal Tutors**

The Committee were concerned about the pastoral and welfare mechanisms in place for students and asked for clarification of these arrangements. It was felt that the two senior tutors in the Business School were already overstretched. It was further agreed that this may be an issue for all Master's students in the Business School and it was agreed that Dr McPhail would raise this with the new Dean for the Business School in due course.

**Action: DSM**

- **On-line Tests**

The Committee asked for clarification why, out of the three on-line tests mentioned in the proposal, only one had several re-sit opportunities. The Committee further recommended that these tests should perhaps form part of the formative rather than the summative assessment of the course.

Subject to the above concerns being satisfactorily addressed, it was agreed that Chair's Action could be taken to approve the programmes and the courses would be recommended for Senate approval with effect from September 2014.

#### **Post Meeting Note**

Following the meeting the Business School made the following response:

**Resources:** *"We do not routinely use PhD students to deliver lecture courses, this was*

*a one-off. This situation arose because of the planned lecturer letting us down at the last minute and subsequent difficulty finding a last minute replacement. The (3rd year) PhD student did extremely well and received great feedback from the MSc RMFE students and a Lecturer Evaluation score of 4.2. The PhD student was not involved in the setting or first marking of the assessment of this course. This was undertaken by a member of faculty.*

*All the core courses on our Finance MSc programmes are taught by a mixture of lectures and classes. The lectures are delivered by faculty and the classes (tutorials) are delivered by GTAs. The class material is provided by the faculty who are responsible for the overall delivery of a course, its assessment and examination. All our TAs are required to undergo training, which most of them do during their first year of PhD and we do not usually allow PhD students to deliver classes until they are in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year, unless they have prior teaching experience. GTA performance is monitored using the same metrics as for Lecturers (i.e. through end of term Lecturer Evaluations) and feedback is followed up with the GTAs and their supervisors as appropriate, with further training provided where needed. PhD students on a bursary do not teach more than 6 hours a week. Some TAs do teach a higher number of hours in one term but only where they are happy to do so and where their supervisor is in agreement. There are a large number of classes to deliver in the autumn term as this is when core courses are taught, with less required in the spring and few in the summer term. TAs have often told us they like to group the majority of their teaching into one term as they can then focus on their research in subsequent terms while not worrying about finances. The allocation of GTAs to courses is reviewed by the Finance Group's PhD Coordinator who raises concern if a student is taking on too many hours.*

*For the last few years we have had one Programme Director who has looked after both MSc Finance and MSc Risk Management and Financial Engineering (310 students) and this has worked well as the programme structures are the same and the MSc's share a number of elective courses. In the new model, the Programme Director would still be looking after the same number of students in total (310) but they would be split across four MSc programmes instead of two. In honesty we have not finalised details of how the Directorship of the new programmes would be handled but it is very likely that we will either introduce a 2<sup>nd</sup> Programme Director or a Deputy Programme Director to ensure sufficient resource. In either case this would be a member of the permanent faculty of the Finance Group.*

**Personal Tutors:** *Although we are introducing 2 new MSc programmes, total numbers on the Finance MSc's will stay the same in the first instance (we are reducing numbers on MSc Finance) so there would not be any impact on pastoral care. This is considered to be an issue for the Business School rather than an issue relating to the new programmes specifically and is best addressed at faculty level.*

**Online Test:** *We are not clear which tests are being referred to here as we only allow students one re-sit opportunity. Perhaps it would be useful for us to clarify the difference between the pre-course on-line tests (primers) and the tests for term zero. The pre-course on-line tests help us to ensure that all students have in fact completed the pre-MSc on-line courses. This is useful because in the past we have found that students do not take the assessment seriously unless it counts towards their final degree, even if this is just a pass/fail component. We have two compulsory*

*pre-courses. The Accounting primer is assessed by a paper based MCQ test during the first week of October. If students do not pass the test at the first attempt, they have the opportunity to re-sit the test later in the Autumn Term. For the second pre-course, Introduction to Finance, students are required to complete the course review Quizzes at the end of each section by the end of the first week of October. They can repeat these as many times as necessary to learn and understand the material. The term zero (September Term) courses are assessed, by a combination of coursework and tests – these are considered to be foundation courses and are therefore compulsory. Students are allowed one re-sit attempt for the term zero course tests, as they are for all other exams during the year.”*

Chair’s Action was taken and the programmes were recommended for Senate approval with effect from September 2014.

## **5. Follow up from Course Reviews**

### **5.1 MSc in Advanced Materials Science & Engineering 2011-2**

The Committee considered a report on the new MSc in Advanced Materials Sciences & Engineering (Department of Materials) on the results achieved by their first cohort of students (2011-2). **Paper E & Ei**

**5.2** The Committee expressed concern with the unusually high failure rate for the first cohort. It was noted that Imperial undergraduates had fared better and it was felt this may be because the course was better aligned with Imperial undergraduate programmes than with programmes at other institutions. It was agreed that the Course Organiser should be asked to review the content and admissions procedures to guard against similar high failure rates in future. The Committee also asked to see the entry and exit qualification report for 2012-3 in due course.

## **6. Course Modification**

### **6.1 Department of Electrical & Electronic Engineering – assessment of MSc courses** **Paper F**

The Committee received a proposal from the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering to change the assessment method for all their MSc programmes (MSc in Analogue and Digital Integrated Circuit Design, MSc in Communications and Signal Processing and MSc in Control Systems) from 2013-4 and for 2012-3 subject to student consent.

**6.1.1** Professor Andrew Holmes presented the proposal and explained that the Department had found their current system of assessment, where students had to pass each module with at least 50% in order to pass the award, to be too inflexible and that this sometimes resulted in an excessive number of failures. The Committee also heard that some of Department’s students had expressed a wish to pursue more than the eight modules which were currently allowed.

**6.1.2** Professor Holmes explained that the Department were therefore proposing to reduce the likelihood of MSc failures resulting from marginal failure in individual modules to allow students with individual module marks down to 40% to pass the MSc provided their examination aggregate was 50% or more (with effect from 2012-3).

- 6.1.3** Professor Holmes further explained that to address the student request for the option to study additional modules, the Department were proposing to allow students to follow up to nine modules with only the best eight modules marks being counted. This would take effect from 2013-4.
- 6.1.4** The Committee noted that the students had not yet been consulted on the proposed changes for the current academic year and it was agreed that this request would be recommended for Senate approval with effect from 2012-3 subject to student consent.
- 6.1.5** The Committee agreed to recommend the second request regarding the number of modules for Senate approval with effect from 2013-4 if the Department agreed to implement a procedure whereby students would be counselled on their decision to take an additional module. The Department agreed and the Committee agreed to recommend the request for Senate approval.

#### **Post Meeting Note**

The Department confirmed that student consent had been received and the assessment change was recommended for Senate approval with effect from 2012-3.

### **7. Course Suspensions**

#### **7.1 MSc in Data Science & Management**

**Paper G**

The Committee considered a request from the Business School to suspend the MSc in Data Science & Management for one academic year (2013-4).

- 7.1.1** The Committee heard that the Business School would like to suspend the programme for 2013-4 as there had not been sufficient interest in the new programme. The Business School wanted take the opportunity to re-visit the programme design and potentially launch a revised programme that would better fit the market need, in the near future.
- 7.1.2** The Committee agreed to recommend the suspension for one academic year (2013-4) for Senate approval.

### **8. Course Reviews**

#### **8.1 MBA and Executive MBA**

**Paper H**

The Committee considered the course review for the full-time and Executive MBA in the Business School.

- 8.1.1** The courses were reviewed Dr Pat Leever who rated them as "GOOD". Dr Leever cited the use of peer assessment and blended learning via pre-programme modules to ensure students begin the programme with the same level of foundation knowledge and skills, to be instances of good practice.
- 8.1.2** The Committee were pleased to note that the Business School had given a very thorough response to the minor concerns raised by the reviewer.
- 8.1.3** The Committee endorsed the rating of "GOOD" and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years' time.

## 8.2 MSc in International Health Management Paper I

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in International Health Management in the Business School.

**8.2.1** The course was reviewed by Dr David McPhail who rated it as “GOOD”. Dr McPhail described the use of external speakers and visits to hospitals as a good way of contextualising the work and informing career decisions. He also felt the use of electronic media (course media compatible with mobile devices) to be an instance of good practice.

**8.2.2** In terms of peer assessment, the Committee wondered whether it was appropriate to allow postgraduates to mark assignments. It was felt that this would be acceptable for formative but not summative assessments. It was further reported that the College regulations stated that “academic oversight” was required and it was agreed that this phase was open to interpretation and that Dr McPhail should discuss with the Business School what was happening with a view to satisfying the Committee on this point.

**Action: DSM**

**8.2.3** The Committee acknowledged that it was a challenge to ensure assessment feedback to students within two weeks but were pleased to note that this issue was under active consideration by the Business School.

**8.2.4** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

## 8.3 MSc in Quantum Field and Fundamental Forces Paper J

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in Quantum Fields and Fundamental Forces in the Department of Physics.

**8.3.1** Dr McPhail reviewed the course and rated it as “GOOD” and cited the use of a detailed questionnaire on each course and the rapid (2-day) feedback system as instances of good practice.

**8.3.2** It was noted that the course uses a scaling system and in particular, Dr McPhail, expressed a concern about the scale being used in the 40% - 50% banding and it was agreed that this should be explored further with the Department. It was further noted that this was not the only course in the College to use scaling and it may be that further College guidance on the use of scaling was required.

**Action: DSM**

### **Post Meeting Note**

After the meeting it was agreed the course would not use scaling in the 40% to 50% band.

**8.3.3** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

## 8.4 MSc in Advanced Mechanical Engineering Paper K

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in Mechanical Engineering



in the Department of Mechanical Engineering.

**8.4.1** The course was reviewed by Dr John Gibbons who rated it as “GOOD”. Ensuring back up on project supervision and using a VLE to communicate with students were cited as instances of good practice.

**8.4.2** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

**8.5 MSc in Advanced Computational Methods for Aeronautics, Flow Management and Fluid Structure Interaction** **Paper L**

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in Advanced Computational Methods for Aeronautics, Flow Management and Fluid Structure Interaction in the Department of Aeronautics.

**8.5.1** The course was reviewed by Dr McPhail who rated it as “GOOD”. It was a very positive review with the following items listed as good practice:

- Very close engagement with industry via the industrial advisory panel and industry placements and with alumni ensured that the course remained topical and relevant to the needs of employers
- Excellent and easy to navigate website which included use of student and alumni profiles
- The methods used to maintain contact with students on external placements, such as monthly reports and internal supervisor

**8.5.2** The Course Organiser was reminded to ensure feedback to students was provided within two weeks.

**8.5.3** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

**8.6 MSc in Biomedical Engineering** **Paper M**

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in Biomedical Engineering in the Department of Bioengineering.

**8.6.1.** The course was reviewed by Professor Sergei Chernyshenko who rated it as “GOOD”. There were no issues which needed a response from the Course Organiser.

**8.6.2** Professor Chernyshenko described the following as instances of good practice

- The system of MSc personal tutors who both guide students in choice of options and projects and provide pastoral support
- The project presentation by video

**8.6.3** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

**8.7 MSc in Applied Mathematics** **Paper N**

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in Applied Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics.

**8.7.1** The course was reviewed by Professor Kang Li who rated it as “GOOD”. There were

no issues which needed a response from the Course Organiser.

**8.7.2** Professor Li cited the frequent introduction of new modules to keep the course updated as an instance of good practice.

**8.7.3** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

**8.8 MSc in Physics**

**Paper O**

The Committee considered the course review for the MSc in Physics in the Department of Physics.

**8.8.1** The course was reviewed by Professor Howard Johnson who rated it as “GOOD”.

**8.8.2** The Committee noted the following late response from the Course Organiser, Dr Julia Sedgbeer, and agreed it satisfactorily addressed all of the issues raised by the reviewer:

*“ We are pleased to receive these comments.*

*The lack of space in the Physics department is an on-going problem and we don't envisage the provision of a dedicated MSc student room in the near future.*

***Externally based placements:*** *Only a small number of students take external placements (e.g. three this year). This is partly due to the fact that the department's research covers most areas of physics so there is no need to go further afield. Feedback on external project placements is generally from talking to the students and supervisors; we will consider formalising the procedures for feedback on all projects.*

*There are currently no funding sources for this MSc. This is certainly a topic we can revisit within the department and more widely with a view to obtaining funds for project placements, scholarships or prizes. (NPL used to provide some funds for project placements with them).”*

**8.8.3** Professor Johnson described the Department’s booklet “*Good Practice Guidelines for External based placements of post graduate taught (PGT) and post graduate research (PGR) students*” as an exemplar for all projects undertaken in external organisations and recommended it for wider dissemination to other Master’s courses. It was agreed that, if the Department agreed, the booklet should be disseminated to other course organisers.

**Action: SCW**

**8.8.4** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

**8.9 MRes in Chemical Biology of Health & Disease**

**Paper P**

The Committee considered the course review for the MRes in Chemical Biology of Health & Disease in the Department of Chemistry.

**8.9.1** The course was reviewed by Dr Simon Schultz who rated it as “GOOD” and who raised no concerns which needed to be addressed.

- 8.9.2** The Committee noted the following late response from the Course organiser, Dr Rudiger Woscholski:

*“Thank you very much for the course review report, which is very complimentary for the MRes course. Given the positive evaluation, we can only thank the referee for his effort and the recognition of the good work invested into this course over the years”.*

- 8.9.3** Dr Schultz describe the following as instances of good practice:

- The use of dual supervisors with complementary expertise which enabled novel inter-disciplinary research
- Timetabling all formal training elements into the first term which enabled the other terms to be dedicated to focused research achievement

- 8.9.4** The Committee endorsed the rating of “GOOD” and it was agreed the course would next be reviewed in three years’ time.

- 9. External Examiners’ Reports (2011-2)** **Paper Q**  
The Committee considered reports from External Examiners for the 2011-2 session.

**Discussion reported in Appendix 1 [not published with the minutes]**

- 10. External Examiners’ Summary Report 2010-11**  
The Committee noted the postgraduate taught external examiners’ summary report for 2010-11 was now available online at:  
<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/externalexamining>

- 11. Student Exchange Partner Agreements**  
The Committee approved the renewal of the following two student exchange partner agreements:

- 11.1** Lund University, Sweden, with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering (MSc in Control Systems) **Paper R**

- 11.2** University of Padova, Italy with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering (MSc in Control Systems) **Paper S**

- 11.3** It was noted that the student exchange agreement for the MA/MSc in Global Innovation Design Engineering with the Pratt Institute, US was now in place and the agreement with University of Keio, Japan was close to signing. A copy of the Pratt Institute agreement is available on request from the Committee Secretary.

- 12. Terms of Reference and Membership of the Master’s Quality Committee (BEPS) for 2013-4** **Paper T**

The Committee agreed the terms of reference and membership of the Master’s Quality Committee (BEPS) for 2013-4, noting that some job-titles and post-holders would change.

- 13. Postgraduate Taught Application Numbers for 2013-14, 2012-3 and 2011-2**

- 13.1** The Committee noted a comparison of postgraduate applications numbers made for the 2013 entry by 17<sup>th</sup> May 2013 with the same period for the previous three years. It was noted there had been a 3.24% decrease in taught course applications between 2013-4 and 2012-3, however, overall, there had been an increase of 9.39% from the same point in 2011. **Paper U**
- 13.2** The Committee noted the current status postgraduate taught applications made for 2013 entry, showing number of pending applications, rejected/withdrawn applications and number of applications with offers made, broken down by offers accepted, offers declined and offers awaiting a response. **Paper Ui**
- 14. QAA – UK Quality Code for Higher Education**
- 14.1** It was noted that Chapter B4: Enabling Student Development and Achievement of the UK Quality Code had been published – see <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/qualitycode>.
- 14.1.1** It was noted that this Chapter addressed the ways in which higher education providers enable students to develop and achieve their academic, personal and professional potential. The Chapter will be used as a reference point for QAA reviews from January 2014.
- 14.2** It was noted that Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints of the UK Quality Code had been published - see <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/qualitycode>
- 14.2.1** It was noted that this chapter covered effective management of academic appeals and student complaints. The Chapter will be used as a reference point for QAA reviews from August 2014.
- 15. Senate Executive Summary**  
It was noted that the latest executive summaries from Senate were available [here](#).
- 16. QAEC Executive Summary**  
It was noted that the latest executive summaries from QAEC were available [here](#).
- 17. Any Other Business**  
There was no other business.
- 18. Dates of next meetings 2012-3**
- 18.1 Master’s Quality Committee (Business, Engineering & Physical Sciences)**  
Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> July 2013 at 2pm – 5pm, Ballroom Room, 58 Prince’s Gate.
- 18.2** The dates and deadlines for all other Graduate School meetings can be found at: <http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/graduateschool/qualityassurance/graduateschoolcommitteestructure>
- 19. Reserved Areas of Business**
- 19.1 Special Cases**  
The Committee noted the latest special cases report. **Paper V**

**19.1.2** It was reported that the Registry's Admissions Team were still continuing to have problems with special case decisions for taught courses, the main problem being delays once the case has been submitted to the Panel members. The Admissions Team were often getting one decision back but not the second and then had to chase for a response. On some occasions they had had to send the case to a third Panel member in order to receive a decision. Panel members were therefore respectfully asked to consider cases promptly.