

Postgraduate Research Quality Committee

25 October 2013

Confirmed Minutes

Present

Dr David McPhail (**Acting Chairman**)
Dr Simon Archer (College Tutor)
Professor Erko Autio (Business School)
Dr Laura Barter [for Dr Tim Albrecht] (Chemistry)
Dr Bernadette Byrne (Graduate School Deputy Director, Professional Skills)
Professor Chris Cheeseman (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
Professor Lesley Cohen (Physics)
Dr Danieli Dini [for Professor Andrew Amis] (Mechanical Engineering)
Professor Sophia Drossopoulou (Computing)
Dr Tim Ebbels [for Professor Michael Seckl] (Surgery and Cancer)
Dr John Gibbons (Mathematics)
Professor Andrew Holmes (Electrical and Electronic Engineering)
Professor Debra Humphris (Vice Provost, Education)
Professor Marjo-Riitta Jarvelin (School of Public Health)
Ms Natalie Kempston (ICU Deputy President, Education)
Professor Peter Lindstedt (College Consul, Engineering & Business School)
Professor Tony Magee (NHLL)
Dr Felicity Mellor (School of Professional Development)
Dr Kevin Murphy (Department of Medicine)
Mr Adam Page (Student Representative, Physics)
Ms Lorna Richardson (Acting Academic Registrar)
Dr Simon Schultz (Bioengineering)
Mr Shijing Si (Student Representative, Mathematics)
Professor Anne Soutar (Institute of Clinical Sciences)
Mr Andreas Thomik (GSU President)
Professor Denis Wright (Director of Student Support)
Professor Xiao Yun Xu (Chemical Engineering)
Professor Robert Zimmerman (Earth Science and Engineering)

In Attendance

Ms Sally Baker (Senior Assistant Registrar, Senate & Academic Review)
Mr Tisham De (PhD student, School of Public Health) – for item 6.2
Mr Jyun Fu (PhD student, Business School) – for item 6.1
Professor Gerard George (Deputy Dean, Research, Business School) – for item 6.1
Ms Caterina Lepore (PhD student, Business School) – for item 6.1
Mr Richard Monk (Assistant Registrar, Senate & Academic Review) – **Secretary**
Ms Erica Pufall (PhD student, School of Public Health) – for item 6.2
Professor Richard Thompson (College Consul, Natural Sciences) – for item 6.1
Professor Helen Ward (School of Public Health) – for item 6.2

Observing

Professor Sue Gibson (Graduate School Director – *from 1 November 2013*)
Mr Calum MacLeod (Management Trainee, Registry)

1. Welcome

The Chair welcomed new members to the meeting: Professor Sophia Drossopoulou, representative for the Department of Computing (replacing Dr Alessandra Russo); Dr Felicity Mellor, representative for the School of Professional Development (replacing Dr Jorge Diaz Cintas); Ms Natalie Kempston, ICU Deputy President, Education; Mr Andreas Thomik, GSU President; Mr Adam Page, Student Representative, Physics, Mr Shijing Si, Student Representative, Mathematics. Mr Calum MacLeod, Management Trainee in the Registry, was welcomed as an observer to the meeting.

The Committee also welcomed Professor Sue Gibson who had recently been appointed as Graduate School Director, succeeding Professor Andrew George. It was noted that Professor Gibson would be assuming the role of Committee Chair from the next meeting in February 2014.

2. Apologies for absence

Professor Ferri Aliabadi (Aeronautics)
Dr Niki Gounaris (Department of Life Sciences)
Ms Boshuo Guo (GSU Deputy President)
Professor Andrew Holmes (Electrical and Electronic Engineering)
Dr Mike Tennant (Centre for Environmental Policy)

3. Terms of Reference and Membership

- 3.1 The Committee received the updated terms of reference and the membership of the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee for the 2013-14 academic session.

PRQC/2013/01

- 3.2 It was noted that both the Strategic Education Committee and Strategic Research Committee had been disbanded and that the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee would now advise the Senate and the Vice Provost Advisory Group (Education) and Vice Provost Advisory Group (Research) on policy and strategy relating to postgraduate research education. It was further noted that the Vice Provost (Research) would no longer be a member of the Committee with effect from 2013-14. Instead, the Graduate School Director would report periodically on the business of the Committee to the Vice Provost Advisory Group (Research).

4. Minutes of the last meeting

- 4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 4 June 2013 were approved.

PRQC/2013/02

5. Matters arising

- 5.1 There were no matters arising not appearing elsewhere on the agenda.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

6. Periodic Reviews of Research Degree Provision

6.1 Review of Research Degree Training in the Business School

- 6.1.1 The Committee considered the periodic review of research degree training in the Business School, including the reports of the assessors, the internal Chairman's completed Reviewer's Comments Form and the Department's response to the assessors' comments.

PRQC/2013/03

- 6.1.2 The review was presented by Professor Richard Thompson, the internal Chair for the review. Professor Gerard George, the Deputy Dean of Faculty and Research, Business School, together with Mr Jyun Fu and Ms Caterina Lepore, the student representatives from the Business School, attended to present their responses to the review.

- 6.1.3 The Committee noted that the reviewers had rated the Business School “compliant” with nine of the eleven precepts, part compliant with one precept and working towards compliance in the other precept. The Committee noted from the Business School’s written response that action had been, or was in the process of being, taken to ensure that the School was fully compliant with all of the precepts and therefore agreed that the Business School was “working towards compliance” overall. The Committee congratulated the Business School on its excellent review and noted that all the points raised by the review panel had been satisfactorily addressed by the School in its response.
- 6.1.4 The review panel had formed a very positive impression of the training that research students receive within the Business School. The panel had found the PhD programme to be a well-run and high quality programme and observed that the Business School had high aspirations for the programme and that it attracted high quality students. The first year of the course structure was considered to be well-organised, especially the finance stream. The programme had good progression and completion rates with excellent career prospects for graduates. The review panel also praised the comprehensive and helpful student handbook. The panel had highlighted all of the above as examples of good practice.
- 6.1.5 In addition, the review panel had observed that most students were very happy with the training received and had praised the Business School for its staff and facilities, as well as the opportunities it offered to its students such as conference attendance, external speakers and teaching experience.
- 6.1.6 The panel had concluded that the Business School was part compliant with Precept 2 (supervisor training). The panel had observed that not all supervisors and Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) had received appropriate training and that this aspect could be improved. The panel also considered it beneficial for the School to set out clear and realistic expectations of supervisors, for the benefit of both staff and students. In addition to the existing training arrangements within the Business School, whereby GTAs were required to complete a one-day workshop prior to teaching and all new teaching staff were required to pass the Business School’s Teaching and Learning Programme, the School had confirmed that a number of additional measures were being implemented to address the panel’s recommendations. These included the development of a Supervisor Handbook, informed by the Educational Development Unit course “Introduction to Supervising PhD Students at Imperial”, and opening the Teaching and Learning Programme to doctoral students who were interested in developing their teaching skills. This training would be followed by a practical assessment in which the GTA would prepare and deliver a class to MSc students whilst being assessed by a member of teaching staff who was associated with the Teaching and Learning Programme.
- 6.1.7 The panel had concluded that the Department was working towards compliance with Precept 11 (staff/student committee). The panel had observed that the Staff-Student Committee (SSC) had not met regularly over the last few years and that some students seemed not to be aware of the existence of the committee and had recommended that these aspects of the programme should be improved. The Business School had taken steps to address the recommendation by further integrating the SSC as an integral part of the doctoral student experience by scheduling regular termly minuted meetings and through setting up an area in Blackboard where contact details of the SSC members, minutes of previous meetings and progress updates on action points and dates of future meetings were posted. In addition, more extensive information about the SSC was provided to students at their induction session where they would also be encouraged to volunteer for the role of student representative for their cohort.
- 6.1.8 The panel had recommended that the role of second supervisor and mentor should be clarified to students and communicated to staff. The panel had observed that there was some confusion about the role of the second supervisor and mentor. The Committee noted that this issue had been identified in other reviews and that similar confusion over the roles of second supervisor and academic mentor had been experienced in other Departments. The Vice Provost (Education) emphasised the importance of a clear understanding of the roles and their responsibilities as part of the research student

experience and the need to communicate them as clearly as possible to students. It was agreed that this matter would be incorporated in the Doctoral Proposition project that was being led by the Vice Provost (Education). The Doctoral Proposition would be presented to the Committee at a future meeting.

ACTION: Vice Provost (Education)

- 6.1.9 During the discussion members were reminded that the Graduate School was currently developing arrangements to further assist Departments with cohort building and support for research students. To aid this initiative, members were invited to provide details of the current cohort building arrangements in their Department to the Graduate School Deputy Director (Professional Skills).
- 6.1.10 The panel had recommended that the management strands of the PhD programme continue to evolve toward a more structured and integrated first year. In response the Business School had reviewed its suite of course offerings, with specific emphasis on improving the management stream, to create an integrated and relevant curriculum for doctoral students, and had made a number of improvements to the curriculum for the 2013-14 academic year which were detailed in its response to the review.
- 6.1.11 The panel had further recommended that the Business School review the content of the first year courses in terms of the balance of qualitative and quantitative research methods and access to niche courses elsewhere. As part of its review of its suite of course offerings the Research Design course had been considerably extended to accommodate more qualitative research. The Systematic Literature Reviews course had also been similarly expanded to accommodate more discussion on qualitative methods. The Business School further planned to introduce an extensive curriculum focusing on both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies via a proposed MRes programme [see 6.1.11 below].
- 6.1.12 The panel had observed that both students and staff considered three years of funding for the Business School PhD to be too short, especially since there was a significant taught component in the first year. The standard length of the PhD programme and the lack of scholarships were considered to be barriers to attracting the very best students. It was noted that the length of the PhD programme reflected the research council policy which required submission within four years. This issue would be addressed in part by the proposal to extend the writing-up period from 6 months to 12 months [see item 12 below]. In addition the recently appointed Dean of the Business School had appointed a task force to propose an MRes programme as a precursor to the Doctoral programme. The intention was to require all new doctoral candidates to take the MRes programme before entering the Doctoral programme, with a 1 + 3 format. Students present at the review and in attendance at the meeting supported the proposed development of an MRes programme as a precursor to the PhD programme.
- 6.1.13 The panel had observed that students were required to achieve a mark of 50% in their first year modules and considered this surprising given the high quality students recruited. The panel suggested that the Business School consider increasing the pass mark above 50%. In response the Business School had agreed to increase the pass mark to 60% for the 2013-14 year to reflect the high standards of the programme.
- 6.1.14 The panel had also observed that the socialisation of the PhD students could be more systematic. This concern was recognised by the Business School as it had also featured in student feedback received via the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey. In its response to the review the Business School had outlined a range of mechanisms through which this issue would be addressed, including through collaboration with the Graduate School.
- 6.1.15 It was noted that the report would be presented to Senate with the recommendation that the Business School be invited to report to the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee on developments since the periodic review in 12 months time.

6.2 Review of Research Degree Training in the School of Public Health

6.2.1 The Committee considered the periodic review of research degree training in the School of Public Health, including the reports of the assessors, the internal Chairman's completed Reviewer's Comments Form and the Department's response to the assessors' comments.

PRQC/2013/04

6.2.2 The review was presented by Dr John Gibbons, the internal review panel member. Apologies were received from the internal Chair of the review, Professor Morris Sloman, who was unable to attend the meeting. Professor Helen Ward, Professor of Public Health, together with Mr Tisham De and Ms Erica Pufall, the student representatives from the School of Public Health, attended to present their responses to the review.

6.2.3 The Committee noted that the reviewers had rated the School of Public Health "compliant" with each of the eleven precepts and "compliant" overall. The Committee was pleased to note that the review panel considered the research degree programme to be very well run and that both students and staff were very enthusiastic about the high academic standards and the achievements. The Committee congratulated the School of Public Health on its excellent review and noted that all points raised by the review panel had been satisfactorily addressed by the School in its response.

6.2.4 The review panel members were unanimous in their praise of the School of Public Health research degree programme and had highlighted a number of examples of good practice. The panel considered the management and monitoring of research students by the School to be excellent. The completion rate within 4 years was very high and the on-time completion of Early Stage Assessment (ESA) and Late Stage Review (LSR) milestone assessments was also considered to be very good. For the LSR, students submit a plan of future work and a written report in the form of published paper. The School had also introduced a 30 minute viva which included an external assessor, in response to feedback from students. The panel considered this to be an example of good practice. In support of the ESA and LSR, individual milestone timetables were sent to both students and supervisors to ensure that they were aware of key dates. The panel considered this to be another example of good practice.

6.2.5 The review panel had been impressed by the effectiveness of the Postgraduate Studies Committee, noting that it met regularly, had good student representation and that it was responsive to student suggestions. The introduction of the LSR viva and the leavers' review form had resulted from student suggestions and subsequent discussion at the committee. The panel highlighted the effectiveness of the committee as an example of good practice.

6.2.6 The panel had also been impressed by the introduction of a leavers' review form which provided completing students with the opportunity to provide feedback on their experience, which could be utilised to enhance provision in the future. The panel considered the leavers' review form to be an example of good practice.

6.2.7 Students present at the review had commented very favourably on the annual symposium. The panel considered this to be an excellent event that provided an opportunity to bring all students and many supervisors together and highlighted it as an example of good practice.

6.2.8 The panel had recommended that the School seek to reorganise its PhD administrative support to ensure that all sites were covered and that there was backup for the current Teaching Administrator. In response the School had established a new portal on Blackboard for PhD information with staff and student queries directed there in the first instance. The School had also conducted a review of its teaching administrative provision and had outlined its future plans to identify designated administrative staff in each of the four Departments within the School who would respond to PhD queries.

- 6.2.9 The panel had observed that the assignment of individual mentors to students had not worked well and recommended that this arrangement be replaced by a small number of senior academics acting as mentors for all students. It was noted that the School would continue with the current mentor scheme in the immediate term but that a new scheme in which students would be able to choose their own mentor would be in place by summer 2014. It was intended that the new Postgraduate Tutor would supervise a group of mentors from each Department.
- 6.2.10 The panel recommended that all students should have transparent access to funds provided by the School for attending events such as conferences and summer schools. It was reported that the School made £1000 per annum available to students who were unfunded, or funded but without any training provision from their sponsor. It was, however, acknowledged that this information had not been widely disseminated. In response the School had now included this information in the Staff and Student Handbook. New PhD students had been informed at induction and existing students via e-mail.
- 6.2.11 The panel recommended that the School consider fixed start times for enrolment of new students (e.g. twice a year) to simplify induction, monitoring and attendance of required courses and to facilitate cohort building. The School had considered introducing enrolment of new students twice a year but had decided against making the change as a number of PhD students were funded by grants which meant that it was a requirement that their studies commence either on a specific date or within a specified timeframe. The School had, however, decided to deliver the training workshops two or three times per year so that new students would not need to wait until the autumn term to attend.
- 6.2.12 The panel did not consider the use of assessors external to the College for assessment of both the initial research proposal and the ESA to be necessary and suggested that the School review this expectation and consider recommending the use of external assessors for the LSR rather than it being compulsory. The School had considered the panel's suggestions but felt that the use of external assessors had worked well since the introduction of the ESA and LSR. PhD students were informed at induction and supervisors during PhD supervisor training meetings. The information was also available within the Staff and Student Handbook.
- 6.2.13 The Committee noted that the review panel had made three recommendations for consideration by the College:
- Students had been very critical of the physical environment and the panel therefore recommended that the School be considered a high priority for re-housing on the Imperial West Campus;
 - The panel recommended that the College make representations to the Imperial NHS Trust to provide students with access to the Hopper bus, which travels between sites. Currently academic staff have access to this but not PhD students;
 - The panel noted that students in the School of Public Health pay fees at the Clinical Medicine rate, although most of the research is not clinical. The panel recommended that the fees be converted to Science rates, to be consistent with other Public Health institutions.
- 6.2.14 The Vice Provost (Education) reported that she was currently taking forward the issue of access to buses in discussion with the Provost. It was further reported that Transport for London (TFL) did not currently provide reductions on travel costs for postgraduate students and that the College may seek to lobby TFL for such reductions to be implemented in the future.
- 6.2.15 It was noted that the report would be presented to Senate with the recommendation that the School of Public Health be invited to report to the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee on developments since the periodic review as part of the next precept review in three years' time.

7. Good Practice Highlighted by Periodic Reviews

- 7.1 The Committee received and noted a report from the Senior Assistant Registrar (Senate and Academic Review) on good practice highlighted by periodic review panels in reviews which were reported to Senate during the 2012-13 academic session.

PRQC/2013/05

8. Department of Computing Doctoral Teaching Scholar Programme [DTS]

- 8.1 The Committee received a progress report on Year 2 [2012-13] of the Doctoral Teaching Scholar programme from Dr Krysia Broda, the Scheme Coordinator. Members were reminded that the scheme had been designed to give PhD students the opportunity to study for a PG Certificate at Imperial and to gain wider teaching experience than is possible through tutorial help. The scheme is funded by the Department and pays fees and maintenance for 4.5 years.

PRQC/2013/06

- 8.2 The Department of Computing representative reported that there were currently four students on the programme. One had started in 2011, two in 2012 and one in 2013. All students appeared to be enjoying the scheme and valued the combination of teaching and research.

9. Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2013

9.1 Imperial College Union response

- 9.1.1 The Committee received and considered the ICU report on the PRES 2013.

PRQC/2013/07

- 9.1.2 The ICU Deputy President (Education) outlined the key matters arising from the ICU response which included: standardising the experience that PhD, DTC and MRes students have when first starting their course; improving mentor provision; better timed marketing of School of Professional Development courses; and providing greater support for extra-curricular activities and networking.

- 9.1.3 The Committee discussed the engagement of research students with the Union and extra-curricular activities. The ICU Deputy President (Education) reported that approximately 20% of PhD students were registered for clubs and societies. The Vice Provost (Education) emphasised the importance of promoting the GSU to research students to increase participation in extra-curricular activities.

- 9.1.4 The Vice Provost (Education) informed the Committee that one of the first projects relating to the Education and Student Strategy 2013-18 involved defining and communicating the College's Doctoral Proposition. The Doctoral Proposition would seek to define the College's 'core' offer to doctoral students.

- 9.1.5 The Committee discussed the issue of uniformity across disciplines in relation to the 9 month ESA. Members were reminded that the College provided a framework and that Departments proposed their own procedures appropriate to their discipline which were approved by the Graduate School. However, the Graduate School Deputy Director suggested that it would be timely to review the ESA and student progression arrangements now that the process had been embedded for a full cohort. The Committee agreed to the proposal to conduct a review and requested that the Graduate School Deputy Director initiate this.

ACTION: Graduate School Deputy Director

9.2 College response

9.2.1 The Committee considered the first draft of the College response to the ICU PRES 2013 report.

PRQC/2013/08

9.2.2 In reference to Recommendation 1 the Director of Student Support informed the Committee that a working group was currently investigating a supervisor-student monitoring system. This would not be confined to undergraduates as, in principle, the system could also be applied to postgraduate research students.

9.2.3 Committee members did not suggest any amendments to the first draft of the College response and it was therefore approved. It was noted that the College response would be considered by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee at its 26 November 2013 meeting.

9.3 Departmental responses

9.3.1 The Committee considered Departmental responses to the PRES 2013 results. It was noted that the outcome of the discussions would be reported to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee at its meeting of 26 November 2013.

PRQC/2013/09

9.3.2 It was noted that the following Departmental responses and action plans were outstanding and it was agreed that these would be requested from the Departments concerned.

- Earth Sciences and Engineering
- Life Sciences
- Centre for Environmental Policy
- Business School

ACTION: Registry

9.3.3 The Committee agreed that the responses received were satisfactory and that Departments should highlight where any changes had been made as a result of their PRES feedback and should publish this on their Departmental webpages. The Committee recommended that a response and action plan template, based on the existing NSS template, be issued to Departments for future surveys.

9.3.4 The Committee discussed the College's participation in PRES 2013 and supported continued participation in the survey in 2015.

10. Supervisor Training

10.1 The Committee received a report from the Manager of the Graduate School outlining existing arrangements for supervisor training and an action plan to improve supervision across the College. The Committee supported the action plan as presented in the report.

PRQC/2013/10

11. Review of Translation Studies Unit Provision

11.1 The Committee considered a report from the working party set up to review research degree provision in the Translation Studies Unit.

PRQC/2013/11

11.2 Discussion focused on the proposal to strengthen the College guideline that a supervisor should not normally have more than 6 students. The report noted that this guideline was not rigidly adhered to across the College and that there were a large number of

supervisors with more than 6 students. Some Committee members commented that 6 students was a guideline and felt that there were circumstances where it was possible to supervise more than 6 students without an adverse effect on the student experience.

- 11.3 The Committee agreed that the issues raised and the proposals within the paper should be considered as part of the Doctoral Proposition project. It was further agreed that the Graduate School Director would take these matters forward as part of that project.

ACTION: Graduate School Director

12. Proposed Changes to Writing-Up Status

- 12.1 The Committee considered a paper proposing changes to writing-up status.

PRQC/2013/12

- 12.2 Members were reminded that the Committee had previously supported the principle of introducing a 12 month writing up period for students who were near completion and who were expected to submit a thesis within the 12 month period granted. It was noted that the paper incorporated revisions following discussion at the 4 June 2013 meeting.

- 12.3 A discussion took place regarding the consideration of cases for late submission, as outlined in section 3 of the paper. It was agreed that further discussion of the process for late submission would take place outside the meeting and that the relevant section would be removed from the paper prior to submission to the Senate.

ACTION: Registry

- 12.4 Committee members emphasised their support for the introduction of a 12 month writing up period, noting that it would enhance the student experience. The Committee approved the proposed changes to writing up status as outlined in the paper and agreed that the changes would be recommended for Senate approval.

13. Clarification of Minimum Attendance Requirements and Update to Professional Skills Statement of Policy

- 13.1 The Committee considered a paper from the Graduate School proposing a clarification of the minimum attendance requirements at Graduate School courses and proposed updates to the Professional Skills Statement of Policy.

PRQC/2013/13

- 13.2 It was noted that the proposed clarification to the minimum attendance requirements was designed to take greater account of the expectations placed upon CDT and DTP students in particular. Such students would be permitted to apply for exemption from the minimum attendance requirement where they had attended equivalent courses elsewhere. All doctoral students would, however, be required to have completed two Graduate School courses by the Late Stage Review.

- 13.3 The Committee approved the amendments to both the minimum attendance requirements and the Professional Skills Statement of Policy.

14. Research Integrity Working Party

- 14.1 The Committee considered the first report of the Research Integrity Working Party.

PRQC/2013/14

- 14.2 The Graduate School Deputy Director (Professional Skills) informed the Committee that the Graduate School had established the working party to review the current support and guidance available to staff and students in relation to research integrity, specifically

copyright and plagiarism awareness. Following the first two meetings of the working party the Graduate School had approved a new Plagiarism Awareness Course. The on-line course was primarily aimed at doctoral students but would also be made available to Master's students and would take around 1.5 hours to complete. One of the five recommendations put forward for consideration by the Committee proposed that, from October 2013, the Plagiarism Awareness Course be compulsory for all first year doctoral students to complete prior to the Early Stage Assessment.

- 14.3 The Committee considered it important that the Plagiarism Awareness Course was made available to all students rather than being restricted to postgraduate students only. The Graduate School Deputy Director (Professional Skills) agreed to ensure that the course was available to all students.

ACTION: Graduate School Deputy Director (Professional Skills)

- 14.4 The Committee agreed that attendance should be compulsory for first year doctoral students registering on or after 1 October 2013 and approved the proposals outlined in the report.

15. Training for Graduate Teaching Assistants

- 15.1 The Committee considered a paper from the working party set up to review the training provided to Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs).

PRQC/2013/15

- 15.2 It was noted that the College did not currently have a clear policy or guidelines that outlined the level and type of training GTAs should receive. Training was currently determined locally at Department / Faculty level and consequently the amount and type of teaching and training available had been variable. The report of the working party contained a number of recommendations regarding policy in order to standardise the provision of training to GTAs across the College.

- 15.3 The Graduate School Deputy Director (Professional Skills) informed the Committee that a job specification had been developed for GTAs to ensure that they were aware of the terms and conditions attached to teaching within the College. The Graduate School was also working with the Educational Development Unit (EDU) and Departments to develop course material for GTAs, adapted from teaching courses currently run by the EDU.

- 15.4 Members welcomed the recommendations and proposals contained within the paper. The Committee approved the proposals as outlined.

16. Postgraduate Professional Development Committee: Update

- 16.1 The Committee received and noted the minutes of the Postgraduate Professional Development Committee held on 16 July 2013.

PRQC/2013/16

17. Collaborative Provision

The Committee received and considered the new and amended procedural documents listed below from the working party set up to review the College's approach to Managing Higher Education provision with others.

17.1 Procedures for Establishing and Reviewing Summer Schools

- 17.1.1 The Committee considered a paper outlining procedures for establishing, renewing and reviewing Graduate School International Doctoral Summer Schools.

PRQC/2013/17

17.1.2 It was noted that this was a new procedural document developed by the Graduate School to formalise the procedures for establishing, renewing and reviewing summer schools.

17.1.3 The Committee approved the new procedures as presented.

17.2 Procedures for the Approval and Review of Split PhDs

17.2.1 The Committee considered proposed amendments to the procedures for the approval and review of Split PhDs.

PRQC/2013/18

17.2.2 The Committee approved the amendments to the procedures as presented.

17.3 Procedures for the Approval, Renewal and Review of Partner Research Institutions (PRIs)

17.3.1 The Committee considered proposed amendments to the procedures for the approval, renewal and review of PRIs.

PRQC/2013/19

17.3.2 The Committee approved the amendments to the procedures as presented.

18. Joint PhD Examination Regulations

18.1 The Committee considered proposed regulations for the Joint PhD programme with the National University of Singapore.

PRQC/2013/20

18.1.1 The Committee approved the regulations as presented.

18.2 The Committee considered proposed regulations for the Joint PhD programme with the University of Hong Kong

PRQC/2013/21

18.2.1 The Committee approved the regulations as presented.

18.3 The Committee noted that the regulations for the Joint PhD programme with Nanyang Technological University (NTU) were being finalised in discussion with NTU and were expected to be presented at the next meeting.

19. Submission data

19.1 The Committee considered a report of submission rates for students due to submit for an MPhil or PhD during the period 1 February 2011 to 31 January 2012.

PRQC/2013/22

19.2 The Graduate School Deputy Director informed the Committee that submission data was being looked at much more closely across the sector and in the Russell Group. On-time submission rates of 90% and even above 95% were considered to be very important. The importance of accurate and readily available data was emphasised.

ITEMS FOR REPORT

20. RCUK Statement of Expectations for Doctoral Training

20.1 Members were asked to note that the recently published *Statement of Expectations for Doctoral Training* was available at the link below.

<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/researchcareers/statementofexpectation.pdf>

21. Reports from key College Committees

- 21.1 **Senate:** Members noted that the latest executive summaries from Senate were available [here](#)
- 21.2 **Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee:** Members noted that the latest executive summaries from the QAEC meetings were available [here](#)

22. Any Other Business

- 22.1 The Vice Provost (Education) reported that a Doctoral Proposition Working Party had been established to take forward the development of the doctoral proposition, led by Professor Dot Griffiths. It was noted that this was the last year in which Roberts' money was available to fund professional skills training and that the working party would be considering the provision of professional skills training, including training provided by the Graduate School. The Committee was invited to send any comments to the Vice Provost (Education).

23. Dates of meetings in 2013-2014

Monday 3 February 2014 – *deadline for papers Monday 20 January 2014*
Friday 30 May 2014 – *deadline for papers Friday 16 May 2014*

All meetings will start at **10.00am** and will take place in the **Council Room, 170 Queen's Gate**, South Kensington Campus.

24. Reserved Business (not circulated to student members)

24.1 Special Cases Panel – Doctoral Programmes 2013-14

- 24.1.1 The Committee received the updated membership of the special cases panel for Doctoral programmes for the 2013-14 session.

PRQC/2013/23

- 24.1.2 The Committee approved the updated membership for 2013-14.

24.2 Special Cases Reports

- 24.2.1 The Committee received reports on special cases considered by the special cases panel for doctoral programmes.

Special Cases for Admissions – PRQC/2013/24
Special Cases for Examiners – PRQC/2013/25
Special Cases for Late Entry – PRQC/2013/26
Special Cases during Registration – PRQC/2013/27