

SENATE

Minutes of Meeting held on 2 November 11

**Present:** The Rector, Sir Keith O’Nions (Chairman), Professors Alford, Belvisi, Buckingham, George, Riboli, Thompson, Wright; Drs Albrecht, Broda, Cathcart, McCoy, McGarvey, Pike, Rogers, Smith; Mrs Cunningham; Mr Heath and Mr Parmar (Student Representatives); with Mr Wheatley (Academic Registrar), Ms Richardson (Deputy Academic Registrar) and Ms Penny (Senior Assistant Registrar).

**Apologies:** Professors Autio, Haigh, Kramer, Magee, Matar, Richardson, Warwick; Drs Buckle, McPhail.

**Present by Invitation:** Mrs Shorley (for Minute 1550), Mrs Farrar (for Minute 1555) and Dr Shemilt (for Minute 1556)

**In Attendance:** Mr Nuttall (Management Trainee).

**1539 Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership of the Senate 2011-12**

Noted: The current Terms of Reference and Constitution of the Senate and the names of those appointed or elected for the current session, as reported in **Paper/Senate/2011/1**. The Rector welcomed new members to the meeting.

**1540 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 15 June 2011 were confirmed subject to an amendment to Minute 1522(3). Pathology teaching would move from the beginning of Finals Phase 1 to the end of the previous year as a pilot in 2012-13 and not in 2011-12 as previously stated.

**1541 Matters Arising**

Received: **Paper Senate/2011/2**.

Minute 1519(1): Engineering Studies Committee – Reorganisation of Undergraduate Courses and Examinations, Department of Computing

Reported: (1) That at the June 2011 Senate the Engineering Studies Committee (ESC) had reported that it had considered and was supportive of a proposal to move the Joint Mathematics and Computer Science degree programmes from the Department of Mathematics to the Department of Computing, change the BSc/MSci designation of these degrees to BEng/MEng and introduce new programme titles. Although the degrees would still be taught by both Departments the administration would be concentrated in the Department of Computing. The ESC had reported at that time that the proposal would be formally considered by the Science Studies Committee (SSC) before a recommendation was made to Senate.

(2) That following approval of the proposal by SSC, the Rector had since taken Chairman’s action on behalf of the Senate to agree to the following changes:

(i) The transfer of administrative responsibility for the undergraduate Joint Mathematics

and Computer Science degree programmes from the Department of Mathematics to the Department of Computing;

(ii) The conversion of the degree programmes from BSc/MSci to BEng/MEng;

(iii) The introduction of new MEng programmes in Mathematics and Computer Science (Computational Statistics) and Mathematics and Computer Science (Pure Mathematics and Computational Logic) with effect from students starting in October 2011.

(3) That no student was disadvantaged by these changes. Students on course prior to October 2011 would graduate with a BSc or MSci; students starting in October 2011 had been strongly encouraged to register for the BEng/MEng but could retain the option of BSc/MSci; and students applying for October 2012 would be offered BEng/MEng only. Rector's action had been required due to the importance of publicising these changes to new students. The programmes were fully accredited and this remained unchanged.

#### Minute 1520: Restructure of Undergraduate Degrees in the Department of Life Sciences

Noted: That at its June 2011 meeting Senate had agreed that it should receive an update on plans for the future of the BSc Biomedical Sciences degree at its next meeting.

Reported: (1) That the Department of Life Sciences would withdraw from the BSc Biomedical Sciences degree at the end of the current academic year. Subject to approval by Medical Studies Committee and Senate, the Faculty of Medicine would take over the course fully from 2012-13.

(2) That the Strategic Planning Division had confirmed that 50 students per annum could continue to be recruited to the programme.

Considered and endorsed: The interim arrangements, outlined in the Senate's paper, for students part way through the course in 2012-13.

### **1542 Rector's Business**

Received: A Report from the Rector (**Paper Senate/2011/3**).

#### (1) Rector's Away Day

Reported: (i) That the Rector's Away Day, held on 21 October, had focused on the Student Experience and had covered many of its aspects: undergraduate and postgraduate, academic and pastoral. While a number of action points had emerged from the Away Day, the most significant and urgent had related to the undergraduate experience and in particular the quality and timeliness of assessment and feedback, and the quality, price and distance from College of student accommodation.

(ii) That the Management Board had reviewed the outcomes of the Away Day and had agreed that that the priority for Departments should now be to address the concerns around the student experience on the undergraduate courses by December, with postgraduate provision addressed in the planning round. It had also agreed that Departmental action plans should seek to identify any key problem areas or constraints and determine how these issues/ constraints could be resolved. It was also suggested that departments should seek to identify evaluation measures that could apply to all years.

(iii) That the Management Board had specifically agreed that:

(a) Faculty Principals should require their Heads of Department to provide action plans outlining measures already in place and measures that they would be introducing during the

current academic year to improve the undergraduate student experience. These plans would be collated by the Faculties and presented at the Management Board's December meeting.

(b) The Chief Financial Officer and Director of Commercial Services should together produce a plan for the refurbishment (where appropriate and necessary) of existing accommodation and the development of new accommodation – with recommendations for suitable social amenities at or close to this accommodation, as well as suitable catering facilities at the South Kensington Campus.

(c) Faculties and Departments should also provide action plans for improving both the undergraduate and postgraduate student experience, including identifying any necessary investment, as part of the Planning Round in Spring 2012. This would enable the Management Board to form a strategic view of requirements, whether capital (perhaps for accommodation) or otherwise (perhaps for assessment and feedback), for improving the student experience at the College.

(2) Imperial College Access Agreement

Reported: (i) That in May 2011 the Senate had received a copy of the College's new Access Agreement 2012-13 which had been submitted to the Office of Fair Access (OFFA). At that time the content of the final Access Agreement had been subject to approval by OFFA.

(ii) That the College's Access Agreement 2012-13 had been approved by OFFA in July. In line with Imperial's mission and ethos, the Access Agreement committed the College to target its efforts at capable disadvantaged groups with a view to ensuring that the best students were recruited regardless of background. It therefore placed emphasis on recruiting those most likely to benefit from, and thrive on, a College course, providing appropriate financial assistance to those who required it and encouraging and enabling disadvantaged students with the potential to meet Imperial's entrance requirements to apply to, and study at, the College or another selective university. The Agreement was available at:

[http://www.offa.org.uk/agreements/AA\\_0132%20Imperial%20College%20London%201213%20app%2012.7.11.pdf](http://www.offa.org.uk/agreements/AA_0132%20Imperial%20College%20London%201213%20app%2012.7.11.pdf)

(iii) That Access Agreements would be reviewed annually by OFFA; hence the need to demonstrate continued progress against the College's targets therein. Imperial was therefore publicising a generous targeted financial assistance package with the aim of encouraging excellent prospective students from low-income families to apply to, and study at, the College. The College was also developing a more evidence-based and targeted OFFA-countable outreach strategy and improving its data gathering, recording and analysis processes to understand further, and act upon, the effectiveness and impact of the outreach programme in supporting disadvantaged groups.

(3) Pro Rector (International Affairs)

Reported: (i) That Dr Simon Buckle, Director of Climate Policy in the Grantham Institute for Climate Change, had also accepted appointment as Pro Rector (International Affairs) with effect from 1 October 2011. Dr Buckle succeeded Professor Mary Ritter who had retired on 30 September 2011.

(ii) That Dr Buckle was responsible for the College's strategic international interests and would work closely with the Pro Rectors for Education and Academic Affairs, Research and Enterprise to identify and advance new opportunities. The position was part-time and Dr Buckle would retain his responsibilities within the Grantham Institute. Dr Buckle was a member of Senate.

(4) Pro Rector (Research)

Reported: (i) That Professor Donal Bradley FRS, previously Deputy Principal of the Faculty of Natural Sciences, had accepted appointment as Pro Rector (Research), with effect from 1 October 2011. Professor Bradley had taken over from the Acting Pro Rector (Research), Professor David Begg, who continued as Principal of Imperial College Business School.

(ii) That Professor Bradley was responsible for strategic research issues across the College, determining priorities for strategic research investment and coordinating and developing the College's research relationships externally. The position was part-time and Professor Bradley would retain his research activities within the Centre for Plastic Electronics and the Department of Physics.

(5) Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions

Reported: That Dr Nicola Rogers, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Medicine, had accepted appointment as Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions with effect from 26 September 2011. Dr Rogers would have academic oversight of the strategic direction of all aspects of undergraduate and postgraduate recruitment, reporting to Professor Julia Buckingham, Pro Rector (Education and Academic Affairs). The position was part-time and Dr Rogers would spend a day a week continuing to work on her academic activities in the Department of Medicine. Dr Rogers was a member of Senate.

(6) Deputy Principal of the Faculty of Natural Sciences

Reported: That Professor Steven Rose, Head of Plasma Physics and Director of the Institute of Shock Physics, had accepted appointment as Deputy Principal of the Faculty of Natural Sciences with effect from 1 October 2011, succeeding Professor Donal Bradley on his appointment as Pro Rector (Research).

(7) Deputy Principals of the Faculty of Engineering

Reported: (i) That Professor Neil Alford and Professor Peter Cheung had been appointed Deputy Principals of the Faculty of Engineering.

(ii) That Professor Alford had accepted appointment as Deputy Principal (Research) with effect from 1 April 2011 in succession to Professor Jeff Magee on his appointment as Principal. He continued as Head of the Department of Materials.

(iii) That Professor Peter Cheung had accepted appointment as Deputy Principal (Teaching) with effect from 1 September 2011 in succession to Professor David Nethercot on his retirement. He continued as Head of the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering.

(8) Deputy Principal (Research and Business Engagement) of the Business School

Reported: That Professor David Gann had accepted appointment as Deputy Principal (Research and Business Engagement) of the Business School, with effect from 1 September 2011. Professor Gann reported to Professor David Begg, Principal of the Business School, and would work closely with Professor Dot Griffiths, who continued as Deputy Principal of the Business School.

(9) Head of Department – National Heart and Lung Institute

Reported: That Professor Kim Fox, Professor of Clinical Cardiology, had accepted appointment as Head of Department for the National Heart and Lung Institute (NHLI) in the

Faculty of Medicine, from 1 September 2011. Professor Fox succeeded Professor Michael Schneider who had led NHLI since 1 January 2009.

(10) Head of Department of Mathematics

Reported: That Professor Richard Craster, Professor of Applied Mathematics, had accepted appointment as Head of the Department of Mathematics with effect from 1 October 2011. Professor Craster had succeeded Dr Emma McCoy who had been interim Head of Department since July 2010 and had now returned to her role as Deputy Head of Department.

(11) Head of Department of Life Sciences

Reported: That Professor Murray Selkirk, Professor of Biochemical Parasitology, had accepted appointment as Head of the Department of Life Sciences with effect from 1 October 2011. Professor Selkirk had succeeded Professor Ian Owens who had left the College to become Director of Science at the Natural History Museum.

(12) Director of the Centre for Environmental Policy

Reported: That Dr Zen Makuch, Reader in Law, had accepted appointment as Director of the Centre for Environmental Policy with effect from 1 October 2011. Dr Makuch succeeded Professor John Mumford who had completed his term of office.

(13) Election of Deans

Reported: (i) That Professor Richard Thompson, Professor of Experimental Physics and Head of the Quantum Optics and Laser Science Research Group in the Department of Physics, had been elected to succeed Professor Chris Phillips as one of the Deans for the Faculty of Natural Sciences from 1 September 2011 to 31 August 2014.

(ii) That Professor Jeff Kramer, Professor of Distributed Computing in the Department of Computing and the current Senior Dean, had been re-elected to serve as Senior Dean for a further year from 1 September 2011 to 31 August 2012.

(iii) That the full list of Faculty Deans for 2011-12 was as follows:

Senior Dean	Professor Jeff Kramer
Faculty of Engineering	Professor Richard Vinter
Faculty of Engineering and Business School	Professor Morris Sloman
Faculty of Medicine (Non Clinical)	Professor Nigel Gooderham
Faculty of Medicine (Clinical)	Professor Simon Taylor-Robinson
Faculty of Natural Sciences	Professor Richard Thompson
Faculty of Natural Sciences	Professor Robin Leatherbarrow

(14) Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology

Reported: (i) That following the signing of an agreement by the College and the University of Oxford on 1 August 2011, staff in the Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology had transferred to the University of Oxford. From this date the Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology had ceased to be an Institute within Imperial's Faculty of Medicine.

(ii) That the transfer had followed consideration by the Trustees of the Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology Trust about their support for funding rheumatology research.

(iii) That staff in the new Oxford institute would operate from the Aspenlea Road premises for the immediate future until their new building in Oxford was completed and available for occupation.

(15) Fellowship of the Royal Academy of Engineering

Reported: That Professor Nick Buenfeld, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, had been elected as a Fellow of the Royal Academy of Engineering.

**1543 Pro Rector's Business**

Considered: A Report from the Pro Rector (Education and Academic Affairs) (**Paper Senate/2011/4**).

(1) Provision of Information about Higher Education

Reported: (i) That Senate had been informed in May 2011 that the College had responded to the HEFCE, UUK and GuildHE consultation on *Public Information about Higher Education*, which set out proposals for how institutions might improve the accessibility and usefulness of information available to the public about higher education courses, from September 2012. It had also described how the National Student Survey might be developed and what wider information about institutions should be made publically available.

(ii) That the outcome of the consultation had now been published. The paper *Provision of information about higher education: Outcomes of consultation and next steps* was available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/news/hefce/2011/kis.htm>

(iii) That the paper stated that:

(a) Institutions in England would be required to publish a Key Information Set (KIS) for each full-time and part-time undergraduate course planned for 2013-14. The KISs would contain information on student satisfaction, graduate outcomes, learning and teaching activities, assessment methods, tuition fees and student finance, accommodation and professional accreditation. KISs would need to be made available, via institutional websites, by the end of September 2012.

(b) All publicly funded HEIs, further education colleges with undergraduate provision and private providers who subscribed to the QAA should also publish a wider information set, to be made available by the start of the 2012-13 academic session.

(iv) That there are also plans to develop the National Student Survey.

(v) That the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee and Student Recruitment and Admissions Strategy and Operations Committee (a new sub-committee of the Strategic Education Committee) were overseeing the College's response to this report. A Working Party, reporting to both committees, had been established to lead the development of the College's KISs and ensure the other requirements of the report were met.

(vi) That the data collation for the KISs would be managed centrally and much of the required information could be obtained from central records. However, Departments would be asked to provide information relating to the teaching and learning activities and assessment methods for their courses. A template and detailed guidance would be provided by Registry in due course.

## (2) Welcome Week 2011

Reported: (i) That Welcome Week had been planned in the same format as 2010 following the success of last year's welcome events. The Rector's welcome addresses for both undergraduate and postgraduate students had taken place during week one and had focused on the 'secrets for university success' and how to make the transition from 'A' level to life at Imperial. As well as the South Kensington welcome talks the Rector, Director of the Graduate School and the Student Union President had visited both Hammersmith and Silwood to address the students based at those campuses.

(ii) That following the success of the welfare talks for students not in halls in 2010 these were again held on Saturday 1<sup>st</sup> October. For the first time a drinks reception was laid on following the postgraduate talk. Both the talks and the reception were well attended and well received.

(iii) That Commercial Services had organised a band of volunteers to help out across the campus on three consecutive days, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> October. The volunteers all wore the recognised green 'HERE TO HELP' t-shirts and were available to help with luggage, traffic control, directions and questions and offered a friendly face and welcoming presence across campus. Over 40 staff members from support service departments had volunteered which was greatly appreciated and helped make the weekend a great success.

(iv) That the Imperial College Union had also organised a programme of Welcome Week events which had included Mingles for undergraduates on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> of October, and the second postgraduate Mingle on the 7<sup>th</sup> October. They had also organised Fresher's Fair and a welcome reception for students not in halls. All events were well attended and greatly enjoyed.

Further Reported: That Professor Denis Wright, Jane Neary, the ICU Sabbatical Officers and their teams were thanked for their excellent work to ensure the week went well.

## (3) Helping Students Adapt: Pilot Induction Programme

Reported: (i) That in response to feedback from staff and students, Management Board had agreed to pilot a new programme of events designed to help new undergraduate students adapt to university life. To complement Welcome Week, these events would be timed to provide additional support when it was most needed – mid-autumn and early spring – when students were more fully aware of the demands of their course and the challenges of living away from home.

(ii) That the pilot would consist of three events for 175 undergraduate students, with priority given to students not living in Halls. Each event would be jointly organised by the College and Imperial College Union, with assistance from approximately 25 student facilitators. A guide to the content of the first two sessions was provided in the Senate's paper.

(iii) That activities would involve as much interactive and group discussion work as possible. Detailed feedback would be collected at the end of each session to evaluate the potential for a full roll-out in the 2012-13 academic year.

## (4) Student Awards for Outstanding Achievement 2011

Reported: The Student Awards for Outstanding Achievement 2011, as detailed in section 5 of the Senate's paper.

(5) Review of Transferable Skills Training

Reported: (i) That in May 2011 the Senate had been informed that the College's Transferable Skills Review Committee had established Working Parties to focus on the four different strands of the College's transferable skills provision: UG, PGT, PGR and Postdoctoral researchers.

(ii) That the Strategic Education Committee (SEC) had now considered a report from the Transferable Skills Review Committee, based on the findings of the Working Parties. It had been agreed by SEC to recommend to Management Board the piloting of Imperial Horizons - a new programme of education and training which would allow students from different disciplines to develop transferable skills while confronting major global challenges such as climate change, security, energy, global health and synthetic biology. The pilot would be for a cohort of approximately 200 first or second year students in the spring/summer 2012.

(6) Education Day Autumn 2011

Reported: (i) That planning for Imperial's Education Day on the 30<sup>th</sup> November was now well advanced. The theme for the event would be 'Broadening Students' Horizons'. The day would commence at 12.30 and the afternoon would focus on the wider role of teaching and education in preparing students for life after university. Guest speakers would include Mr Malcolm Horton, Global Head of Recruitment and Programmes, Nomura Europe, Professor Adrian Sutton, Imperial College and Dr Evan Harris, Vice-Chair of the Liberal Democrat Federal Policy Committee, writer, and former MP. A chaired keynote debate, 'Is university education failing our students?', would also take place with a panel consisting of Sir William Atkinson, Executive Headteacher, The Phoenix Canberra Schools Federation, Dr Anthony Seldon, Master, Wellington College and Sir Richard Sykes, Chairman, UK Stem Cell Foundation. The day would conclude with the presentation by Baroness Eliza Manningham-Buller of the 2011 College Awards for Excellence in Teaching, Supporting the Student Experience, Pastoral Care and Research Supervision and a wine reception.

(ii) That full details of the programme were available at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/edudev/networksandevents/educationdaynov2011>

(7) A New, Fit for Purpose Regulatory Framework for the Higher Education Sector

Reported: (i) That the White Paper *Higher Education: Students at the Heart of the System* (June 2011) had set out a commitment to introduce a new, fit-for-purpose regulatory framework to establish the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) as lead regulator. Building on this, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) had issued a technical consultation on 'A new, Fit-for-Purpose Regulatory Framework for the Higher Education Sector' which was available at the following link:

<http://discuss.bis.gov.uk/hereform/technical-consultation/>

(ii) That the College's response to the consultation, submitted in October 2011, was attached to the Senate's paper.

(8) QAA consultation on the Reference Point for External Examining

Reported: (i) That the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was revising its guidance on external examiners, currently set out in Section 4 of the QAA Code of Practice, and had issued a draft document for consultation, which was available at:

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Newsroom/Consultations/Documents/EEconsultationJuly2011.pdf>

(ii) That the College's response to this consultation, submitted in September 2011, was

attached to the Senate's paper.

(9) QAA consultation on International Students

Reported: (i) That the QAA had developed draft guidance which, the Agency said, sought to 'establish a UK-wide set of shared principles that reflect minimum expectations of support for international students, with a view to assisting higher education institutions in developing an inclusive environment that meets the challenges associated with an increasingly international student body.' The draft guidance was available at:

[http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/International\\_students\\_guidance.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/International_students_guidance.pdf)

(ii) That the guidance covered the whole of the typical international student journey, from marketing and recruitment through to support for learning and graduation. The principles outlined in each section were intended to act as a point of reference for institutions. The College's response to the draft guidance, submitted in October 2011, was attached to the Senate's paper.

**1544 National Student Survey 2011**

Considered: The results of the National Student Survey (**Paper Senate/2011/5**)

Reported: (1) That the results of the National Student Survey (NSS), now in its seventh year, had been published in August. The results from the survey influenced league tables and informed applicants with regard to their decisions about where to study, thus having a reputational impact on the College. The survey also provided an insight into the student experience.

(2) That the College's 2011 participation rate in the survey was 64%, up from 58% in 2010.

(3) That although the overall response rate had improved this year, the College continued to perform badly on questions relating to assessment and feedback (Imperial was ranked 163<sup>rd</sup> out of 168 in the assessment and feedback section of the survey). The College also did not rank highly in the sector in the sections of the survey relating to teaching and academic support. The College did however perform better on questions relating to learning resources, organisation and management and overall satisfaction in comparison with the sector. In 2011 overall satisfaction at the College was 85%, compared with 83% for the sector.

(4) That an analysis of the results at departmental level revealed significant variations in satisfaction across the College, with the Department of Earth Science and Engineering receiving the highest level of overall satisfaction – 98%. The largest increase in overall satisfaction from 2010 was achieved by the Department of Bioengineering whose total overall satisfaction increased by 35% to 90%.

(5) That Dr Lorraine Craig, Academic Tutor for the Department of Earth Science and Engineering, had given a presentation at the Rector's Away Day on the strategies used by her Department to provide an excellent student experience.

(6) That during the autumn term, the Dean of Students and Education Strategy Manager had also held meetings with Directors of Undergraduate Studies and Senior Tutors to discuss the NSS results and departmental education enhancement plans. An 'Improving the Student Experience' paper had been compiled as a result, in order to share practical ideas and measures for improving the student experience between Departments and Faculties. The latest draft of this document was attached to the Senate's paper. This noted that improving the student experience required concentrated and coordinated effort and that

it was the simple things which often had the greatest impact: (i) instilling a culture which rewarded and valued teaching, (ii) promoting strong communications with students and (iii) effective course coordination and management.

Further Reported: That while it would take time for Departments to achieve sustained improvements in student satisfaction, one negative experience could have a detrimental impact on NSS scores. It was also important that there was sufficient staff time to provide good feedback. It was noted that some Departments had reduced the amount of coursework in their programmes so that enhanced support for and feedback on the remaining coursework could be provided.

Agreed: That any one strategy for enhancing the student experience would not necessarily suit all Departments, hence it was important for individual Departmental action plans to be developed, as agreed by the Management Board.

#### **1545 Periodic Review of Research Degree Provision in the Department of Materials**

Considered and approved: A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/6**).

Reported: (1) That in its review of research degree provision in the Department of Materials the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee had been advised by four assessors (two internal and two external) who had visited the Department on 20 May 2011.

(2) That the Committee had noted that the reviewers had been unanimous in complimenting the Department on the high quality of research provision and the vibrant environment in which students undertook their research. The completion rates, pastoral and administrative support, attitude of students and information provided to students by the Department all drew favourable comment from the review panel. It had been reported that the documentation for the review was comprehensive and clearly presented which had afforded the opportunity for the panel to form a clear view of the Department's strengths and weaknesses ahead of the visit and had therefore made the review meeting itself very productive. The reviewers had rated the Department of Materials "compliant" in all the Precepts and "compliant" overall.

(3) That the students present at the review had confirmed that they were happy with the supervision they received and were positive about the Department overall. The panel had reported that it believed the success of the provision was largely due to effective communication between staff and students. The internal Chairman of the review panel had commented that he had been particularly impressed with the way in which academic staff within the Department delivered the programme, ensuring that students were clear about what was expected of them and when.

(4) That the reviewers had highlighted many examples of good practice within the Department including the postgraduate student handbook, the rigorous selection procedures, which ensured only the highest quality students were admitted and which in turn contributed to excellent Departmental completion rates, and the excellent induction programme. In particular, students present at the review had praised Departmental social events which facilitated a thriving student community.

(5) That the students present at the review had reported that access to Departmental facilities out-of-hours was problematic. In addition to this, students had also reported that it was difficult to find out what equipment was available to them elsewhere in the College. The Committee had noted that this was not a problem unique to the Department of Materials and that it had been highlighted by students across the College in the last ROLE survey. In response to this the Department had confirmed that it was already in discussion with relevant stakeholders and was investigating ways in which access could be improved.

The Department had emphasised that the safety of its students was the paramount consideration and that any new arrangements would have to be approved by the Department's Health and Safety Committee. It was confirmed that students had access to Departmental facilities during the core operating hours of between 8am and 6pm and had swipe card access from 7pm until 11pm. In the first instance, the Department's priority was to ensure that all equipment was fully functional between those times to allow optimal usage. It would also encourage students to start early so that the need to work late into the night could be avoided. It was noted that the Department would continue to think of flexible ways in which to try and solve this issue.

(6) That the review panel had suggested that the Department might wish to consider a more 'gathered field' approach to its admissions process which could lead to more equitable admission as well as facilitating strategic deployment of funds. It was suggested that this method would also allow students to be assessed against each other and therefore facilitate better matching of projects across the Department as a whole. In discussion with the Department it became clear that the Department's existing procedures achieved these goals. The Committee had confirmed that it was happy with the Department's recruitment process.

(7) That although the Department was compliant with Precept 5, which stipulated that all students must have an academic mentor, the scheme was relatively new and both staff and students were unclear as to the nature and effectiveness of this provision. However, the review panel had been satisfied that students were clear about where to get help from. Members of the Committee had agreed that the College should clarify the role of the academic mentor and review other roles within Departments responsible for the pastoral care of postgraduate students. It was suggested that a smaller number of cohort specific academic mentors should be appointed with a specific remit to advise students on career choices, as well as pastoral care and welfare.

(8) That students present at the review had expressed a wish to receive information about College and Departmental events, including seminars taking place in other Departments, via a single portal. The Committee had agreed that the development of a College-wide network for Departmental research events such as lectures and seminars which all students could access would be of great benefit to students. This was an issue for the College to consider.

(9) That students present at the review had reported that they would welcome the opportunity for a 2-3 month internship as part of their PhD programme. The panel had also suggested that there could be more seminars delivered by industrialists or those at the interface of academia and business, including alumni. It was noted that the Careers Advisory Service offered an internship service and that the Department was encouraged to make use of this.

(10) That the Committee had congratulated the Department on its excellent review.

Noted: That the Graduate School would be looking to provide further guidance to Departments on the role of the academic mentor.

Agreed: That the Senate was satisfied with the outcome of the review and approved the recommendation of the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee that the Department should report on developments since the periodic review as part of the next Precept Review in three years time.

Endorsed: The Committee's recommendation that a College-wide events calendar for research students should be developed. This would be taken forward by the Graduate School.

**1546 Periodic Review of Research Degree Provision in the Centre for Environmental Policy**

Considered and approved: A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/7**).

Reported: (1) That in its review of research degree provision in the Centre for Environmental Policy the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee had been advised by four assessors (two internal and two external) who had visited the Department on 5 May 2011.

(2) That the panel had been impressed with the friendliness and dedication of the Centre's staff and students. It was noted that the Centre had undergone numerous transformations over the last three decades including repositioning within different Faculties, restructuring and accommodation moves. Despite this, the students who had attended the review had reported that they were happy with the quality of supervision they received, the networking opportunities afforded by the Centre's excellent links with industry and the library and publishing opportunities available. The panel had found the intellectual environment within the Centre to be vibrant and innovative.

(3) That students present at the review had reported that they found the College's Transferable Skills Training Programme to be excellent. The students were also pleased that they were able to undertake some taught courses (part of the Centre's successful MSc programme), which enhanced their overall research training. In addition to this, the review panel highlighted several examples of good practice including the Centre's excellent links with industry and government offering outstanding internship and work opportunities for students, the effective 'buddy system' where an experienced research student was paired with a new student, the Centre's commitment to interdisciplinary research, the alumni network and the survey of PhD Student opinion, which was designed and analysed by the students themselves.

(4) That the reviewers had rated the Centre for Environmental Policy 'non-compliant' in Precepts 3, 6, 8, 9 and 10 and therefore rated the Centre 'non-compliant' with the College's Precepts overall. The Centre had reported that it had found the review to be a useful exercise because it had provided constructive feedback which would help the Centre to make improvements to its current provision. The Committee had been pleased that the Centre, and in particular the new DPS, was taking steps to address the issues raised by the panel.

(5) That one of the main issues highlighted by students present at the review was the poor accommodation of the Centre on the South Kensington Campus. The Centre had suffered particularly badly from the notorious space limitations at the South Kensington Campus. In particular, research students did not have space for independent study or a common room. It was noted that the Centre currently occupied 'temporary accommodation' within the Faculty of Engineering which overlooked Exhibition Road. As a consequence, the Centre had experienced noise issues for more than a year during the Exhibition Road redevelopment. It had been noted that some students preferred not to work in their office as the accommodation was felt to be so poor (in particular noise, temperature and lighting were cited). The DPS had reported that the Centre had recently tried to make some positive changes, such as providing a water cooler and providing space for personal telephone calls, but that it had been constrained by the limitations of the building and available space. The Committee members agreed that it was unacceptable for students to not have a decent work area and that the Committee would emphasise the importance of having adequate accommodation to the Senate.

(6) That the review panel had reported that there were communication issues between staff

and students, exacerbated because at the time of the review the Head of Centre and DPS had both been located at the College's Silwood campus. In response, the Centre had confirmed that it had taken steps to address this issue with the appointment of a Deputy DPS who was based at the South Kensington Campus. It had also confirmed that the PG Tutor was based at South Kensington. The Centre agreed that it would continue to review this issue and to make improvements where necessary. The Committee noted that the new Head of Centre was currently undertaking a review of the administrative support of the Centre.

(7) That research students in particularly small research groups within the Centre had expressed a wish to feel part of a wider group. The panel had suggested that the Centre might wish to organise more academic and social events in which students from different research groups could interact, for example, an annual conference day or coffee mornings. The Centre had confirmed that it would consider ways in which to facilitate this.

(8) That currently, the Centre did not have a formal induction programme for research students who arrived outside of normal registration periods. This was pertinent because the Centre had a large proportion of EU and overseas students who did not arrive in October. EU and overseas students who had attended the review commented that the induction they had received was limited, although they did receive a briefing on Health and Safety. The panel had recommended that the Centre update its postgraduate student handbook with respect to clarifying the role of key staff within the Centre (HoD, DPS, PG Tutor, Supervisor and Academic Mentor/Advisor) and the procedures for PhD registration and progression.

(9) That the panel had found that Precept 8 was being inconsistently applied across the Centre, and that a large percentage of students were failing to transfer from MPhil to PhD within 18 months. However, it was noted that the new procedures for PhD registration should help to mitigate this issue. The Centre had confirmed that it was aware that submission rates were poor and that the financial implications for students were worrying. The Centre had reported that it was looking at ways to improve record keeping of students with a view to making sure that students were kept informed of milestones.

(10) That the panel had reported that a formal PG Committee had not met since 2008 and that there was no regular forum in which students were represented to discuss issues. In response the Centre had confirmed that it had now implemented a PG Committee and would ensure that the deliberations of such a Committee were formally recorded.

(11) That whilst the Committee had been pleased that the Centre was taking positive steps to address the matters discussed, it had agreed that an internal review panel should be established to review the Centre in May 2012. The paperwork for this review would focus on the specific issues raised by the periodic review panel and in particular on submission rates.

Agreed: That the outcome of the review be confirmed and that the Centre for Environmental Policy be invited to participate in an internal review during May 2012.

#### **1547 Periodic Review of Research Degree Provision in the Department of Humanities**

Considered and approved: A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/8**).

Reported: (1) That in its review of research degree provision in the Department of Humanities the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee had been advised by four assessors (two internal and two external) who had visited the Department on 17 May 2011.

(2) That the reviewers' reports were, in general, very positive and the Department had been

commended by the panel for the quality of documentation provided for the review. The panel had congratulated the Department for making significant progress to address concerns raised during the previous Precept Review, in particular for establishing a Departmental Postgraduate Committee and for appointing a DPS.

(3) That the panel had found that there were excellent research facilities available to students and was pleased to hear that the Department had been successful in its first interdisciplinary AHRC bid. As a result three PhD studentships had been awarded.

(4) That the panel had confirmed that the mechanisms for monitoring and supporting student progression and for providing feedback to students were good. Other good practice highlighted by the review panel had included the excellent research students' handbook and the vibrant seminar programmes which brought students into contact with external guest speakers who were often leaders in their field.

(5) That all students who had attended the review had been extremely pleased with the quality of supervision they had received, the frequency of supervisory sessions and the accessibility of their supervisors who had been quick to respond in terms of feedback or issues raised. Students had confirmed that they met formally with their supervisors once every one or two weeks but informal meetings often took place much more frequently.

(6) That the review panel had reported that the small size of individual disciplines within the Department exacerbated the sense of isolation experienced by some students, especially those from overseas. The students present at the review had expressed a desire for more interaction between research groups. It had been suggested that the Department might wish to consider providing platforms and opportunities for students to interact both socially and intellectually such as organising a day for peer presentations, social events or providing students with improved communication about seminars available to them in other parts of the Department. The Head of Department had felt that due to the disparate nature of the three groups which made up Humanities, a seminar series would not be appropriate but confirmed that the Department would consider other ways in which to build an overarching Humanities cohort.

(7) That a number of students present at the review had commented that the Graduate School's Transferable Skills Programme was primarily aimed at Science, Engineering and Medical students and that much of the training was therefore not appropriate to their specific research needs. It was noted that students sometimes attended external courses which they felt were of far greater relevance and benefit to them. The Committee had agreed that this issue should be taken forward by the Graduate School and that the Chairman of the Postgraduate Professional Development Committee would contact the Department of Humanities for further information.

(8) That the reviewers had rated the Department of Humanities 'non-compliant' in Precept 3 (regarding induction) and 'working towards compliance' overall. It was reported that students normally arrived at different times during the year, rather than in one 'batch', and as such received an induction from their supervisor, rather than a formal induction day. Students present at the review had reported that the induction information provided to them by their supervisors was variable. In response to this, the Department had confirmed that all students were told that the DPS was available to see them to supplement their induction, but typically they did not take up this offer. Since 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011, the Department had put in place a formal meeting with the DPS for every student to ensure that their induction programme was complete. The Committee was satisfied that the Department now complied with this Precept and was therefore 'compliant' with the College's Precepts overall.

(9) That the panel had congratulated the Department for achieving world-class standards in history of science research, for their highly regarded MSc courses and for providing much needed language support services to the College.

(10) That the Committee had noted that the College would be carrying out a review of the Humanities Department's provision and that this might have wide ranging implications for the Department.

Agreed: That the Senate was satisfied with the outcome of the review and approved the recommendation of the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee that the Department should report on developments since the periodic review as part of the next Precept Review in three year's time.

**1548 Student Employment During Studies**

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Student Welfare Committee, a College Policy on student employment during studies (**Paper Senate/2011/9**), with immediate effect.

**1549 Policy on Progress of Students who are Remanded or given a Custodial Sentence whilst on Course**

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Student Welfare Committee, a College Policy on the progress of students who are remanded or given a custodial sentence whilst on course (**Paper Senate/2011/10**), with immediate effect.

Noted: That it was suggested that a link to the College's Procedure for the Assessment of Fitness to Practise Medicine be added to the Policy.

**1550 Online Publication of Theses**

Received: A Report by the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/11**).

Noted: That at its meeting in May 2011 the Senate had noted that a Working Group was being established to consider the issue of online publication of theses.

Considered: The recommendations of the e-theses Working Group, which had been endorsed by QAAC.

Reported: (i) That the College had currently restricted access to PhD theses on its Spiral Digital Repository in response to concerns over several issues, including third party copyright. The College was seeking to address these concerns in order that large scale online publication of its PhD theses could be resumed. This would bring the College in line with the majority of Russell Group institutions, 18 of which had online digital repositories. Of these, 12 institutions automatically added PhD theses with open access and five had a voluntary system for the addition of PhD theses.

(ii) That the College's primary concerns in relation to online publication of PhD theses related to potential infringements of copyright and the potential for publication of plagiarised material. Full details of the issues considered to be of key concern were outlined in the Senate's paper.

(iii) That the proposals outlined by the Working Group were intended to address these matters and enable the College to permit open access to its online theses. The recommendations in summary were:

- (a) Introduce a disclaimer for students to sign relating to copyright and online publication.

- (b) Introduce an embargo system to ensure that pre-publication, pre-patent and commercially sensitive material was appropriately protected.
  - (c) Require copies of permission documents to be appended to the final version of a thesis; the award of the degree would be withheld until this material was received.
  - (d) Continue to implement a rapid take-down policy for work published on Spiral.
  - (e) Train supervisors, PhD students and PhD internal examiners to ensure they were aware of the potential for copyright infringement and the College's regulations in this area.
  - (f) Continue to pilot plagiarism checking for PGR students' 9 month reports.
  - (g) Consider introducing courses or workshops for PGR students to increase understanding of what plagiarism was and the College's policies in this area.
  - (h) Inform students that the College reserved the right to perform plagiarism checks on submitted theses.
  - (i) Produce a clear College policy on self-plagiarism, stating that this was acceptable provided that appropriate statements and references were included in the thesis.
  - (j) Library Services to publish a list of commonly used journals which had a published policy stating that reproduction of appropriately referenced material for educational academic work was acceptable.
  - (k) Provide guidance for PhD supervisors on the use of Turnitin and publicise the guidance which existed on the College webpages relating to the use of Turnitin.
- (iv) That the Faculty Research Committees had considered and supported the recommendations of the Working Group.

Further Reported: (i) That it would be acceptable for small sections of a thesis to be redacted before publication by the College; however, publication could only take place if the sense of the thesis was maintained. The suitability of the edited thesis for publication would need to be judged by the student and supervisor.

(ii) That while many Departments were comfortable with the online publication of PhD theses, some continued to be concerned about the proposal to permit open access to such documents online, even following implementation of the Working Group's recommendations. There remained a significant concern that a student's material or articles might be rejected when submitted for publication because checks would reveal that the material was already available online and therefore was not original. There might also be Intellectual Property issues. Although the recommendations of the Working Group included the introduction of a flexible and extendable embargo system, some Senate members considered that the embargo should be automatic for a defined period so that there was sufficient time to train staff and students on the implications of online publication. There should of course be the opportunity for staff and students to opt out of the embargo.

(iii) That in response to a question regarding the recommendation that the award of a degree could be withheld until copies of permission documents had been obtained, the Pro Rector (Education and Academic Affairs) confirmed that it would be for the examiners to determine whether the award of the degree should be delayed.

Agreed: (i) That while the College should move towards the online publication of PhD theses, it was essential that staff and students received training and guidance on the implications of online publication. This would be provided by the Library and the Graduate

School.

(ii) That in the first instance - for one year - there should be an automatic embargo on the publication of all theses, which staff and students would need to opt out of should they wish to publish a thesis online. This would allow time for sufficient training to be provided in this area. After this period, and following submission of a progress report to Senate, online publication would be automatic; staff and students wishing to use the embargo system would need to specifically request this.

Approved: The recommendations of the Working Group, subject to the agreed adjustments relating to initial implementation.

#### **1551 Quality Assurance Advisory Committee**

Considered: A Report by the Quality Assurance Advisory Committee (**Paper Senate/2011/12**).

(1) Amendments to the Regulations for Taught Master's Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered amendments to the Postgraduate Framework approved by Senate in May 2010.

(ii) That at that time the Senate had agreed a new Postgraduate Framework whereby two new award strands had been created: a Postgraduate Certificate and a Postgraduate Diploma. Senate's decision had been confirmed by Council in July 2010. Regulations for the new Postgraduate Diplomas and Certificates had been incorporated into the Master's regulations.

(iii) That Senate had at that time agreed specific progression rules for Certificates, Diplomas and Master's programmes whereby Certificates and Diplomas could not be issued as compensatory exit awards for students who had failed a Master's programme. Senate had also agreed that should students register initially for either a Certificate or Diploma they may progress upwards with credit accumulating towards the next level.

(iv) That the Framework had now been considered further by QAAC. On the recommendation of the Graduate School and the Registry, the Committee had agreed that students should normally be required to complete the programme for a Postgraduate Certificate in no more than two years after initial registration, for the Diploma programme in no more than four years after initial registration for the first qualification and for a Master's programme in no more than five years after initial registration for the first qualification, except where individual programme regulations specifically allowed longer periods of study. In exceptional circumstances Departments might request the Graduate School to permit students to register for a subsequent award up to five years after successful completion of a Certificate or Diploma.

(v) That the Committee had also agreed that a student who registered for a Postgraduate Certificate should normally be required to successfully complete and pass the Certificate programme before progressing to the Diploma programme. Likewise, a student should normally be required to successfully complete and pass the Diploma programme before progressing to the Master's programme. A student who registered directly for a Master's programme, but who failed any part of the initial stages of assessment of the programme, would be allowed to progress to further stages of the Master's programme, subject to the requirements of the marking scheme, likewise for Diploma students.

(vi) That the QAAC had noted that currently Certificates and Diplomas could not be issued to students as compensatory awards for a failed Master's programme if that programme did

not have associated Certificate or Diploma awards. The Committee had agreed that where associated programmes (Certificates or Diplomas) did exist for Master's programmes, then students should henceforth be awarded the qualification for which they had satisfied the outcomes and assessment criteria. The College prospectus and Departments must make it clear to prospective students which exit awards were available to them.

(vii) That the Committee had agreed that where associated programmes existed, full-time students would normally register directly for the Master's level programme and then could be awarded the lower level award (where this existed and where they met the criteria) should they not be successful in their attempts to pass the Master's programme, and that part-time students would normally register for the lower level award and could then progress upwards should they so wish.

(viii) That it had also been agreed that students should not be able to accumulate all three awards. The lower award should normally be surrendered if the student subsequently elected to continue studying for a higher award. This would only apply for qualifications awarded by Imperial College since Imperial College could not insist on students surrendering qualifications from other institutions.

(ix) That current Regulations for the Award of Taught Master's Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates allowed for candidates to be granted credit transfer (APL) under certain conditions. For example, a growing number of MSc and MRes modules were offered as CPD courses and having successfully completed such courses, students might wish to go on to study the Certificate, Diploma or Master's programme and request credit transfer in that respect. The Committee had agreed that a life span of two years should be applied to CPD modules to be used towards a College qualification.

(x) That the Committee had also agreed that APL of no more than 10 ECTS credits towards a Certificate programme could be considered, provided a suitable Imperial College module had been undertaken. APL of no more than 20 ECTS credits towards a Diploma programme could be considered, provided suitable Imperial College modules had been undertaken and exceptionally no more than 30 ECTS credits if the candidate had been awarded an Imperial College Certificate in the same field. All cases of APL should be referred to the Academic Registrar and the Director of the Graduate School or their nominees for consideration.

(xi) That the Committee had also agreed that each course director should prepare a protocol for their programme of study in terms of prerequisites for Diploma and Master's modules and the maximum number of credits that could be included in an APL request. When offering CPD modules, course organisers must be responsible for counselling candidates appropriately about their progression and qualification options.

(xii) That Certificates and Diplomas may be offered as part-time or full-time qualifications but currently arrangements for credit transfer were only in place for part-time students. The Committee had agreed that applications for credit-transfer should continue to not be permitted for full-time students.

Approved: The changes to the Postgraduate Framework recommended by the Committee, and the consequent amendments to the Regulations for Taught Masters Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates, with immediate effect.

## (2) Amendments to the Regulations for the Award of PhD and MPhil

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, amendments to the 'Attendance and Course of Study' section of the Regulations for the Award of PhD and MPhil, outlined in section 2 of the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

Noted: That the Committee had agreed that submission rates for MPhil would be surveyed at 24 months.

(3) Attendance at Research Degree Viva Examinations

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, a minor amendment to the College's Regulations regarding attendance at research degree viva examinations, so that in the early period of a collaborative or joint degree an independent observer could be appointed, with immediate effect.

(4) Examination Regulations: Students and External Examiners

Reported: (i) That the QAAC had noted that it had become more common for students, whether UG, Master's or PGR, to think nothing of making direct representations to the external examiners appointed for their programme or, if PGR, to examine their thesis. The appointment process for examiners was not secret: nominations for UG and Master's examiners went through the Studies Committees and the Graduate School's Master's Quality Committees on which there were student representatives. The names of external examiners for UG and Master's and their institutional affiliations were also reported to Senate on which there were also student representatives.

(ii) That some supervisors would also discuss the appointment of PGR examiners with their students though the latter had no role in the process. Once the appointment of the examiners had been confirmed by Registry acting on behalf of the Graduate School it was courtesy for the student to learn who they were from their Department. As regards UG and Master's programmes, arrangements were usually made for external examiners to meet students on the programme at some point; in many cases the external examiners would be involved in vivaing some students each year.

(iii) That the advent of the internet had made it easy to track down contact details for anybody including external examiners. There had been recent instances of students raising a grievance or concerns direct with an external examiner at UG, Master's and PGR level. This was both discourteous and inappropriate on behalf of students especially as the College had clear procedures for students to make representations, appeals or complaints about academic issues. The College would wish to shield its external examiners from unauthorised approaches.

(iv) That the Committee had therefore recommended that the Senate approve the following wording, to be included in the Examination Regulations, with immediate effect:

*Students must not make direct contact with the external examiner[s] for their programme of study or research unless they are specifically invited to do so in writing by the examiner[s] concerned. A student who makes unauthorised contact with their external examiner[s] may be liable for disciplinary action.*

Further Reported: That some 'unauthorised contact' with external examiners should not be liable for disciplinary action. For example, unintentionally meeting an external examiner at a conference would not fall into this category. Students should be clearly informed of what was acceptable and what was not permitted.

Approved: The wording recommended by QAAC, with immediate effect, subject to the clarification of the 'direct contact' (i.e. inappropriate contact) that could be liable for disciplinary action.

(5) Amendments to the Procedure for Consideration of Representations by Candidates for Research Degree Examinations

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the slight

modification to the Procedure for Consideration of Representations by Candidates for Research Degree Examinations, outlined in section 5 of the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

(6) Student Withdrawals and Appeals – Procedures for Dealing with Cases of Unsatisfactory Academic Progress

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, a minor amendment to the Procedures for Dealing with Cases of Unsatisfactory Academic Progress, outlined in section 6 of the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

(7) Regulations for Students

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the minor changes to the Regulations for Students, outlined in Appendix 2 of the Senate's paper, with immediate effect.

(8) Collaborative Research Degree Precepts

Reported: That one of the advisable recommendations made by the QAA Audit Team in the College's 2010 Institutional Audit had been that the College should 'review its procedures for the approval and oversight of collaborative provision to ensure that relevant sections of the QAA's Code of Practice are taken into account'. In response to this, the QAAC had agreed a number of actions including that the Graduate School should develop a set of collaborative research degree precepts.

(ii) That the collaborative research degree precepts clarified the additional requirements with which the College's collaborative research degree programmes should comply.

Endorsed: The collaborative research degree precepts, outlined in the Appendix 3 of the Senate's paper.

(9) Procedures for the Review of Collaborative Research Degree Programmes not Owned by Departments

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered draft procedures for the review of collaborative research programmes not 'owned' by a specific academic Department within the College but which were instead established at College or Faculty level with students placed in a number of Departments.

(ii) That as these programmes were not owned by a particular Department within the College, they were not adequately covered by the College's existing review procedures for Departmental research degree provision. Therefore this procedure had been developed in order to ensure that the College had a process to monitor and review these types of collaborative research programmes.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the *Procedures for the Review of Collaborative Research Degree programmes not owned by Departments*, with immediate effect.

(10) Joint Degrees

Reported: That the QAAC had reviewed the College's position with regard to joint degrees to clarify the role each institution should play in any such partnership and which regulations students should be required to follow and when.

Considered and approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, that:

- (i) A lead institution must always be identified when the College was establishing a new collaborative programme.
- (ii) Normally, students registered on collaborative programmes should be subject to the Regulations and Procedures of the lead institution, unless otherwise agreed at the time of programme approval. Both institutions should be informed of and consulted on any action taken by the partner and members of both parties should be involved in the consideration of any student cases, where appropriate.
- (iii) In most cases, the College would be the lead institution unless there was a demonstrable strategic advantage for the partner's Regulations and Procedures to take precedence and the partner's Regulations and Procedures were comparable to those of Imperial. Any proposals for new collaborative programmes should indicate at the time of initial submission to the Strategic Education Committee (SEC) which partner would be the lead.
- (iv) In cases where Imperial was not the lead institution, the College may impose additional criteria to assure itself of the quality and academic standards of the award being made. All Regulations and Procedures must be approved by the Studies Committees/Master's Quality Committees prior to programme approval. The Studies Committees/Master's Quality Committees would need to provide an overview of arrangements to SEC when SEC was asked to confirm its support of the proposed programme. Senate should also receive this information.
- (v) For collaborative research degrees, there would always be a lead supervisor who would normally be from the lead institution.
- (vi) The College's existing collaborative programmes should be considered on an individual basis with a view to moving existing partnerships to the model described above. Where appropriate, existing agreements would be re-negotiated.

(11) 2010 QAA Institutional Audit

Audit Action Plan

Reported: That the Committee had received an update on the College's 2010 Institutional Audit Action Plan, developed in order to address the recommendations made by the QAA Audit Team, and was satisfied with progress made so far. The Committee had heard that the QAA would contact Imperial during summer/autumn 2012 with a request for the College to make its formal follow-up report of action taken since the Institutional Audit. It was expected that the College would need to submit this report in spring 2013.

Student Representation on Departmental and Faculty Committees

Reported: (i) That one of the advisable recommendations made by the QAA following last year's Institutional Audit had been that the College should 'provide a full and consistent level of student representation in all its deliberative academic committees'.

(ii) That in order to address this issue, the Faculty Teaching Committees had been asked to consider the QAA's comments regarding student representation on Departmental and Faculty-level committees and report their comments to the QAAC.

(iii) That the QAAC had considered this information and had agreed that Departments should continue to demonstrate student engagement by inviting students to attend all relevant meetings. The Committee had been pleased that the Faculty of Engineering Teaching Committee was reviewing its terms of reference and membership with a view to further enhancing student representation.

(12) UK Quality Code for Higher Education

Reported: That the QAA had now published its final report of changes that would be made to the academic infrastructure. The academic infrastructure would now be called the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. Further details were provided in the Senate's paper.

(13) The Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR): The Implementation of the Honours Degree Classification Report

Reported: (i) That the Burgess Implementation Steering Group (BISG) had been undertaking trials to develop the HEAR with the aim of sector-wide roll out from the start of the 2012-13 academic session. The HEAR provided a detailed picture of student achievement, encompassing both academic and extra-curricular activities, prizes, voluntary work, employability awards and offices held within the Student Unions, which was verified by the Institution and was intended to provide employers and other stakeholders with a richer record of student achievement whilst at university.

(ii) That the Committee had noted that a range of institutions were implementing the HEAR on a trial basis. The BISG had developed a "starter pack" that provided institutions with the material required to take this initiative forward and the College has been asked whether it would like to develop the HEAR during 2011-12 ahead of the sector-wide roll out in 2012-13. It was reported that the College would not be taking part in the pilot for the 2011-12 session.

(14) QAA Audit of UK Higher Education Provision in Singapore

Reported: (i) That in autumn 2010 the College had contributed to the information-gathering element of the QAA's review of arrangements that UK institutions had with partner providers in Singapore by providing a submission on the A\*Star-Imperial Doctoral Programme (AIP). Representatives from the QAA had visited the College to discuss the programme in November 2010 and had also made a courtesy visit to A\*Star in January 2011. The final report was available at:

<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/InstitutionReports/Reports/Pages/overseas-Imperial-11.aspx>

(ii) That the report had been sent to the academic lead for the programme who had provided a response to the issues highlighted within the case study. The final report and response had been considered by the Graduate School's Postgraduate Research Quality Committee.

(15) Procedures for Establishing Collaborative Modules

Reported: (i) That the Committee had approved a procedure that should be followed and the matters to be considered when establishing collaborative modules: individual modules which formed part of an Imperial College award but that were taught and assessed by another institution/organisation.

(ii) That the Committee was still considering what proportion of the curriculum could be taught/assessed by a partner institution before a programme should be classified as a fully collaborative degree.

(16) Collaborative Programmes: the Nature and Frequency of Site Visits to Partner Institutions

Reported: (i) That the Committee had been reminded that prior to the approval of a new partner institution, a site visit was normally undertaken as part of the College's due diligence

checks in order to assess the resources available at the proposed partner to deliver the proposed programme; the visit should include review of the partner's laboratory and teaching facilities, IT and Library support, student accommodation and social/sports facilities as appropriate.

(ii) That site visits were undertaken by at least one senior member of the College not involved with the Department proposing the programme. Those undertaking site visits were asked to complete a site visit form and the Department proposing the programme was required to fund the visit and any subsequent visits carried out by members of the College throughout the duration of the partnership.

(iii) That the College's *Guidelines for Establishing Collaborative Degree Programmes* stated that the frequency of formal site visits during the partnership should be determined by the Strategic Education Committee (SEC) at the time of partner approval but did not currently provide any guidance on the normal frequency of on-going visits. The Committee had agreed that formal site visits should normally take place once every five years and would be carried out by a senior member of academic staff, not affiliated with the programme. The site visit should be scheduled so that it could help to inform the strategic review of the partnership by the SEC.

#### (17) Guidance for Students on the Publication of Research

Reported: (i) That the Committee had agreed guidance for students on the publication of research. The guidance confirmed that all journal articles must adhere to the Vancouver Protocol which stated that in order to be credited as an author, each author must have been involved with conception and design or analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content and final approval of the version to be published.

(ii) That where the IP was owned by the College the supervisor must be given the opportunity to contribute to the latter two points. Where these rules were broken, they would be investigated under the College's research misconduct rules. It had been agreed that this guidance should be made available to students via postgraduate and undergraduate student handbooks.

#### (18) MRes Degrees and the QAA Code of Practice

Reported: (i) That now MRes courses were considered to be PGR rather than PGT courses, as they involved >50% independent research, they must conform to the *QAA Code of Practice for assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education, Postgraduate research programmes Sept 2004*.

(ii) That this section of the QAA Code of Practice listed 27 precepts that organisations needed to follow to assure the quality of their PGR provision. The code covered a wide range of research qualifications including research masters where the research component was larger than the taught component. However, the Code did allow flexible interpretation.

(iii) That in most cases there were no issues for the College and the precepts were covered by current arrangements for MRes courses. However, the Graduate School had made several recommendations, outlined in the Senate's paper, to ensure compliance with the Code. These had been approved by the Committee.

#### (19) Quality Assurance of Student Placements

Reported: (i) That the Committee had approved a *Procedure for the Establishment, Renewal and Review of Exchange Partners*, which clarified that proposals for new exchange partners, and the renewal of exchange agreements, should be approved by the relevant Studies Committee/Master's Quality Committee. A Student Exchange Agreement

must be signed and lodged with the Assistant Registrar (Placements) prior to an exchange commencing.

(ii) That the new procedure was available on the Registry website at

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/collaborative>

This page also contained *Good Practice for External Curriculum-based Placements* and other resources to assist Departments in the management of student placements.

(20) Staff-Student Committees

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered a report from the ICU Deputy President (Education) on the key items highlighted at undergraduate and postgraduate Staff-Student Committees during spring 2011 and had agreed that the document should be considered by the Faculty Teaching Committees and by the Graduate School's Postgraduate Quality Committees.

(21) Student Surveys

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered the results of Spring SOLE 2011, Spring PG SOLE 2011, Summer SOLE 2011, TOLE 2010-11, NSS 2011 and PRES 2011.

(ii) That the Committee had agreed questions for a new Student Experience Survey which would run during the autumn term.

(22) Final meetings of Boards of Examiners

Reported: That the Committee had received a list, prepared by Registry, of items to be included in the Minutes of Final Boards of Examiners' Meetings. This document was available at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/goodpractice>

(23) Periodic Review

Reported: That the Committee had received a report on good practice identified during periodic reviews which had taken place during the 2010-11 academic session and had agreed that this document would be circulated to the Graduate School's Master's Quality Committees, the Studies Committees and HODs, DPSs and DUGS. This document was available at:

<http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/proceduresandregulations/qualityassurance/coursereviews>

(24) Template Agreements

Reported: That the Registry, in consultation with the Legal Team, had now developed template collaborative agreements for Collaborative Taught Courses, Collaborative Modules and Collaborative Research Degrees.

**1552 Graduate School Master's Quality Committee (Business, Engineering and Physical Sciences)**

Considered: A Report by the Graduate School Master's Quality Committee (Business, Engineering and Physical Sciences) (**Paper Senate/2011/13**).

(1) New Courses

MSc in Statistics

Reported: (i) That the Committee had received a proposal from the Department of Mathematics to introduce a new MSc in Statistics with effect from October 2012.

(ii) That the Committee had heard that the motivation behind the establishment of the course was the demand from industry and government for well trained statisticians. The Department had also noted a growing demand from potential students for the subject. Furthermore, the course would meet the Department's strategic objective to provide Master's courses in all areas of its expertise. The new programme would be fully integrated with and complement existing teaching within the Department.

(iii) That the course would consist of a mixture of compulsory and option modules plus a major project. The Committee had heard that the course would distinguish itself from other programmes at leading UK universities through the breadth and depth of its optional courses. A further distinct feature of the programme would be in the strong links that the Department's Statistics Section had with the financial and statistic sectors. These links would come into play in particular with the major project which could be conducted in conjunction with an external partner.

(iv) That the course would be offered on a full-time basis. The course would attract a premium fee.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the establishment of a full-time MSc in Statistics, with effect from October 2012.

MSc in Economics and Strategy for Business

Reported: (i) That the Committee had received a proposal from the Business School to introduce a new MSc in Economics and Strategy for Business with effect from October 2012.

(ii) That the Committee had noted that the Business School felt that the course would be an excellent strategic fit and the content would reflect the strengths of the Business School and the College in the following areas: economics, strategy, innovation, entrepreneurship, technology, health care management and environment. The course would equip students to understand strategic economic thinking in the context of running a modern organisation. The aim of the programme would be to produce a pool of MSc graduates who could either proceed directly to economics and strategy jobs in a range of established businesses, entrepreneurial ventures or governmental organisations or continue to advanced academic study.

(iii) That the Committee had heard that the Business School had commissioned market research to assess the likely demand for the course and this had concluded that the course would be attractive both to potential students and employers of potential students.

(iv) That the course would be offered on a full-time basis. The course would attract a premium fee.

Noted: That there was an error in the summary degree requirements for the course, attached to the Senate's paper. Instead of stating that the additional entry requirements were 'Normally an Upper Second Class Honours degree...' these should note that 'Normally *at least* an Upper Second Class Honours degree...' was required.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the establishment of a full-time MSc in Economics and Strategy for Business, with effect from October 2012.

#### Postgraduate Diploma in Biomedical Engineering

Reported: (i) That the Committee had received a proposal from the Department of Bioengineering to offer a free-standing Postgraduate Diploma in Biomedical Engineering alongside their existing MSc in Biomedical Engineering.

(ii) That the course would be offered on a part-time basis although the regulations would allow for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma to full-time students in appropriate cases. The full-time Diploma would not be offered as a matter of course but could be offered in exceptional circumstances to students who enrolled on but were unable to complete the MSc. (It would normally be expected that students who enrolled on the MSc programme would complete the MSc programme.)

(iii) That the Committee had heard that the Department felt that the new qualification would attract high quality students from industry with valuable work experience. As the course would be offered part-time over two years alongside the full-time MSc programme there would be no impact on resources, staff or teaching space. The fee for the Postgraduate Diploma would be approximately 2/3 of the MSc course fee.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the establishment of a Postgraduate Diploma in Biomedical Engineering, with effect from October 2012.

#### (2) Major Modifications to Existing Courses

##### MRes in Chemical Biology of Crop Sustainability and Protection

Reported: (i) That the Committee had received a proposal from the Department of Chemistry to offer a part-time version of their existing full-time MRes in Chemical Biology of Crop Sustainability and Protection with effect from October 2012.

(ii) That the Committee had heard that in response to demand, the Department wished to introduce a part-time version of their existing MRes in Chemical Biology of Crop Sustainability and Protection. The course would be run part-time over two years alongside the existing full-time MRes programme. Students would sit the examinations in year 1 (January) and submit their multidisciplinary research project in year 2 (September). There would be no significant impact on resources, staff or teaching space.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the establishment of a part-time MRes in Chemical Biology of Crop Sustainability and Protection, with effect from October 2012.

#### (3) Change of Award Title

##### MSc in Innovation and Entrepreneurship (MSc in Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Management)

Considered and approved: The change of award title of the MSc in Innovation and Entrepreneurship to MSc in Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Management, with effect from 2012 entry.

#### (4) Minor Amendments to Existing Courses

Reported: That the Committee had approved minor amendments to several courses, as outlined in section 4 of the Senate's paper.

1553 **Graduate School Master's Quality Committee (Humanities, Life Sciences and Medicine)**

Considered: A Report by the Graduate School Master's Quality Committee (Humanities, Life Sciences and Medicine) (**Paper Senate/2011/14**).

(1) New Course

MRes in Biodiversity, Informatics and Genomics

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered a proposal for the establishment of an MRes in Biodiversity, Informatics and Genomics which would be taught by the Division of Ecology and Evolution on the Silwood Park Campus.

(ii) That the course aimed to provide students with high-level research training in the latest developments of informatics and genomics for whole-organism research, including conservation, tropical and environmental biology. It would prepare students for a career in academic, government or non-governmental organisations engaged in research into biodiversity.

(iii) That the course was expected to attract students with a broad range of biological degrees (e.g. biology, zoology, plant sciences, microbiology, and environmental sciences), as well as bioinformatics, mathematics or physical sciences. Students would undertake a series of compulsory taught course elements and would complete a 36-week research project during the year. The project, which must be a piece of original research within the broad areas of Biodiversity, Informatics and Genomics covered by Imperial and affiliated research groups, was designed to give practical experience of theoretical, laboratory and/or field-based research as well as opportunities to learn a wide range of skills.

(iv) That research projects might be undertaken outside the College, at suitable external locations (e.g. Natural History Museum, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, NERC Centre for Ecology and Hydrology), but students must be based within College for at least 12 weeks of the project, such that they spent at least six months within College. In such cases two supervisors would be assigned (one at Imperial and one in the host institution) and regular contact would be maintained with the course tutor throughout.

(v) That students would be assessed by a written report of original research and *viva voce* examinations. Coursework would be examined in the form of practical write-ups from the core course components.

(vi) That the course would be available on a full-time only basis over one calendar year. The course would attract the standard fee applied to Master's courses in the Department of Life Sciences.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the establishment of a full-time MRes in Biodiversity, Informatics and Genomics, with effect from October 2012.

(2) Major Modifications to Existing Courses

MSc Health Policy

Reported: (i) That the Committee had considered a request to vary the start date for the MSc in Health Policy, for entry in October 2011. The course was taught and administered by the Centre for Health Policy, under the auspices of the Department of Surgery and Cancer.

(ii) That the MSc in Health Policy was a new course which would run for the first time in 2011-12. A series of external events had led to a late start date being desirable in the current session. The Graduate School would discuss with the Centre for Health Policy whether a non-standard start date would be appropriate in future years, in which case a separate request would be made.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, a non-standard start date of 21 November for the MSc in Health Policy, for the 2011-12 academic year only.

### MSc Quantitative Biology

Reported: (i) That the MSc in Quantitative Biology course had been established as a programme run jointly by the Life Sciences and the Mathematics Departments. Due to staff departures, the Mathematics Department was no longer able to continue teaching on the course. The Life Sciences Department was now solely responsible for organising the programme.

(ii) That the Committee had considered a request from the Department of Life Sciences for Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) Department of Mathematics staff to teach three modules on the course during 2011-12.

(iii) That RHUL would be responsible for all aspects of the delivery of these modules, including setting, supervising, marking and providing feedback on all coursework and assessments required as part of the modules. RHUL staff would prepare questions for summative examinations; these questions would be vetted and approved by the Imperial external examiner and must also be approved by Imperial staff. All assessments required as part of the modules would take place at Imperial and all module handbooks would be produced by Imperial.

(iv) That RHUL would appoint a member of academic staff as the day to day coordinator who would be responsible for the management of all aspects of the modules at RHUL and who would act as the first point of contact for students in all matters relating to welfare, teaching and the curriculum for the modules. This was in addition to the welfare and teaching support provided by Imperial to the students. At Imperial there would also be a named academic who would take overall responsibility for the management of the modules.

(v) That the Committee had approved a list of the RHUL staff who would be teaching on the course. These staff would be given honorary appointments by Imperial. They would also become members of the Imperial College Board of Examiners for the MSc Quantitative Biology.

(vi) That an agreement, outlining these arrangements, had been prepared.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, the delivery of three modules on the MSc in Quantitative Biology by Royal Holloway University of London staff for the 2011-12 academic year only.

### (3) Minor Amendments to Existing Courses

Reported: That the Committee had approved minor amendments to several courses, as outlined in section 3 of the Senate's paper.

Noted: That since the Senate papers had been circulated the Graduate School had also approved a request from the Department of Life Sciences to suspend entry to the MSc Plant Science and Biotechnology in October 2012.

## 1554 Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee

Considered: A Report by the Graduate School Postgraduate Research Quality Committee (Paper Senate/2011/15).

### (1) EngD in Water Engineering

Reported: That the Committee had received a proposal from Dr Mike Templeton, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Imperial co-ordinator for the STREAM IDC, for a minor amendment to the EngD in Water Engineering regulations to allow students to complete their two technical modules and transferable skills courses at anytime during the programme (but before the submission of their thesis). The previous requirement had stipulated that students must take at least one technical module in each of their second and third years. The proposed change was supported by all the STREAM IDC institutions.

Approved: On the recommendation of the Committee, this minor amendment to the EngD in Water Engineering regulations, with immediate effect.

### (2) A\*Star-Imperial Doctoral Programme Singapore Case Study

Reported: That the Committee had considered the QAA's review of Imperial's A\*Star Imperial Doctoral Programme (AIP) and had agreed that Imperial's academic lead for the programme had satisfactorily addressed the issues raised by the reviewers. The Committee had also recommended that the academic lead for the programme should ensure all students were made aware of their individual milestones and any reports that were needed by either A\*Star or Imperial.

### (3) PRES Results 2011

Reported: That the Committee had considered a summary report of the PRES results for 2011. The Committee had been pleased to see improvements on the last survey but were concerned that overall Imperial came slightly below other Russell Group Institutions in some areas. The Committee had noted that the response rate to the survey was very variable and had agreed that mechanisms needed to be put in place to ensure better response rates in future. Although not statistically significant, it was noted that there was a drop in satisfaction with opportunities to develop transferable skills. The Committee was confident that the changes implemented as a result of the review of transferable skills training and as a result of the Graduate School merger would improve this rating in the longer term. The Committee agreed that they would like to see further breakdown of the results by overseas/home students and by campus.

### (4) Quasi Campuses

Reported: (i) That the Committee had been supportive of a proposal made by the Graduate School Director and Academic Registrar for designating some specialist research institutions (eg CERN, the Diamond Light Source and Harwell Science Campus in Oxfordshire) 'quasi campuses'. Quasi campus status would be bestowed on institutions where Imperial staff were based and where a significant number of Imperial research students were carrying out their research on a full-time basis. Students based at a quasi campus would not have to attend Imperial for a prescribed period as for example PRI students, who had a requirement to attend Imperial for two months per year, did.

(ii) That the Graduate School was now finalising the procedure for approving locations as quasi campuses and this would come to Senate shortly for approval.

## 1555 **Careers Advisers' Committee**

Considered: The annual report of the Careers Advisers' Committee for 2010-11 (**Paper Senate/2011/16**).

Reported: (1) That in the last year the Careers Advisory Service had continued to develop and refine delivery to students, graduates and employers, and had again achieved all the targets set for development in last year's annual report including expanding the number and variety of careers forums, continuing to focus on the development of students' interview and assessment centre skills and expanding the use of IT to provide support for students and alumni.

(2) That the high demand for one to one appointments during the autumn term continued (9% increase on the previous year in 2010-11) and was partly met by the use of an hourly paid pool of advisers supporting the work of the full time Careers Adviser team.

(3) That throughout the year the Service continued to obtain feedback from recruiters on the performance of Imperial College students in the selection process. Anecdotal evidence still suggested that Imperial College students were not performing as well as they could in one to one interviews and assessment centres specifically in describing and marketing their skills and abilities. The Careers Advisory Service had continued to place emphasis on these areas in workshops and seminars and also in employer led activities.

(4) That the results of the 2010-11 Destination of Leavers from Higher Education Survey had shown that 6.8% of the College's home and EU undergraduates were unemployed six months after graduation. This remained below the national average of 9%.

Further Reported: (1) That changes to the College's Careers Advisers' Committee were proposed, as outlined in section 4 of the Senate's paper. The current Careers Advisers' Committee would cease to be a Senate subcommittee, changing its name to the Careers Advisers' Forum, and a new committee named the Careers Advisory Service Committee would be formed. This committee would report to Senate with a further dotted reporting line to the College's Strategic Education Committee (SEC).

(2) That the remit of the new committee would be to monitor the role and strategic objectives of the Careers Advisory Service (CAS) rather than monitoring day to day operational delivery. Reporting annually to SEC as well as Senate would ensure that CAS was aligned to the College's strategic objectives. The current members of the Careers Advisers' Committee supported this proposal.

Approved: The changes to the Careers Advisers' Committee, with immediate effect.

## 1556 **Information and Communication Technologies**

Considered and approved: The annual report to Senate by the Director of Information and Communication Technologies (**Paper Senate/2011/17**).

Reported: (1) That IT and library services had received a high score in the recent NSS survey. The annual ICT survey of staff and students had been carried out in the Summer term and ICT had received a 94% satisfaction rating. The detailed results were currently being reviewed before publication.

(2) That usage of the Blackboard Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) during 2010/11 continued to be extensive, with peak monthly usage of 12,000 individuals. The system reported concurrent usage often in excess of 700 users with an absolute peak of over 1,000 users for the first time. The ICT E-Learning Services team worked closely with Faculty Learning Technologists to identify technologies to support innovative teaching and was also

working with the College's E-Learning Strategy Committee to review the College supported VLE.

(3) That ICT continued to receive a significant number of copyright notices. The Division was monitoring this and was investigating mechanisms to prevent peer to peer software on the College network, which would considerably reduce the number of notices and could lead to removal of the 5Gbyte download limit on student hall networks.

(4) That there had been a serious issue with illegal use of Mathematica software, which had brought the College into conflict with the supplier, Wolfram: a large number of students had downloaded the software from the internet and applied an illegal software key. As part of the resolution of this dispute, ICT had put in place a mechanism to check all licence requests made by the software to Wolfram's licence servers. Machines used which did not have a registered legitimate licence were banned from the College network until a valid licence was configured.

#### **1557 Prizes and Medals Established/Amended**

Considered: Recommendations concerning a number of prizes, as detailed in **Paper Senate/2011/18**.

Approved: The establishment of the Company Prize of the Worshipful Company of International Bankers, the Imperial College Business School Prize for the Best Overall Performance on the MSc Strategic Marketing, the Imperial College Business School Prize for the Best Performance on the Strategy and Leadership Pathway, the Imperial College Business School Prize for the Best Project Performance on the MSc Strategic Marketing, the MSc Finance Prize for Financial Econometrics, the MSc Innovation and Entrepreneurship Core Course Prize, the MSc Innovation and Entrepreneurship Overall Performance Prize, the MSc Risk Management and Financial Engineering Prize for Financial Statistics, the MSc Risk Management and Financial Engineering Project and Applied Financial Research Prize, the Sigma-Aldrich Prize, the Stochastic Calculus Prize and the William Harvey Prize.

#### **1558 Prizes and Medals Awarded**

Reported: The award of prizes and medals, as detailed in **Paper Senate/2011/19**.

#### **1559 Scholarships Awarded**

Reported: The award of scholarships, as detailed in **Paper Senate/2011/20**.

#### **1560 Provisional Student Numbers 2011-12**

Received: Statistics of provisional student numbers for the current session (**Paper Senate/2011/21**).

#### **1561 Staff Matters**

Received: A Note by the Rector (**Paper Senate/2011/22**).

#### **1562 Representation Concerning Decisions of Examiners**

Received: A Note by the Academic Registrar (**Paper Senate/2011/23**).

#### **1563 Appointment of External Examiners 2010-11**

Received: The names and affiliations of External Examiners for undergraduate and

Master's degrees in 2010-11 appointed since the last Senate meeting (**Paper Senate/2011/24**).

**1564 Strategic Education Committee**

Received: The Executive Summaries of the meetings of the Strategic Education Committee held on 21 June and 13 October 2011 (**Paper Senate/2011/25**).

**1565 Graduate School Report**

Received: A Report by the Graduate School (**Paper Senate/2011/26**).

(1) Graduate Schools' Merger

Reported: That the Graduate School was pleased to announce the appointment of Dr David McPhail as Deputy Director of the Graduate School. Amongst other duties, Dr McPhail would chair the Master's Quality Committee for Business, Engineering and Physical Sciences. Dr Bernadette Byrne had been appointed the chair of the new Postgraduate Professional Development Committee; this Committee replaced the separate GSEPS Academic Training Committee and the GSLSM Academic Training Committee. The Graduate School tutor team had also been re-branded the 'Postgraduate Development Unit, Graduate School'.

(2) Director's Award for Transferable Skills Training – Dr Colin Belton

Reported: That the Graduate School was pleased to announce that Dr Colin Belton of the Department of Physics was the 2011 recipient of the annual Graduate School Director's Award for Transferable Skills Training. The award recognised the outstanding contribution to and support for the Graduate School's transferable skills training programme amongst Imperial academic and research staff. The award had been presented at the Graduate School's Moon Regan Trans-Antarctic: One Year On guest lecture on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

(3) Reports of External Examiners 2009/10

Reported: (i) That during 2010-11, the GSEPS and GSLSM Postgraduate Quality Committees had reviewed the comments received from External Examiners in respect of the 2009-10 academic session (and some late reports from 2008-9), together with the responses to the comments from Departments.

(ii) That the Committees had pursued issues which had been raised as needing attention and had taken particular note of areas of good practice which were highlighted in the reports. A copy of the minutes of these discussions, which included full details, were appended to the Senate's paper.

(4) Outcomes of the Course Review Process and Review of Research Degrees Procedures for 2010-11 review period

Reported: (i) That all taught postgraduate courses were reviewed on a regular basis. The report of the taught course evaluations undertaken by the GSEPS and GSLSM Postgraduate Quality Committees for the 2009-10 cohort was appended to the Senate's paper.

(ii) That research degree procedures within Departments were also reviewed on a regular basis. The report of the assessments undertaken by the GSEPS and GSLSM Postgraduate Quality Committees during the academic year 2010-11 was attached to the Senate's paper.

**1566 Senate Sub-Committees**

Received: Updates to the Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership of the Senate's sub-committees for 2011-12 (**Paper Senate/2011/27**).

Noted: That the Graduate School Postgraduate Quality Committees had been renamed Graduate School Master's Quality Committees.

**1567 Suspension of Academic Regulations**

Reported: Action taken on behalf of the Senate by the Chairman to suspend academic regulations, as detailed in **Paper Senate/2011/28**.

**1568 Award of Degrees and Diplomas**

Reported: That under the provisions of University of London Ordinance 9(2) and Imperial College London Ordinance B1(1), and with the terms of SM 8 of October 1998, that the Academic Registrar had acted on behalf of the Senate in approving the awards for undergraduate and postgraduate degrees for candidates who had satisfied the examiners in the examination and satisfied all other necessary requirements for the award of the degrees, and that degrees had been conferred on these candidates, the date being as indicated on the award.

**1569 Any Other Business**

Change of Name of Department

Reported: (i) That the Faculty of Engineering wished to change the name of the Department of Chemical Engineering and Chemical Technology to Department of Chemical Engineering.

(ii) That the term 'Chemical Technology' was a pre-WWII term used to describe the then-nascent discipline of what became Chemical Engineering, and had remained appended to the Department's name since then. The rationale for now amending the Department's name was that over the years the additional term 'Technology' had become redundant and the shortened title was now the de facto title used in everything but official College documents. In essence, Chemical Engineering was the more accurate and definitely concise description of the Department's activities.

(iii) That the Management Board had given approval to this name change on 28 October 2011.

Endorsed: The proposal to change the name of the Department of Chemical Engineering and Chemical Technology to Department of Chemical Engineering.

Noted: That Council would consider this matter formally at its meeting on 25 November 2011.