Minutes of the College Education Committee held at 2pm on Wednesday 3 December in Room 1.11 Franklin Wilkins Building, Waterloo Campus

Attendance

Chair
Vice-Principal (Students) Professor P Whitfield

One member nominated by each School
Biomedical Health Sciences Professor P Emery
Dental Institute Dr M Woolford
Humanities Dr S Massai
Law Dr T Aplin
Medicine Professor A Greenough
Nursing and Midwifery Mrs A Parry
Physical Science and Engineering Professor A Mainwood
Social Science and Public Policy Dr M Goodman

Ex officio
Director of KLI Professor P Blackmore
Director of the Graduate School Professor V Robinson
Chair of the College Assessment Board Professor T Macklem (vice Dr K Wolff)
KCLSU nominee Mr P Ellender

In attendance
Deputy College Secretary and Academic Registrar Mr B Salter
Director, Services for Students Ms J Briggs
Deputy Director ISS Dr M Davies
Deputy Registrar (Quality Assurance) Ms H Placito
Graduate School Administrator Ms J Eldridge
Corporate Services Ms F Brogan

Apologies for absence were received from: Professor P Salkovskis

Before the start of the meeting the Chair took the opportunity to wish Brian Salter, long standing member of the Committee and its antecedents, good luck in his retirement and to thank him for his important input into the work of the Committee over the years.

Professor Tom Pitt-Ford

On a more sombre note the Chair also spoke of the memorial service that been held earlier in the day to pay tribute to Professor Tom Pitt-Ford and to celebrate the many contributions he had made to the College and the dental profession.
Part 1: Housekeeping

18. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER BUSINESS
18.1 Reported: that there were no items of any other business to be taken.

19. MINUTES
19.1 Noted: in respect of minute 9.10 relating to the review of joint honours provision, that a summary of the review would be not forthcoming in the near future as the working group was set to run for two years.

19.2 Approved: the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2008 (CEC7M).

20. MATTERS ARISING
20.1 Reported: that in respect of minute 3.3 relating to life long email addresses, that following the withdrawal of the Microsoft offer, the Alumni Office was currently evaluating two options from different suppliers, details of which could be obtained from the Alumni Office;

20.2 that it was stressed that when considering the options, the Alumni Office should also take into account the requirements of a range of users as access to alumni was also important for Schools and Departments;

20.3 that in respect of minute 3.3 relating to pre-registration access to College IT services, that there should be a working system by February which would be piloted and if successful should be operational by August. This would enable any student with an offer of 'unconditional firm' to have access to a version of MyKCL;

20.4 that the Chair was satisfied that these issues could now be passed to the Alumni Office and ISS, respectively, to be dealt with. However, if there were issues regarding the progress of the above projects that the Committee would reinstate this as an agenda item;

20.5 that in respect of minute 10.7 relating to social and catering space at the Guy's campus, the Director of Estates would take this forward with a view to incorporating it into the College's strategic estates planning;

20.6 that the Students' Union had recently conducted a 'Rant week' and the lack of social facilities (eg lockers, places to eat and meet) came up across all campuses. The information collected would be used by the Student Council to inform their priorities for the forthcoming year. It was felt that this would be a useful document for the Committee to consider at a future meeting and an executive summary was requested;

20.7 that in respect of minute 10.12 relating to the identification of the probationary status of lecturing staff, that the software that collated information for academic staff did not currently have a field to record probationary status, the Chair would pursue this with the Director of Human Resources.

21. GOVERNANCE MATTERS (minute CEC: 08/09: 4.2 refers)
21.1 Received: for information clarification of the role of the Graduate School in governance matters (CEC: 08/09: 14).
21.2 Noted: that the Graduate School was not a formal governance body and it did not carry out the governance functions required of a School.

Part 2: For consideration

22. THE KING’S GRADUATE PROJECT (minute CEC: 08/09: 5 refers).
22.1 Received: for consideration a report on the responses from Schools to the King’s Graduate Project (CEC: 08/09: 15).

22.2 Reported: that each School had provided a detailed response to the King’s Graduate Project report in which there were a number of generally agreed principles. However, it was clear from the responses that a ‘one size’ fits all approach was not achievable in a complex and varied institution;

22.3 that the Committee endorsed the broad thrust of the report and its five general principles. It was proposed that the working groups, which had run their course, should be stood down; the Steering Group would continue and would drive the project forward. It was important to note that the Project report was not an end point, rather it was part of a process of ongoing dialogue and consultation. The next stage of the project would be to engage on a School by School basis to build a framework for the future;

22.4 that the comments and suggestions made by Schools in their responses would not be lost but would be used to inform the next stage of the consultation process with Schools;

22.5 that a progress report would be made at the next meeting of the Academic Board where it would be received by a wide audience as all Heads of department and Heads of division had been invited to attend that meeting.

22.6 Agreed; that it would be premature to produce a revised Learning and Teaching Strategy until the discussions with individual Schools about their responses to the Project report had been held.

23. NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY 2008 (minute 7 refers)
23.1 Received: for consideration the report of the NSS Task Force (CEC: 08/09: 16).

23.2 Reported: that the rapid ideas were intended to move things forward alongside the mid to longer term strategies designed to improve the student experience. The key immediate action was to ensure that all final year students were given an opportunity to have a one-to-one discussion with a member of academic staff about their academic progress. The Principal had already written to all Heads of School to request that this be actioned;

23.3 that in respect of feedback, that students’ expectations of feedback needed to be managed, it was important for them to understand when they were receiving feedback and that it came in many different forms. In return students should be provided with a clear and realistic expectation of when they would receive feedback;

23.4 that in respect of paragraph 2.4 of the report relating to the archiving of examination scripts, the suggestion that students should have access to their examination scripts for feedback purposes should be explored further. It was felt that there would only be pedagogical benefits to this if the students were
talked through the markers comments and the logistics and resources of this would also need to be explored further.

23.5 **Agreed:** that these issues would be taken forward by the College Assessment Board.

23.6 **Approved:** the Task Force recommendation for the 2009 Survey namely that:
- the Survey should open for King’s students in the week beginning 2 February 2009
- the option to include additional questions be taken up and the categories to be included (five allowed) to be Careers, Social Opportunities, Course Delivery, Learning Community and Intellectual Motivation
- the institution-specific question should remain the same as the previous year namely “Taking into account my overall experience, I would recommend King’s College London to potential students as a place to study.”

24. **ANNUAL REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS FOR 2007/08 – UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES**

24.1 **Received:** for approval, the outstanding annual reports from Schools and information missing from previously submitted reports (CEC: 08/09: 17a-d).

24.2 **Reported:** that the introduction of the scrutiny panels was working well as they allowed the reports to be given detailed attention and inspection;

24.3 that the reports gave a detailed account of the year’s activities highlighting the main areas of concern and how these were being resolved.

24.4 **Biomedical and Health Sciences:** with reference to Equivalent and Lower Qualification (ELQ) students, that the fees for these students would be set £1000 higher than the EU/Home fees in the hope that the College could generate an ELQ market; this would be kept under review. The opportunity for Schools to charge more than this would be open for discussion. Each School would have an ELQ intake target and it was important that such students were aware of the fees that they would be charged;

24.5 that the report had noted some confusion over progression requirements which had been resolved but the School should ensure that all progression requirements were clear and were understood by students; **School of BHS**

24.6 **Law:** that the School had concerns regarding the depressive effect of the C score of 2-3% on aggregate degree classifications. The Assessment/Feedback working group of the KGP had established a proposition to ameliorate this but that further research was necessary; the College Assessment Board would take this forward;

24.7 that following the abolition of the committee structure at School level it was not clear how the core governance functions were being fulfilled, and that this must be addressed, in particular how students were involved in the process. The School was asked to provide a response to these concerns; **School of Law**

24.8 **Physical Science and Engineering:** that the panel noted the request for the College to consider the introduction of automating attendance but it was not immediately obvious how this could be resolved;
that the School had noted (as had a number of others) that the development of template reports from SITS to allow better extraction and analysis of data had stalled. This development needed to be accelerated.

24.10 **Approved:** the above reports and missing information from the School of Medicine, subject to the provision of a response from the School of Law to the information required in minute 24.7.

25. **ANNUAL REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS FOR 2007/08 – TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES**

25.1 **Received:** for approval annual reports from Schools (CEC: 08/09: 18a-g).

25.2 **Reported:** that the reports gave a detailed account of the year’s activities highlighting the main areas of concern and how these were being resolved.

25.3 that reports had not been received from two Schools; these should be submitted to the Committee Secretary as soon as possible

25.4 **Dentistry:** that this was a very positive report which highlighted the active response to changing markets for programmes with very thorough processes for assessing students progress. The scrutiny panel also noted the active engagement with research with many student research reports being published;

25.5 **Humanities:** that the scrutiny panel noted that the question in respect of links with employers was answered with a ‘not applicable’. The School was asked to provide a response to this question;

25.6 **Law:** that the credit framework allowed for a maximum of 30 credits to be condoned and that this had caused problems for the LLM programme which had packaged its modules into volumes of 20 and 40 credits. However, other Schools who had the same credit volumes had not experienced the same issues as those raised by the LLM programme;

25.7 that the scrutiny panel did not agree with the School’s assertion that it was irrational to require students to be reassessed and for condonement to be granted only after all attempts had been exhausted;

25.8 that there was no mention, under collaborative activity, of the MSc Construction Law joint programme with the National University of Singapore and this should be included. It was noted that the programme was in abeyance but that it should be included as there were still students registered who were yet to complete;

25.9 that following the abolition of the committee structure at School level it was not clear how the core governance functions were being fulfilled, and that this must be addressed in particular how student’s were involved in the process. The School was asked to provide a response to these concerns;

25.10 **Institute of Psychiatry:** that the scrutiny panel noted that the programme leaders away day was good practice. It was also noted that every new programme required employer support;
25.11 **Medicine:** that the scrutiny panel noted the active engagement with peer review as good practice;

25.12 that the School reported difficulties in relation to the ethical approval panel and the timescale associated with the approval process. It was noted that the Panel was newly established and that it was hoped that in time it would evolve and that the approval process for non controversial, non intervention research would be expedited;

25.13 **Physical Science and Engineering:** that the scrutiny panel noted that the comments made by the External Examiners were good examples of constructive comments;

25.14 **Social Science and Public Policy:** with reference to ELQ students see minute 24.4 above;

25.15 that the scrutiny panel noted the responsive action to students’ needs and provision of better feedback and also the extensive links with employers;

25.16 that with reference to overseas students and their standard of English, the School was encouraged to use the facilities offered by the English Language Centre;

25.17 that the School had experienced problems with access to information on incoming students, in particular there was a lack of information regarding students’ module choices. It was suggested that this was likely to be because the School was not using the on-line module diets which allowed students to register for modules via myKCL.

25.18 **Approved:** the above reports, subject to the provision of the missing information required in minute 25.5, 25.8 and 25.9.

26. **ANNUAL REPORTS FROM SCHOOLS FOR 2007/08 – POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRAMMES**

26.1 **Received:** for approval annual reports from Schools (CEC: 08/09: 19a-g).

26.2 **Reported:** that reports had not been received from two Schools, these should be submitted to the Committee Secretary as soon as possible;

26.3 that the reports submitted were satisfactory and showed that the Schools were adhering to the **Core code of practice**, the scrutiny panel noted the following generic issues:

26.4 **Facilities:** that a number of Schools had made concerted efforts to improve the quality and quantity of workspace. Workspace was one of the key areas of dissatisfaction identified in the PRES survey in 2008;

26.5 **Training:** that some Schools had encouraged their students to suggest and in some instances organise training that they felt was not currently provided;

26.6 **Supervision:** that a number of Schools were organising refresher sessions designed to encourage supervisors to reflect on their supervisory practice. Attendance at these sessions was being monitored and used where necessary to encourage greater involvement;
26.7 Events: that some high profile events had been organised at which students had presented their research findings to an invited audience;

26.8 Support: that the Institute of Psychiatry had introduced a ‘buddy’ system whereby each new postgraduate student was mentored by a more senior student; this was considered excellent practice and something other Schools should consider introducing.

26.9 Approved: the above reports.

27. ROLLING SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMME REVIEW AND ONE YEAR FOLLOW-UP

27.1 Received: for approval, to re-approve the programmes for a further six years, reports from the following programme reviews:

- Programmes in the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies (CEC: 08/09: 20a)
- Programmes in the Department of Film Studies (CEC: 08/09: 20b)
- Programmes in the English Language Centre (CEC: 08/09: 20c)
- Programmes in the Department of Theology and Religious Studies (CEC: 08/09: 20d).

27.2 Received: for approval a progress report on the following programme review:

- MSc Neuroscience (CEC: 08/09: 21a)

27.3 Reported: that a scrutiny panel had reviewed the review reports and follow-up report and highlighted the following issues:

27.4 Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies: that the commendable aspects section of the form was a bit thin and that the text in the main body of the report could be used to supplement this section of the form; School of Hum

27.5 Film Studies: that the review panel had commended the Department as a particularly good example of excellence in relation to the dissemination of feedback;

27.6 English Language Centre: that the Centre had made great progress in raising its profile as a central academic resource to train and support prospective and current students. Work was ongoing to formalise quality assurance arrangements and reporting lines following the Centre’s move out of the School of Humanities;

27.7 Theology: that some of the information provided in student handbooks relating to the credit framework was incorrect. However, the Department had given assurances that all students would be notified as a matter of urgency;

27.8 that three of the four review reports had highlighted problems with departmental space and accommodation that required urgent attention. The Chair would seek a progress report on the matter.

27.9 Approved: the following reports to re-approve the programmes for a further six years, subject to the provision of the missing information required in minute 27.4.
• Programmes in the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies
• Programmes in the Department of Film Studies
• Programmes in the English Language Centre
• Programmes in the Department of Theology and Religious Studies

and the following progress report

• MSc Neuroscience

27.10 **Received:** *for approval*, a request from the School of Social Science and Public Policy to defer the programme review of undergraduate programmes in Geography that was due this session (CEC: 08/09: 22).

27.11 **Reported:** that a number of programmes would be discontinued in September 2009 and to conduct a review of these seemed an unnecessary use of resources. The remaining programmes had been subjected to an extensive review in the past year in order to devise new programmes that remained attractive to students and incorporated up-to-date skills, knowledge and teaching methodologies. This review had involved students and input from external specialist. The School was therefore, requesting to defer the submission of the review of undergraduate programmes in Geography until after the first cohort of students had graduated in 2011.

27.12 **Approved:** the above request.

27.13 **Received:** *for information*, a list of outstanding programme review reports and progress reports due in 2007/08 (CEC: 08/09: 23).

28. **COLLABORATIVE PROVISION**

28.1 **Received:** *for outline approval to proceed* the following proposals:

• joint MSc in Orthodontics with the University of Malta (CEC: 08/09: 24a)
• joint MA in Global, International and Comparative History with Georgetown University (CEC: 08/09: 24b)

28.2 **Reported:** that there were pre-existing Memoranda of Understanding in place with Georgetown University which was one of the College’s strategic partners;

28.3 that the University of Malta would allow access to the North African market which otherwise would not be accessible as the cost associated with living in London made it prohibitive for most students.

28.4 **Approved:** the outline approval to proceed with the above proposals.

28.5 **Received:** *for information*, a report on new partnerships entered into between September and November 2008 (CEC: 08/09: 24c).

29. **ASSESSMENT ISSUES**

29.1 **Received:** *for approval* from the King’s Graduate Project Working Group on Assessment and feedback, a report on the moderated marking pilot and recommendations for future action (CEC: 08/09: 25).
29.2 **Reported:** that the College had conducted a moderated marking pilot in 2007/08 which was very successful and had been very well received by markers and External Examiners. The Working Group had examined the outcome of the pilot alongside the practices of other higher education institutions in the sector and devised a new marking framework and a suite of marking models to replace the current College requirement of double marking all summative assessments;

29.3 that the suite of marking models would allow those with the expertise and knowledge at module level to assign the most appropriate method within the constraints of the marking framework and subject to School Board approval.

29.4 **Approved:** *for recommendation to the Academic Board,* the marking framework and marking models with a further recommendation that the introduction of the marking framework be withheld until the start of next academic session and that all External Examiners should be notified of the new marking methods.

30. **FORA**
30.1 **Received:** verbal reports from the most recent meetings of the various Fora:
   - Taught postgraduate Forum

30.2 **Reported:** that the Forum had considered issues relating to Bologna and were covered below.

31. **BOLOGNA ISSUES**
31.1 **Received:** *for consideration* current issues in respect of the Bologna process together with recommendations for future action *(CEC: 08/09: 26a)* and proposals for the development of MRes degrees *(CEC: 08/09: 26b).*

31.2 **Reported:** that in respect of the Diploma supplement that these were designed to make the content of degrees more transparent; currently further development of SITS was required before they could be produced by SITS and this was on the SITS development agenda;

31.3 that in respect of 1 Year Masters, that 180 UK credits from a one year masters programme equated to 90ECTS credits, the Bologna recommendation was 90-120 ECTS. This made the UK masters only marginally acceptable in some instances and many countries did not accept the UK masters qualification as adequate preparation for a PhD;

31.4 that in respect of Integrated Masters, that these programmes were equivalent to a bachelors plus an additional 120 M level credits (60 ECTS) and that an additional 30 credits were needed in the final year to make them equivalent to a Bachelor and Masters degree under Bologna. Imperial College had introduced an optional additional 30 credits which students could take over the summer vacation. The College could also consider this as an option if it was felt there would be market for it;

31.5 that in respect of MRes degrees the following recommendations were made:

31.6 that Schools should be encouraged to introduce more Masters by research programmes;
31.7 that the research component of MRes programmes should be allowed to exceed 90 credits without special permission being required and that a 120 credit research component should be considered acceptable [Regulation A4 1.5 refers]; A change to the Regulations would be required to enact this;

31.8 that existing and new Masters programmes could become extended to become Bologna compatible MRes degrees. It was noted that a number of extended programmes were currently being designed and that an appropriate nomenclature would need to be agreed;

31.9 that members were invited to comment on the questions raised in the paper and that the responses would be fed into the Taught postgraduate Forum.

32. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
32.1 Received: for consideration a paper from the Director of the Graduate School on KPIs for postgraduate research degrees (CEC: 08/09: 27).
32.2 Reported: that similar consideration should be given as to what KPIs the Committee, in conjunction with the College Assessment Board, should be considering in respect of undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes;
32.3 that a key role of the Graduate School was to take an institutional overview and to identify and publicise where Schools were working beyond the minimum requirements and to assist those who were not achieving those standards;
32.4 that a standardised processes for analysing data would be devised and once in place discussions would be held, through the Graduate Forum, about the selection and calculation of KPIs;
32.5 that a scrutiny panel, comprised of Heads of Graduate Studies from each School, would consider the KPIs for each School to establish best practice within the institution. Any significant deviation from the institutional norm that could detract from the student experience would be drawn to the attention of the Heads of School. The response from the Head of School would then be considered by the Graduate School and reported to this Committee.

33. SCRUTINITY PANELS
33.1 Reported: that the scrutiny panels were working effectively and gratitude was expressed to those who had volunteered to be on them, it was hoped the composition of the panels would be rotated so that the onus did not always fall on the same individuals.

Part 3: For information

34. PROGRAMME APPROVAL ACTIVITY 2008/09
34.1 Noted: for information the following intended programme approvals for 2008/09 (updated from previous meeting) (CEC: 08/09: 28);
34.2 with reference to the School of Law, that the UG Dip in Law should be removed from the list.
35. **QAA INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT 2009**
35.1 **Reported**: that a briefing meeting for Schools would be held in January to provide further information on preparations for the audit. The dates for the audit had now been confirmed as 20-22 October for the briefing visit and 23-27 November for the main audit visit.

36. **REVIEW OF CREDIT FRAMEWORK**
36.1 **Reported**: that one of the recommendations of the Quality Assurance Review Group had been that there should be a review of the implementation of the credit framework after the first year of operation. Volunteers were required to sit on a working group to take this forward.

37. **SECTOR ACTIVITY**
37.1 • QAA Higher Quality no 28
• QAA Outcomes from institutional audit: Staff support and development
   [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/outcomes/series2/StaffSupDev.asp](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/outcomes/series2/StaffSupDev.asp)
• QAA Outcomes from institutional audit: Arrangements for joint, combined and multidisciplinary programmes
   [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/outcomes/series2/ArrangementsCMP.asp](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/outcomes/series2/ArrangementsCMP.asp)
• HEFCE report Graduates and their early careers
• HEA report, The effects of programme assessment environments on student learning

38. **DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**
38.1 **Noted**: the future meetings of the Committee for 2008/09 all at 2pm on Wednesday were as follows:

   11 February 2009 Old Committee Room, Strand Campus.
   22 April 2009 Room G4/12, New Hunt House, Guy's Campus.
   27 May 2009 Room 6.13, James Clerk Maxwell Building, Waterloo Campus.
   1 July 2009 Old Committee Room, Strand Campus.

Secretary: Hilary Placito, Deputy Registrar (Quality Assurance)
Telephone: ex3387
Email: hilary.placito@kcl.ac.uk
November 2008