



**CITY GRADUATE SCHOOL COMMITTEE  
MEETING 19  
21 SEPTEMBER 2017  
C103  
UNCONFIRMED MINUTES**

<b>Name of Member</b>	<b>Meeting 19 21/09/2017</b>
Professor Ken Grattan (Chair)	✓
Professor Andrew Jones	A
Professor Steve Cottrell	✓
Professor Gary Morgan	✓
Professor Charles Baden-Fuller (Senate representative)	A
Professor Chris Hull	A
Professor Davide Ravasi	A
Professor Giovanni Cespa	
Professor Panos Koutrakos	✓
Stephanie Wilson	✓
Dr Youyou Yan	A
Professor Pam Parker	A
Professor Susannah Quinsee	A
Malek Arab (SU, Vice-President, Education)	A
Aurora Herrera (student representative)	---

In attendance: Claire Packham (Library representative), Alison Edridge (Secretary), Richard Alderman (observing).

- ✓ indicates attendance;
- indicates a period when the member is on extended leave/when the person was not a member;
- A indicates apologies have been provided

**Part One: Preliminary Items**

**1. Welcome and Apologies**

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed members. Apologies for absence were noted. Richard Alderman, who would be taking up the post of Assistant Registrar (Research Degrees) on 2 October 2017 and who would be Secretary to the Committee, was in attendance as an observer.

**2. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the City Graduate School Committee held on 13 February 2017 were **approved** subject to a correction to the attendance list to show that Dr Mauro Barelli attended the meeting.

### 3. Matters arising from the minutes

The Committee **noted** the status of matters arising provided in a documented report. In addition, the following points were discussed:

- Item 4, 7 October 2016 – The Chair encouraged members to continue to provide details of potential doctoral projects for the website as a means of attracting high quality applicants. It was confirmed that the approach varied between Schools as to whether the projects were ones being undertaken by current students, or available new projects.

On a related matter, it was agreed that the mechanism by which current students could publish their profile on the website needed to be clarified. Academic staff and students were currently unclear about how to do this, and whether students were able to update their profiles themselves. The Secretary would clarify the mechanism with Marketing and circulate details to the Committee.

**Action: Secretary**

- Item 12: 13 February 2017 – An update was provided on the identification of a replacement for RaP. Feedback on requirements from Schools had been obtained and had been shared with IT. Work was in progress with IT to develop a business case for the replacement.
- Item 3, 20 June 2017 – An update was awaited on the status of the action for the Visa Compliance Manager to highlight the requirements for submission dates and other milestone information in RaP to School representatives. An update would be circulated after the meeting.

**Action: Visa Compliance Manager, Secretary**

- Item 4, 20 June 2017 – The rationale for the PRES population would be circulated after the meeting once it had been confirmed by the Student Voice team.

**Action: Secretary**

- Item 4, 20 June 2017 – Further to the funding of some bursaries for student conference attendance by the Worshipful Company of Saddlers in 2016/17, the Chair informed the Committee that it was not yet known whether further funding would be available this year. Schools would be made aware of any funding as and when it is confirmed. In the meantime, the Chair reminded the Committee that students who were successful in 2016/17 would need to write a report and attend a Saddler's event. It was agreed that it would be useful for a list of all sources of funding for conference attendance to be collated. This could be coordinated by the Graduate School but would require information from Schools.

**Action: School representatives, Secretary**

### 4. Terms of Reference, Composition and Membership

The terms of reference of the Committee were noted. There had been some changes to membership for 2017/18 which had been reflected in the table of membership. In addition, it was noted that 'Library and Information Services representative' was now 'Library Services representative' following organisational changes. Professor Ravasi requested that Dr Andreas Tsanakas be added as a member for Cass.

### 5. Chair's Business

There was no Chair's business to report.

## ***Part Two: Report from students***

### **6. Report from the Students' Union**

The report from the Vice President (Education) of the Students' Union (SU) was noted. The following matters were highlighted by the Vice President (Education):

- The outcome of a food survey undertaken by the SU along with recommendations had been provided to Sodexo.
- A significant number of new programme representatives had been welcomed and trained by the SU. It was hoped that all representatives would be trained this year.
- Work to promote and increase engagement with academic societies was a current priority and was intended to enhance student satisfaction and employability. A report completed by the outgoing SU Vice-President (Activities and Development) on academic society provision at City was noted.
- Research and Giving activities had been very successful with over £11,000 raised for charity.
- The SU had been working with Schools to secure doctoral student space following the closure of the Graduate Library Centre and 55 extra spaces had been found.

### **7. Update from Students' Union Graduate School Student Representative**

The new Graduate School Student Representative reported that a survey had been undertaken of research students and their needs. The results would be available during October and a report would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee.

## ***Part Three: Report from Vice-President (Research and Enterprise)***

8. The Vice-President (Research and Enterprise) had sent apologies for absence. The Chair reported that City had recently received notification that it would be able to submit an application to be part of the EPSRC doctoral training partnership allocation scheme as a result of increased grant activity with EPSRC. EPSRC would make decisions on allocations in December 2017.

## ***Part Four – Items for discussion***

### **9. 2017 Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES)**

The Committee considered an initial report on the PRES 2017 results including initial recommendations. Further analysis would be undertaken in the coming weeks and a more detailed report would be presented to the Graduate School Committee and Senate in due course.

It was noted that the response rate had been significantly higher than in previous years and was now broadly in line with the sector average.

Results for all national surveys including student literal comments had been sent to Schools via Deans for cascading to relevant colleagues. Some members of the Committee reported that they had not yet received their PRES results. The Committee agreed that it would be useful if the results could be broken down by year of study, given that students in their first year of study were likely to have provided quite different feedback to students nearing completion. It was agreed that the detailed PRES results would be circulated after the meeting along with confirmation of whether it was possible to provide a breakdown by year of study.

**Action: Secretary**

Whilst some broad initial recommendations had been made in the report, the Committee agreed that consideration of the more detailed analysis to be undertaken would be required to agree School and institutional level actions. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Committee would focus almost exclusively on discussion of the detailed analysis and the agreement of an action plan. The agenda for the next meeting would be planned accordingly.

#### **10. Policy and Guidance Revisions: Suspensions and Extensions**

The Committee considered the proposed changes to the policies and guidance on suspensions and extensions. Changes were being proposed to ensure alignment with City's Tier 4 obligations and sector best practice, as well as to support improved completion rates. The following feedback was provided:

- The reasons for a period of suspension that had been proposed were different to those that had been proposed for an extension. It was queried whether they should be the same, and if not, the rationale for them being different needed to be clear. For example, lack of funding was not currently a valid reason for a suspension but was an acceptable reason for an extension.
- It was suggested that alignment, where appropriate, with the extenuating circumstances procedures for taught provision, should be considered. The guidance available for MRes students might also be useful.
- The general principle that students must have exceptional circumstances not to submit on time should be strengthened.
- The Policy on Writing Up should also be reviewed, in particular to clarify the level of supervision that students can receive. It was reported that in practice students often required more engagement with their supervisor following the transfer to writing up, but the current policy did not reflect this. This would be brought to a future meeting.

**Action: Secretary**

Members were asked to provide any further feedback on the policy revisions to the Secretary following the meeting. The proposals would be revised to reflect comments received and Boards of Studies would then be consulted. The Graduate School Committee would then consider final proposals prior to making recommendations to Senate on the policy changes.

**Action: All (Deadline: 31 October 2017)**

#### **11. Policy on the Approval of Doctoral Supervisors: Guidance on External Supervisors and Consultants**

Feedback from consultation with Boards of Studies on the Approval of Doctoral Degree Supervisors in August 2016 had indicated that clarification on the roles of External Supervisor and Consultant was required. The Committee considered draft guidance intended to provide this clarification.

It was queried whether external supervisors were considered to be a second supervisor. It was noted that for students with external registration status based at another institution, the external supervisor was their main point of contact. Relevant policy and regulation would be checked and the wording in the draft guidance would be adjusted to ensure this was clear.

It was noted that an external supervisor was required to have a defined contractual relationship with the University to support the supervision as part of a supervisory team. The Committee agreed that the form that this contract should take should be specified. This was to ensure that contracts were appropriate, there was consistency for students and to be clear that engaging an external supervisor through an honorary appointment was not

appropriate. It was agreed that advice would be sought from HR on the contractual basis on which external supervisors should be engaged, e.g. whether Visiting Lecturer contracts should be used.

**Action: Secretary**

It was agreed that any further comments on the draft guidance should be sent to the Secretary following the meeting.

**Action: All (Deadline: 6 October 2017)**

Following clarification of the points above, and receipt of any further comments, the guidance would be adjusted and presented for final approval by the Committee.

*[Secretary's note: Senate agreed in March 2017 that the outcome of the Committee's discussion on clarifying the external supervisor and consultant roles would be reported to a future meeting of Senate.]*

## **12. Annual Programme Evaluation Template**

A revised template for Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) had been proposed, which was intended to align more closely with the objectives of the Graduate School, and to incorporate action planning for completion rates, which Schools had previously been required to report on separately. The proposed form had attempted to incorporate feedback previously received from some members of the Committee on data it would be useful to collect more routinely, particularly around employability and contribution to research culture.

Senate had agreed at its meeting in July 2017 that the proposed template should be considered at a future meeting and feedback from the Committee was being sought prior to the template being taken to Senate.

There was general dissatisfaction with the proposed template. It was suggested that the form should be streamlined as it was considered to be onerous to complete. For example, actions in relation to PRES results could be reflected in the overall action plan, without programme teams being required to specify how PRES results were addressed by their actions. The form would also require Schools to provide and reflect on data that was not currently collected and this would require additional work. The Secretary confirmed that the requirement for additional data was intended to respond to feedback previously received on current gaps in information on research degree provision. The APE form had been suggested as the mechanism to address this so that Schools were not being sent separate requests for information. It was agreed that it should be clarified what data would be provided to Schools to enable completion of the APE and what data Schools would need to provide.

The Secretary reported it was intended to align the section on data relating to completion rates with a new Performance Indicator (PI) on completion rates arising from the new strategic plan. Discussions about the new PI were ongoing and this section would therefore be finalised once the PI was confirmed.

It was agreed that further comments should be sent to the Secretary within a week to enable the template to be submitted to Senate's October meeting.

**Action: All (Deadline 28 September 2017)**

*[Secretary's note: In light of the strength and tone of comments received on the proposed template after the meeting, the Secretary informed the Committee that further work on it would be undertaken prior to a revised template being presented to the Committee and*

*subsequently to Senate. Committee members were advised to use the previous template to complete their 2016/17 APEs.]*

### **13. Research students who teach**

Senate had approved revisions to the Research Students who Teach Policy at its July 2017 meeting, subject to some revisions and the development of an accompanying guidance note. The Committee considered the draft guidance noting that information on how notional time spent on preparation and marking should be calculated was awaiting advice from HR. It was agreed that the guidance was useful but that it would be helpful to clarify that Schools may decide to identify one member of staff to take oversight where, in line with the Policy, a number of staff may be involved in managing matters related to students who teach. It was also agreed that the guidance should make clear that a student's mentor could be a student's supervisor, but would normally be the module leader for the module they were teaching on.

The revised pro formas for use by Boards of Studies to monitor compliance with the Policy were noted.

The minor revisions suggested by the Committee above would be made. The draft guidance and pro formas would be considered by Senate in October 2017.

### **14. PhD by Prior Publication**

Proposed guidance had been developed by the School of Health Sciences to provide further information on the requirements for PhD by Prior Publication to supplement the regulations typology. The Committee was being asked to consider and comment on the proposed guidance. As the School of Health Sciences representatives were no longer present at the meeting, it was agreed to defer discussion of the guidance to the next meeting.

### **15. City Graduate School Reporting – to Senate and Council**

The Chair informed the Committee that Council would be receiving a report on the role of doctoral students at City and current issues related to doctoral provision at its October meeting. A draft report had been considered by the Executive Committee and the Executive Team. It would be circulated to the Committee following the meeting. The Chair requested that any comments be sent to him by 25 September 2017 to meet the deadline for submission of papers to Council.

**Action: All (Deadline: 25 September 2017)**

The proposed report to Senate on Graduate School activities in 2015/16, which had been drafted during 2016/17, would be revisited in due course. It had been requested by Academic Governance Committee that further information be included in the report. However, this information was not currently available from Schools and would need to be collected. It was intended to dovetail this with work to revise the Annual Programme Evaluation template to enable this information to be reported on in the future.

## **Part Five: Items for information**

### **16. Research Degrees Awarded**

The Committee **noted** this report.

**17. Research Degree Examiner Appointments**

The Committee **noted** this report.

**18. AoB and Dates of Future Meetings**

There was no other business to discuss.

The Committee **noted** the dates of future meetings as follows:

- 14<sup>th</sup> November 2017 at 2pm
- 19<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 11.30am
- 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2018 at 11.30am
- 16<sup>th</sup> May 2018 at 11.30am
- 25<sup>th</sup> July 2018 at 11.30am

Secretary: Alison Edridge  
Email: alison.edridge.1@city.ac.uk  
Telephone: 020 7040 3328

---

City University's Publication Scheme, produced in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, makes clear that the papers and minutes of meetings of Council and Senate and their **Committees** are routinely published on the web. Paper letters given suffix "c" are closed papers that are exempt from the Scheme; these papers will not be published, at least in the first instance. All other papers are categorised as "Open" and are published without hesitation.