THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

GRADUATE BOARD

Minutes

14 February 2011

Present: Professor E Spiers (in the Chair), Dr T Batten, Professor M Chipperfield, Mr T Davies (PGR student representative), Dr J Donnelly, Dr H Dyer, Dr P Gardner, Professor H Hall, Dr O Harlen, Mr E Jebreel, Professor P Jimack, Dr P Knapp, Professor P Millner, Dr W Rea.

In attendance: Mrs J Y Findlay, Mr R Gilworth, Ms J Hanks (MM 10/231-235), Ms P Hatton (MM 10/253-257), Dr K Hodgson (MM 10/243-249), Dr J Lamie (MM 10/197-206), Ms H Love (MM 10/236-242), Ms K Mattinson (M10/274), Ms K Owen, Dr H Sears, Dr A Temple (MM 10/269-272), Ms S Throp, Professor R Williams (MM 10/197-206).

Welcome

It was reported that Dr Oliver Harlen had replaced Professor Paul Seakins as the Director of the Faculty Graduate School for MAPS with effect from 01 January 2011. The Chair welcomed Dr Harlen to his first meeting of the Board.

External Postgraduate Education

The Board welcomed Pro-Vice-Chancellor for International Partnerships, Professor Richard Williams and Dr Judith Lamie, International Director to the meeting.

A paper prepared by Research Student Administration setting out details of the current split-site PhD arrangements at Leeds was circulated with the agenda for information (GB/10/53). A further paper, which highlighted the issues for consideration and some possible actions, which had been prepared by Professor Williams and Dr Lamie was laid on the table (GB/10/53(b)).

The Board was invited to discuss recent trends in postgraduate education/research relating to split site and joint provision and to consider future needs in relation to the University’s International Strategy http://www.leeds.ac.uk/comms/strategy/downloads/ which had been approved by Senate last summer.

Professor Williams advised the Board that he wished to stimulate discussion of external postgraduate opportunities and how the University might grow quality, resources, impact and develop long term ambitions.

Issues for consideration included:

- future strategy with perhaps greater focus at discipline level;
- international market trends
  - building indigenous capacity (which can be accommodated under the current split-site arrangements)
  - collaborative model – genuine partnership with high quality institutions which might include joint awards
• data and intelligence – limited information is available about PGR registered at UK universities but studying overseas and steps were being taken to seek more information.

Possible future actions included:

• consideration of how to use split-site and other PGR models to grow quality and resources proactively
• obtain further data for the UK (and Australia) to review trends
• take Malaysia as a case study and explore opportunities for Leeds.

The Board welcomed the initiative which was timely given the anticipated decline in domestic markets and the reduction in funding from traditional sources such as the Research Councils. The importance of ensuring any development was centred on a critical mass of students rather than multiple individual collaborations was highlighted. Identifiable cohorts would reduce overheads but one-off arrangements introduced quality challenges.

The Graduate Board’s Split-Site Steering Committee, at its recent meeting, had concluded that more rigorous marketing of the split-site opportunities at Leeds, particularly models A and B, was desirable.

DOGES were invited to take discussions back to their Faculty Graduate School Committees with a view to identifying quality markets where cohorts of students might be attracted to the University split-site PhD programmes.

Professor Williams and Dr Lamie confirmed that, as this is a new area of development for the University, initial thoughts were to identify one or two initiatives which could be put in place within the next 12 months. It was agreed that the Steering Committee on Split Site arrangements should be kept informed of developments. The Board would return to further discussions at its next meeting.

Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 December 2010 were confirmed subject to the following amendment to the first sentence of M 10/116 (amendment shown using bold type):

M10/116 (first sentence)

Whilst the way forward proposed for pgr students was accepted by VCEG and FMG it was recognised that more work was required on provision for post doctoral researchers.

Matters Arising on the Minutes (and not discussed elsewhere on the Agenda)

M10/99 Research Student Appeals

REPORTED: that the Chair had established a Group to consider the possibility of introducing a prima facie stage to the research student appeal procedure comprising Professor M McPherson (in the Chair), Ms K Owen, Professor E Spiers and Mr D Wardle. The first meeting will be held in March.
RECEIVED: details of discussions held by FGSCs (GB/10/51).

M 10/185 Group on Higher Doctorates

RECEIVED: recommendations from the Chair of the Group on Higher Doctorates for amendments to Ordinance XII (GB/10/52).

The Board noted that the recommendations, which arose from discussions held at the last meeting, would open up the opportunity of applying for a higher doctorate to honorary members of staff of the University. The Board was supportive of the proposed amendments and agreed to send forward the following recommendation:

RECOMMENDED: that, with effect from session 2011/12, amendments be made to Ordinance XII as set out in Annex I to these Minutes.

M 10/191 Plagiarism Group

REPORTED: that the Chair had established a Group to review issues related to plagiarism for PGR students comprising Professor E Spiers (Chair), Dr T Batten and Dr M Purvis. The first meeting will be held in March.

CHAIR'S STATEMENT

The Chair highlighted the issue of PGR academic fees in the light of the decision by Parliament to agree ug tuition fees in the region of £6-9K from 2012/13. Senate, at its meeting in January 2011, had confirmed that pgt fees should not be subsidised by ug fees.

The matter of PGR fee levels remained an issue and would require careful consideration. If PGR fees were to be raised in line with fees for taught programmes this would have serious implications upon the Research Council funding secured for PGRs.

It was agreed that the issue should remain as a Standing Item on the Board’s agenda.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

PGR Project Progress Report (GB/10/54)

Professor Spiers drew attention to the content of the report and, in particular, the following matters:

- the work undertaken to finalise the paper on the development of Graduate Schools;
- the establishment of a Postgraduate Research Funding Oversight Committee which would report to GRIP;
- the need to apply lessons learnt from the bid for the ESRC DTC and to share best practice;
- the “Postgraduate Needs Analysis” in ARIR/IPE which had been approved by Research Board and would be used in the next planning round;
- the relevance of the PGR Employability agenda which was being taken forward by the Careers Service.
In addition the Board’s attention was drawn to a recent email from the Chair of the Board, Professor Andrew Thompson, to relevant University staff to provide an update on the PDR Project. Following the decision to employ the Faculty of Biological Sciences PDRS as a basis on which to develop a University wide system, work was entering a development period to ensure that the system will meet the functional and technical requirements necessary for it to be a suitable University wide solution.

The Education Officer drew attention to work being undertaken under the heading “other student experience” and confirmed LUU’s willingness to facilitate PGR input into any discussions.

Development of Faculty Graduate Schools at Leeds (GB/10/55)

Professor Spiers introduced the paper which, following the stock-take conducted last year, set out a proposed role and remit for Faculty Graduate Schools. It had already been discussed with the Deans, DOGES and RSA. The proposed key/core responsibilities, which were dependent upon adequate resourcing being available, included:

- support for the strategic development of postgraduate education at the University;
- quality assurance (in particular, in relation to research degree supervision);
- quality enhancement (including Skills Training)
- careers development;
- fostering interdisciplinary research within and beyond the Faculty;
- marketing and recruitment;
- growing external funding;
- internal scholarships and bursaries;
- communication.

During discussions the following issues were raised:

- possible resistance to a more centralised structure from federal faculties. The current position allowed for genuine differences in academic culture, the disparate physical location of schools within a faculty and for PGR tutors to handle those quality assurance issues which arose within their own schools;
- PGR students identified themselves as members of a School or Department rather than a Faculty;
- the PDR system was an important development tool and would offer new opportunities to Graduate Schools. It would assist in supporting faculties to address quality assurance issues and to monitor and improve PGR submission and qualification rates;
- some concerns that the quality assurance arrangements at faculty level might distract from the responsibilities of heads of school, but it was pointed out that heads of school remained responsible for ensuring that quality assurance mechanisms were in place and were implemented;
- the new arrangements would provide a structure under which faculties could respond to the findings of the PRES survey and develop action plans for addressing emerging themes;
- the implication that the proposed changes would lead to a significant increase in the responsibilities of the DOGES. Would the role receive corresponding recognition? It was noted that a variety of Graduate School
models were currently in place with differing levels of responsibility for the DOGE (for example in terms of numbers of students).

In connection with 4.9 of the paper LUU would be happy to contribute to activities concerned with communication and consultation.

Professor Spiers thanked the Board for its comments which would be taken on board. The paper would be revised following the discussions outlined above and be presented to FMG.

Working Group on PGR Submission and Qualification Rates – Update on Progress (GB/10/56)

The Board received an interim report from the Working Group which had been convened to make recommendations for performance improvement of qualification rates.

The 7 year research degree qualification rate data published by HEFCE last year showed a decline in full-time qualification rates from 88% to 82% at the University of Leeds for the cohorts of students starting in the 2000/01, 2001/02 and 2002/03 academic years.

The Group had noted that overall the qualification rates at Leeds compared well against other Russell Group universities and were set to improve in coming years. Insofar as 7 year qualification rates can be projected for more recent cohorts of students the Group had found that the decline in the Leeds rate would be reversed, and is likely to increase to around 85-86% for the cohorts commencing doctoral degrees between 2003/04 and 2005/06. However, rates remained variable across the institution.

The Group had identified a number of possibilities for further discussion which included:

- increased rigour at the transfer stage (and support packages to be implemented for borderline cases)
- raise awareness across the University of the impact of non-completion
- dissemination of good practice;
- introduce a track whereby candidates register for M Phil leading to a PhD;
- more effective screening of the quality of PGRs at the admissions stage;
- the possibility of increasing the level of the English language entry requirements.

The Chair of the Programmes of Study and Audit Group, Dr Peter Gardner, informed the Board that he was sometimes asked to consider exceptional requests from Schools for permission to accept a student who fell short of the University’s English language entry requirements. Where permission to accept the student was granted he then saw instances at the transfer stage where the School concerned had subsequently not ensured that the student had taken additional English language training and testing which had been a specified condition of admission (see M 10/235 and MM 10/288-289 below).

One member highlighted the importance of striking a balance between rigour at the transfer stage and giving borderline candidates the opportunity to progress. It was important that the transfer stage did not become a tool simply to improve qualification and submission rates.
One DOGE drew attention to apparent disparities between the University submission rates and IPE exercise\(^1\). The Chair indicated that the ARIR gave Schools the opportunity to work out any anomalies that might occur.

**English Language Requirements, Testing and Support (Annual Report from the Language Centre) (GB/10/58)**

Ms Judith Hanks, Language Centre, presented a report on English Language Requirements, Testing and Support. Ms Hanks explained that following the retirement of Dr Don Dunmore in July 2010, the Language Centre had set up a small team to answer queries relating to entry requirements (langentry@leeds.ac.uk). The team was currently engaged in updating equivalent entry requirements to encompass the upcoming change in the minimum entry requirements for taught postgraduates from 6.0 to 6.5 IELTS. There would now be a discrepancy between the entry requirements for TPs and PGRs with requirements for TPs being higher than those for PGRs.

In the current academic year over 2000 international students have been tested to date. Of those approximately 125 students were on research and programmes (compared with 93 at this point last year); 27 (21.6%) of these had scored below 60% on the test (the cut point for recommended entry to in-sessional English language support courses).

The report highlighted the demands on the Language Centre with increasing numbers of students taking the UELT and an increase in numbers of students scoring below 60% who were then more likely to need English language support. In addition the number of students registered on pre-sessional English language courses in 2010 was exceptionally high. A case had been made in 2010 for an increase in funding to cover the costs associated with the growing number of international candidates and a decision was still awaited.

The Language Centre was supportive of PSAG’s comments from its meeting on 17 January 2011 which related to English Language issues. Students entering the University with low IELTS and TOEFL scores may experience difficulties with the demands of academic study at a UK university, creating heavy demands on supervisors as well as support services. In-sessional English language support classes were limited to 3 hours per week and, therefore, Schools needed to be realistic about how much the Language Centre could do to improve a candidate’s English language abilities.

The Chair of PSAG informed the Board that the Group had asked RSA to provide available evidence about the subsequent academic performance of international (including EU) research students who had been admitted under exceptional English language arrangements (see M 10/228 above and MM 10/288-289 below).

**Marketing Update**

Ms Hannah Love from the Communications Team attended the meeting to provide an update on the marketing action plan for PGR and, in particular, to provide an update on progress on corporate and faculty websites.

At corporate level changes had been made to the University’s website to include the following:

---

\(^1\) These were investigated in detail following the meeting and the data for individual students was accurate.
• types of degree (including an explanation of a PhD)
• information on how to make an application had been included and this was now one of the most visited parts of the corporate website
• PGR brochure
• PGR case studies
• PGR film clips

Members were invited to send comments or ideas about further information that might be added to the site to Hannah Love. It was important that feedback be obtained about the expectations of students.

Guidance on faculty websites was now being shared with Faculty Marketing Managers and Directors of Faculty Graduate Schools. Discussions were ongoing on implementation with all faculties and considerable progress had been made with appropriate links back to the corporate, SDDU and scholarships sites being included. The Faculty of Environment site had been identified as an example of good practice. New websites were planned for the Faculties of Medicine and Health and PVAC.

Faculty Marketing Managers were increasingly becoming involved in promoting PGR and were involved in the latest planning round.

The Communications Team were keen to support the PGR Conference 2011.

Ms Karen Innis would now undertake a more central marketing role following key departures in the Marketing Team.

**Student Services Review – Update**

Dr K Hodgson, Director of the Learning and Teaching Support Office, attended the meeting to provide an update of the Student Services Review. Paper GB/10/76 entitled Potential Structures: Student Education Service was laid on the table.

The first round of the Student Services Review had focussed on the analysis of some key student processes, identifying opportunities to improve consistency, quality and equity for all students. Dr Hodgson drew attention to the latest consultations, which had taken place across the University about the potential structure for a Student Education Service. A report on the outcome of these consultations would be presented to Senate in March.

The Review aimed to maximise the efficiency in processing “student data” whilst recognising that PGR candidates whilst still students were also early career researchers. The Review aimed to standardise work, as far as possible, into cross faculty and cross institutional teams.

One further aim of the project was to ensure that support services were available to all students including PGRs (eg counselling, careers service). Historically PGRs had not always had equal access to such services. Work was currently taking place with LUU to develop a branded “Help” service with a problem based website.

No date had been set for the Student Services Working Group to meet with a representative Group of the DOGES where further discussions would take place.
Members noted that DOGES currently reported to the Pro-Deans for Research and asked whether changes to their line management were proposed. Dr Hodgson confirmed that the proposed model had no implications for academic staff and that any changes to reporting structures would only emerge following discussions with the Working Group and a representative Group of DOGES. The Board observed that there were, however, likely to be HR implications for administrative and support staff within the centre, faculties and schools.

**QAA Institutional Review**

Dr Hodgson advised the Board that the University had been selected by QAA to undergo Institution Review during Semester Two of session 2011/12. This date was earlier than had been anticipated and would involve the new Institutional Review methodology to be adopted by QAA with effect from 2011/12 to replace Institutional Audit. The methodology was still under review by QAA.

The University would be required to submit its briefing paper to QAA by October/November 2011.

**QAA - Mid Cycle Follow up for Institutional Audit**

The Board was informed that the second draft of the University’s mid-cycle follow up briefing paper was not yet available and that no paper GB/10/57 had, therefore, been circulated.

It was anticipated that the second draft would be available from AQST shortly and would be circulated for comment in advance of the final draft being presented to Senate on 16 March 2011. The deadline for report to QAA was 18 April 2011.

The mid-cycle follow up was an integral part of Institutional Audit and served as a health check on the continued satisfactory management by the University of academic standards and quality of provision.

**The Role of Postgraduate Research Students in Teaching: A Discussion Paper (GB/10/59)**

Dr Penny Hatton, SDDU, advised the Board that during a discussion at the Leadership Forum (26/01/11) of School plans and preparations for student education in 2012 and beyond, the question of the roles, responsibilities and use of PGR students in teaching and supporting student learning, and the associated University policies had emerged. The PVC for Research and Innovation had asked that the Graduate Board hold some preliminary discussions about the University’s policies on the involvement of PGRs in teaching, the support in place for such students, the challenges that might lie ahead and examples of models already in use. The paper (GB/10/59) set out a number of issues for information. The Board noted that the Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Students Engaged in Teaching, which was put in place with effect from session 2008/09, was attached to the paper.

It was clear that varying arrangements were in place across the University and that data on the different practices was required to inform further discussion.

The issue of PGR students involved in marking was raised and, in particular, the need for guidance on whether involvement could extend beyond formative assessments to include summative assessments.
Some concerns were raised by the Education Officer about where responsibility for monitoring and implementation of the Code rested. The Chair of the Board confirmed that ultimately responsibility rested with the Head of School.

Further discussions would now take place and consideration would need to be given to the possibility of setting up a Working Group to consider the issues raised.

Postgraduate Research Experience Survey 2011 (PRES)

Dr Heather Sears, SDDU, advised the Board that the University had signed an agreement with the Higher Education Agency (HEA) to participate in PRES 2011. It was anticipated that 99 institutions would also take part.

The next step was to agree the University of Leeds specific questions to be included in the survey alongside the more generic questions incorporated by PRES. Members were asked to let Dr Sears know of any areas that might be included in the Leeds specific questions by the end of the week.

The survey would be launched to PGR students on 1 March and DOGES were invited to raise the profile of PRES with their PGR students. Dr Sears advised the Board that when Leeds last participated in the survey in 2008 the response rate for the University was 34% - which was considered one of the best rates amongst HEIs. The Board acknowledged the importance of raising the profile of PRES amongst PGR students.

The results from the survey would be made available to Faculties/Schools in due course. The results would be considered by Faculty Graduate Schools (see M10/221 above) and fed into Student Academic Experience Reviews.

PGR Conference Update

The Steering Group for the PGR Conference had met recently to review feedback from participants, which was largely positive. Negative comments related to the use of the Roger Stevens building as the venue and it had been agreed that in 2011 the Conference Auditorium and Sport Centre would be used. A date of Tuesday, 13 December had been set and it was hoped that as many students as possible would be involved.

ISSUES FOR REPORT

Report from the Education Officer

The Education Officer reported that meetings with PGR had revealed some concerns about the arrangements for those engaged in teaching (see MM 10/253-257 above) and payments for attendance at training and preparation time. Other matters that had been discussed included the role of the PGR representatives upon University Committees, accessibility to information about the structure of Graduate Schools and the relevant PGR committees within Faculties.

Exploration and consultation with the University and Faculties over possibilities for increased and new methods of communication with PGR was welcomed.
Annual Report on the Vitae ‘Roberts’ Policy Forum, the Vitae Yorkshire and North East Hub and YALISS (GB/10/60).

RECEIVED: (i) a report of the key elements of the annual Vitae Policy Forum (held in Leeds 12-13 January 2011) which had been attended by the Deputy Chair of the Board (Professor Spiers) and other staff. The recommendations of Professor Alison Hodge in her independent review of national progress in implementing the Roberts recommendations on employability and career development of PhD students and research staff (October 2010) were included as an Annex to GB/10/60.

(ii) a summary of 2010 activity in two specific areas run through SDDU: the Vitae Yorkshire and North East Hub and the management and delivery of the York and Leeds Interpersonal Skills School.

Report arising from the Annual Meeting between the Accredited Institutions and Chairs of the Examinations Group and Programmes of Study and Audit Group (GB/10/61)

The Board noted that the meeting between the Chairs of the Programmes of Study and Audit Group and Examinations Group and representatives of York St John University and Leeds Trinity University College had taken place on 2 February 2011.

The Board noted that:

(i) Leeds Trinity University College continued to supervise its research students in conjunction with co-supervisors at the University of Leeds;

(ii) that at York St John University 53 out of 55 current students were supervised entirely by members of staff from within that institution under a co-supervision model;

(iii) that some measures had been put in place, and others were under discussion, to support the application for Research Degree Awarding Powers that YSJU intended to submit in June 2013.

UNIVERSITY BOARDS/COMMITTEES

RECEIVED: the Minutes from the following University Boards: 10/268

(i) Taught Student Education Board (19/01/11) (GB/10/62)

(ii) Research Board (17/01/11) (GB/10/63)

(iii) A summary paper prepared for the University Research Ethics Committee on Engaging PGR Students with Ethics (GB/10/64(b)).

The Board noted that the UREC meeting scheduled to be held on 8 February 2011 had been cancelled and that there was therefore no paper (GB/10/64(a)). The Minutes of the re-arranged UREC meeting would be circulated to the next Board meeting.

Dr A Temple, SDDU, presented Paper GB/10/64(b) which provided an update on the work that had already been completed or was in progress and aimed at engaging research students in the ethics of their research. It included information and advice in the Research Student Handbook, explicit references in the University Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures and relevant training for students and supervisors. Work underway within UREC to develop a University ethics policy, would influence further developments. The paper also
included some examples of “salient ethical issues and wider societal impact”, which were particularly welcomed by members.

Once UREC had been able to consider, and approve, the contents of a circular (including a pro forma for completion) prepared by RSA it would be sent to DOGES. DOGES would be asked to complete the Pro Forma in consultation with Heads of School/PGR Tutors. This would provide more detailed information about the arrangements in Schools.

NATIONAL AND EUROPEAN ISSUES

Bologna Issues

There were no Bologna issues to be drawn to the attention of the Board.

GENERAL SCHOLARSHIP MATTERS

Research Mobility Programme (WUN) (GB/10/65)

Kirsty Mattinson reminded the Board of the opportunities available for PGR within WUN (research with a host supervisor within a WUN partner university), involvement in an International Research Collaboration, PGR Conferences, Summer Schools and Master Classes. Attention was also drawn to the opportunity for newly qualified PhD students to apply for temporary lecturing contracts at the University of Nanjing.

Information from the European Office regarding funding opportunities for PGR students (GB/10/66)

The Board received updated information on the number of applications submitted by Leeds under the Marie Curie ITN competition. The results would be known in April/May 2011.

RESEARCH COUNCIL INFORMATION

ESRC White Rose Doctoral Training Centre (GB/10/67)

The Board congratulated all members of the team that had contributed to the White Rose bid for an ESRC Doctoral Training Centre, which had been successful for a 2011/12 start and studentships were currently being advertised. Only 21 Centres had been approved.

It was noted that there had been some discussions about the internal algorithms and other procedures that had been used to allocate studentships and that these had been raised at Research Board.

ESRC Submission Rate Survey 2010 Results (GB/10/68)

The Board congratulated all those at Leeds who had contributed to achieving a 95% institutional submission rate (based on ESRC fully funded students within recognised outlets).
EPSRC Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Portfolio of Centres for Doctoral Training (DTCs)

The Board noted that the EPSRC’s evaluation framework for their funded DTCs/CDTs was currently set out on
http://www.epsrc.ac.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/funding/CDTevaluationframework.pdf

More detailed and revised information would be published shortly.

AHRC – BGP Monitors’ Annual Meeting (GB/10/69)

A report by the Leeds BGP Monitor, Professor Spiers, was received on the BGP Monitors’ Annual Meeting held at the University of Birmingham on 25 January 2011. Discussions had taken place on the proposed content of the BGP Mid-Term Monitoring Report 2011 (the Report Template being expected in April 2011), an anticipated reduction in the funding for future years of the BGP and the proposal that universities might consider funding up to 50% of some studentships and that these could be badged as AHRC studentships.

Significantly fewer awards were expected for 2014 onwards (a likely cut of 33%). The principles of BGP-2 were outlined and a timetable for the preparation of bids was explained, with a deadline of February 2012 for the submission of bids. A series of meetings would be held during 2011.

Research Council Delivery Plans (GB/10/70)

The Board welcomed the summary of the individual Research Council Delivery Plans for 2011-15 and the information on priorities and plans for PGR Training and Development.

GROUPS AND COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

Researcher Training and Career Development Steering Group

The Board received an oral report on the meeting held on 18 January 2011.

It was noted that Professor Scott’s Group was currently giving consideration to issues concerned with Post Doctoral training and career development and the accompanying financial implications.

Faculty Graduate School Committees

RECEIVED: Minutes from meetings of FGSCs (GB/10/71(a) – (i))
Programmes of Study and Audit Group

RECEIVED: the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2011 (GB/10/72) 10/287

(i) English Language Requirement

The Chair of the Group drew clear attention to discussions about the University’s English Language entry requirements for PGR and various issues that had arisen where there were concerns about support and monitoring of students who had been admitted under exceptional arrangements with qualifications lower than the specified minimum (see M 10/228 and M 10/235 above).

The Board noted that the Group would return to further discussion of the issues and that RSA had been asked to provide available evidence about the subsequent academic performance of international (including EU) research students who had been admitted under exceptional English language arrangements.

(ii) Constituency of Transfer Panels

An amendment to the Code of Practice was proposed by the Group to ensure clarity in the description of the constitution of transfer assessment panels.

RESOLVED: that, with effect from session 2011/12, section 6.2 of the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures be amended as follows:

"Members of an assessment panel should be from the same or from a cognate subject area or discipline to the work submitted by the student."

(iii) Support for PGR Students with Disabilities

It was noted that the Group was engaged in discussions with the Equality Service in order to raise awareness of the support that is available for PGRs with disabilities.

(iv) Programme Withdrawals and Suspensions

RESOLVED: 10/293

(a) that the Integrated degree of PhD and MA (Business, Economics and Management) be withdrawn with effect from session 2011/12;
(b) that the degree of Doctor of Business and Management be suspended with effect from session 2011/12.

The Board invited the Group to bring forward details of corresponding amendments to the Regulations for Ordinance X to its next meeting.

(v) Review of Schools Subject to a Wider University Review in 2010/11

The Board noted the “Light Touch” Review methodology that would be adopted for PGR issues in Schools which were currently subject to a wider University review.
Examinations Group

A report was not yet available from the meeting held on 24 January 2011 and would be available for the next meeting.

FOR INFORMATION

RECEIVED: the following documents for information:

- Portal Annual Report 2009/10 (GB/10/74)
- London Conference on the History PhD (GB/10/75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Ref</th>
<th>Required Action</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 10/205</td>
<td>FGSCs to discuss content of presentation made by Professor Williams and Dr Lamie with a view to identifying quality markets where cohorts of students might be attracted to the University split-site PhD programmes</td>
<td>DOGES</td>
<td>March/April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10/212</td>
<td>Send forward recommendation to Senate and Council for amendments to Ordinance XII</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>16 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10/216</td>
<td>Include level of PGR academic fees as a standing item on GB agenda</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10/223</td>
<td>Development of FGS Paper to be revised in light of Board's discussions and presented to FMG</td>
<td>Edward Spiers</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10/238</td>
<td>Members of the Board invited to send suggestions to Hannah Love, Communications Team, about further information that might be added to the University's web pages for pgrs</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>18/04/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10/250</td>
<td>Second draft of institutional briefing paper to be circulated for comment</td>
<td>AQST</td>
<td>07/03/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 10/259</td>
<td>Members asked to let Heather Sears know of any areas that might be included in the Leeds specific questions for the PRES survey</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>28/02/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>