Minutes

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

GRADUATE BOARD

15 April 2013

(Unconfirmed) Minutes

Present: Professor P Harrison (in the Chair), Dr T Batten, Dr N Bown, Professor M Chipperfield, Dr H Dyer, Dr P Gardner, Professor H Hall, Professor A Haywood, Ms S Lebel, Dr K Mullin, Professor A Mullis, Professor M Peckham, Dr M Purvis, Mr J Smith, Dr M Spencer, Dr N Stonehouse, Dr B Thomas, Mr S Welsh.

In attendance: Dr A Bromley, Ms L Burton, Dr C Robinson, Ms S Throp, Mr S Webster (MM 12/232 – 238).

Minutes

The Minutes of meeting held on 10 December 2012 were confirmed. 12/189

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

M12/57 PGR Online Application Form

The Chair advised the Board that an on-line application form was being considered as part of the Student Education Service Project. The Project Team were clear that the current PGR on-line application form was not fit for purpose and it was critical that steps were taken as quickly as possible to put in place alternative arrangements. The University is now considering the purchase of an “off the shelf” admissions package which could be configured to provide an on-line application form tailored to our needs.

The Chair assured the Board that he was positive that the University was moving in the right direction to address existing problems with on-line admissions. 12/191

MM 12/157-162 Draft Guidance Notes on the Responsibilities of the PGRT

The draft guidance notes on the responsibilities of the PGRT together with feedback received from Faculties during the consultation process will be considered at the next Directors of PGR Studies Forum. 12/192

M12/185 Reports from Appeal Groups

The Board was supportive of the Deputy Secretary’s proposal to submit a regular anonymised summary of decisions taken by Appeal Groups, including details of lessons learnt, for consideration by Graduate Board. This would replace the current arrangement whereby the full reports from Appeal Groups were circulated for information under reserved business. The new arrangement would hopefully facilitate general discussion amongst all members of the Board including LUU and PGR student representatives. The Chair would continue to receive the full reports, for information, on behalf of the Board and in this way identify any general issues which required immediate attention. 12/193

CHAIR’S STATEMENT
(a) Chairs of Groups

The Chair informed the Board that he had taken action on its behalf to extend the appointments of Dr Peter Gardner as Chair of PSAG and Dr Nic Stonehouse as Chair of Examinations Group for session 2013/2014. Dr Oliver Harlen’s appointment as the Chair of the Group on Scholarships, Studentships and Prizes, already ran until 2014. Professor Harrison had also agreed with the relevant Chairs role descriptors for their individual positions. A copy of the role descriptors were provided as paper GB/12/64 for information. The Chair thanked the Chairs of the Group for their continuing hard work and expressed his appreciation that they would continue in their respective roles for a further 12 months.

(b) PGR Support Structure

The Chair confirmed that the PGR Support Structure Review was on hold until the new Vice-Chancellor was in post.

(c) PGR Funding Development Group

The Chair advised the Board that a new Group had been established to look specifically at funding development. The PGR Funding Development Group, which would supersede the PGR Finance Oversight Committee, took its membership largely from the Research and Innovation Service with the Dean of PGR Studies in the Chair. The Group would report to each meeting of the Graduate Board with the first meeting taking place at the beginning of May.

The unconfirmed Terms of Reference and Membership of the Group were provided in paper GB/12/65 for information.

(d) HEFCE Research Degree Qualification Rates to be suppressed for 2013 publication

The Board was reminded that HEFCE had introduced a revised predictive methodology for calculating RDQRs in 2012. The University’s Strategy and Planning Office identified an issue with the University’s data which was leading to unrepresentative projected data. As a consequence of this the University asked HEFCE to suppress Leeds’ data from the 2012 report, as permitted under the HEFCE arrangements. This gave the University the opportunity to amend local processes to ensure that future predicted RDQRs, using the revised methodology, were accurate.

The Chair advised the Board that HEFCE had now accepted a request to suppress from publication the University’s 2013 RDQRs data. This would allow the changes S&P had put in place to fully work through the system. It was not expected that any future requests for suppression of data would be made.

(e) EPSRC call for DTCs

EPSRCs call for Centres for Doctoral Training (CDTs) had closed on 4 April. Leeds has been involved in 20 separate EPSRC CDT applications: 12 single site bids, 1 Leeds led multi-site bid and 7 partner-multi site bids.

EPSRC was expected to announce those invited to submit full applications by the end of May 2013 with a closing date for submission of full proposals by 18 July 2013. Grants will be announced in November/December with new CDT cohorts commencing
in October 2014.

(f) **NERC DTP**

Work was underway to submit a DTP application to NERC by the closing date of 01 May 2013.

(g) **AHRC bid (Block Grant Partnership (BGP) 2)**

An application had been submitted to AHRC (BGP 2) at the end of January. The University expected AHRC to announce the outcome of applications in June.

Report from Leeds University Union (GB/12/47)

The Education Officer provided the Board with an update which included a presentation of the LUU Impact Report. Members were encouraged to view the details of the Impact Report at the LUU website http://www.leedsuniversityunion.org.uk/impact.

The Board congratulated LUU for the very impressive report. It appreciated the work being undertaken to engage further with PGR students.

The Education Officer drew attention to discussions at the previous meeting (MM 12/149 – 156) when Equal Opportunities Monitoring data had been presented to the Board. The Education Officer asked if any further actions to support the recruitment of lower represented groups to PGR study were taking place. It was agreed that further discussions would take place after the meeting.

**STRATEGIC ISSUES**

**Progress Issues Working Group: Pre-transfer progress monitoring and transfer report form** (GB/12/48)

Dr Peter Gardner, Chair of the Progress Issues Working Group, presented the proposals to the Board. It was noted that a variety of practices currently exist across the University for progress monitoring with more than 20 different templates for use by Transfer Assessment Panels together with corresponding guidance in existence.

The Working Group in recognition of the importance of progress monitoring, and in particular at the pre-transfer and transfer stage, to ensure timely and successful completion of doctoral awards wished to propose the following University-wide forms:

A. Joint Report of the Transfer Assessment Panel
B. First Formal Progress Report
C. Report at the Transfer Stage

In addition the Group proposed some amendments to the University-wide Guidelines on University Procedures and Recommended Best Practice for the Transfer Process. The forms would initially be uploaded to the PDR pending the allocation of resources to support further development of the PDR.

Engagement with the new arrangements would help to further embed University requirements and ensure compliance with the requirements set out in the University’s Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures. It would also ensure consistency
and rigor at the transfer stage.

Dr Gardner thanked Faculties for providing feedback. He assured the Board that the Group had considered carefully all feedback, which had been diverse, before making some amendments to its proposals which were now presented to the Board. A response to the feedback would be made available to Directors of PGR Studies in due course.

The Board held a lengthy discussion about the proposals. Whilst some concerns were expressed the general consensus was that the arrangements were consistent with the one University culture and harmonised existing arrangements whilst retaining an appropriate level of flexibility to accommodate disciplinary differences. For example, Faculties could identify the most appropriate stage to complete the first formal progress report of the candidature provided that in all cases this was completed by the end of month 6 for full-time candidates.

Students would be given the opportunity to comment on their progress and supervision in the progress reports and to discuss this with the Transfer Assessment Panel, in the absence of the supervisor(s), at the transfer stage. It was agreed that it would not be appropriate to record the outcome of confidential discussions in the Transfer Report Form which would be uploaded to the PDR.

It was noted that the Working Group had not made proposals for harmonising the composition of the Transfer Assessment Panel across the University. Whilst this had been considered in detail by the Working Group it had concluded that the current arrangements which set out minimum expectations remained appropriate to accommodate different areas across the University. It had, however, identified best practice, which would be outlined in the guidelines.

The Board discussed in detail the signatures to be capture on the Transfer Assessment Form. The consultation had shown particularly diverse opinion in this regard. Some Faculties felt that all members of the Panel should sign the form whilst others believed that this requirement was unnecessary and administratively burdensome. There was also a lengthy debate about whether the student should be required to sign the form and if a signature was to confirm sight of the report and/or agreement with its contents.

The Board confirmed that the student would not be required to sign the Transfer Assessment Report and concluded that by uploading the Transfer Assessment Report to the PDR the Faculty/School was making its content available to the student and supervisor. It was expected that the supervisory team would discuss the Transfer Assessment Report at the next formal supervision meeting and that a record of those discussions would be kept in the notes of the meeting. Faculties/Schools would, however, be instructed to email the student and supervisor(s) when the report was uploaded to the PDR and authorised by the PGR Tutor. A statement confirming its availability would also be included on the standard letter issued by RSA to those students who are successfully transferred to a specific research degree category. RSA was asked to submit a change request to the PDR User Group for the PDR to generate an automatic email notifying the student/supervisor(s) that the transfer report had been uploaded.

RESOLVED: that with effect from session 2013/2014:

(i) all Faculties and Schools be required to use the standard progress monitoring forms as set out in paper GB/12/48 (subject to minor amendments agreed at the meeting).
Recommendations submitted using out of date forms would be refused;

(ii) the Transfer Assessment Report must be agreed by all members of the Transfer Panel and, as a minimum, signed by either the Chair or Independent Assessor confirming agreement on behalf of all parties. Faculty Graduate School Committees may, however, agree that reports within their Faculty should be signed by all members of the Panel. In such cases the Faculty should advise members of the Transfer Panel accordingly and ensure that appropriate checks are put in place before the PGR Tutor authorises the recommendation on transfer.

(iii) amendments to the University-wide Guidelines on University Procedures and Recommended Best Practice for the Transfer Process set out GB/12/48 be approved;

(iv) amendments to Section 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 of the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures be approved as set out in Annex I to these Minutes (see MM 12/241 below).

The Chair thanked Dr Gardner and the Working Group for their hard work in preparing these proposals. It was his view that adopting consistent documentation for the transfer process was a significant step forward.

Submission rate statistics for full-time PhD students commencing in the period November 2007 to October 2008 (GB/12/49)

Dr Christina Robinson introduced the submission rate statistics for full-time PhD students commencing study in the period November 2007 to October 2008 to the Board. The Board noted that this data had been sent to Schools for checking and any responses had been addressed. Submission rate data for the previous 10 years was also included in the paper.

The Board noted that the overall University submission rate of 59.8% (for 2007/08 starters) was the first time the University submission rate had fallen below 60% in the years represented in the survey.

It was agreed that whilst this data was not reported externally and requirements for submission rates data to be included in bids for funding varied between Research Councils and other funders (eg with some requiring data only on those students they had funded, with others requiring data on those registered in cognate research areas etc) the importance of the data could not be underestimated.

One member suggested that it might be helpful to reduce the overall time limit for doctoral study from, for example, 4 calendar years to 3 calendar years and 9 months, with those students who required the full 4 years being made to submit an application for extension. It was agreed that it would be useful to return to further discussion of this suggestion at a future date.

PSAG, at its meeting in March, had suggested that a review of extension requests (rather than suspension requests) might be useful in understanding the submission rates.

The Board agreed that the position was complex and would require further discussion. It asked that the data be forwarded to FGSCs for consideration in the first instance. RSA was asked to prepare a pro forma for Faculties to complete and return to the Board in time for discussion at the October 2013 meeting.
Collaborative Provision Approval (GB/12/50)

The Board received a request for outline planning approval from the School of Earth and Environment to offer joint PhDs awards with the Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP) in Brazil. The intention was that the first joint PhD students would commence study in March 2014. The proposed programme is aligned with the Brazilian Ciência Sem Fronteriras (Science without Borders) mobility programme through which the Brazilian government aims to fund Brazilian students and researchers to study and develop in the best and most relevant universities around the world.

The Board agreed in principle approval to the proposal. It noted that due diligence and legal enquiries would now be completed and that further detailed information on the proposed arrangements would be submitted to PSAG and Examinations Group for consideration.

The full proposal would be submitted to Graduate Board at its June meeting.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

Working Group established to Review the Code of Practice for PGRs Engaged in Teaching Activities (GB/12/51)

The joint Working Group established to review the CoP and its implementation had launched a University-wide consultation on a revised draft CoP and processes to support the engagement of PGRs in Teaching Activities.

Some concerns were raised about the proposals from one Faculty where it was felt that engagement in laboratory and project supervision by PGRs was part of the PhD training programme. The Chair reminded the Board that the new Code was clear that unpaid work would not be permitted.

It was acknowledged that the proposals would involve some change of practice across the University.

Members of the Board and FGSCs were invited to submit comment on the proposals to Sarah Throp, RSA by no later than 15 May 2013. The Working Group would meet on 24 May to prepare its final proposal for submission to TSEB and Graduate Board in June with the intention of recommending the introduction of a revised CoP to Senate on 03 July 2013.

Report and recommendations for University English Language Test (UELT) Development (GB/12/52)

Simon Webster, In-Sessional Programme Director, Language Centre, attended the meeting to introduce the proposals.

Mr Webster reminded the Board that the University’s regulations for both taught and research degree programmes required that all international students whose first language is not English to take the UELT within one month of registration. Those students who fail to reach a satisfactory standard (UELT 60%) being required to satisfactorily complete appropriate in-sessional courses.
Mr Webster informed the Board that the UELT was developed in 1985 and included a basic test of grammar and vocabulary. It remained a paper based test, taken by 2,500 student in 2011/12, which had to marked by hand. This was labour intensive and inefficient. The Language Centre was of the view that the test was no longer suitable in terms of what it tested and in its mode of administration.

Given the UKBA’s more stringent requirements the Language Centre was also of the view that it was no longer necessary to have a blanket test. A certain cohort of students should, however, still be required to take a test; notably those who have 6.0 IELTs or equivalent, those who do not have a Secure English Language Test (SELT) and those admitted to the University on a waiver. If the results indicate a need, they should be recommended to take In-sessional classes. It would also be possible for students and Schools to refer students for additional language support where a need was identified, perhaps through the training plan agreed within one month of the date of commencement of study or through the early submission of a piece of written work.

The Board was broadly supportive of the proposal which would allow the Language Centre to divert its efforts from testing to providing language support. It concluded that it would wish to see the Language Centre entering details of attendance at classes into SAP so that this information would readily be available for monitoring by Faculty/Schools through the PDR.

Members were surprised to hear that the UELT remained a paper-based test marked by hand and were supportive of the Language Centre's stated aim to develop an online test which was fit for purpose through which results would be generated and communicated to students and schools more quickly. Some members questioned why there was a need to develop a test at all and whether it would be more appropriate to simply offer in-sessional support to those cohorts outlined in MM 12/xx above.

The Board noted that TSEB (or its relevant Group) was still to discuss the proposal and it was, therefore, most unlikely that any changes could be agreed for 2013/14 entrants.

Working Group established to Review the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures (GB/12/53)

The Working Group had considered the implications for the CoP of the publication of the QAA Quality Code, Chapter B11: Research Degrees. It had agreed that it would not re-write the existing CoP as it remained an operational document which was fit for purpose. It took a general overview to ensure the currency of the existing Code and recommended some amendments for 2013/14 which included embedding web links which would take readers to relevant policies hosted elsewhere on the website.

It was recognised that further work on the CoP would be required, particularly with regard to the management structure, once the outcome of the PGR Support Structure Review was known.

RESOLVED: that the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures be amended with effect from session 2013/14 as set out in Annex I.

FGSCs would now be invited to review their Faculty Protocols in view of amendments to the Code including those agreed as part of the review of the pre-transfer and transfer arrangements (see M 12/217 above).
UNIVERSITY BOARDS/COMMITTEES

The Board received Minutes from the following University Boards:

(i) Research and Innovation Board (10/12/2012, 14/01/2013, 11/02/2013 and 11/03/2013) (GB/12/54(a) – (d))
(ii) Taught Student Education Board (23/01/2013) (GB/12/55)

COMMITTEES/GROUPS OF THE BOARD

Programmes of Study and Audit Group (GB/12/56 (a) – (b))

The Board received the Minutes of the PSAG meetings held on 14/01/2013 and 25/03/2013.

(a) Points of Induction for PGR Students

Dr Peter Gardner, Chair of PSAG, informed the Board that a Working Group had been established to consider the introduction of a consistent set of induction activities for all PGR students together with points of induction. A report would be submitted to PSAG’s meeting in May.

(b) Part-time Students and Commitment to Study

RESOLVED: that with effect from session 2013/2014 the Research Student Handbook, Guide to Supervisors and the reverse of the formal letter of acceptance be amended as follows:

Additions shown using **bold type**

8.2 Commitment to Research Activity

It is important that a research project is completed within the standard period of study. It provides the preparation and training for a professional career and requires the same commitment to meeting objectives and timescales for the completion of work. Full-time postgraduate research students are therefore expected to work on their research project for periods of time that are comparable to a full-time academic post (the equivalent of an average of at least 37 hours a week). This does not include paid work. **Part-time postgraduate research students are expected to work on their research project for periods of time equivalent to 20 hours per week.** It is inevitable that your work load will be variable during the course of the year and it should be agreed with your supervisor(s). When approaching a specific deadline such as the submission of a transfer report or thesis additional hours of work will be necessary. Research students are encouraged to maintain a good work/life balance (see 8.1 for information on holidays).

Research students are, as part of their work load, expected to undertake other professional activity, for instance to attend conferences, undertake field work and other research activities outside the University during the course of their studies.
(c) **Review of Eligibility for Research Degree Supervision**

The Board noted amendments to the University’s eligibility criteria for research degree supervision which had been proposed in the light of the publication of the QAA Quality Code, Chapter B11: Research Degrees.

RESOLVED: that the eligibility criteria for research degree supervision be amended, with effect from session 2013/2014, as set out in Annex I of the Minutes of PSAG (14/01/2013).

(d) **Proposal for the Institute of Communications Studies to offer practice-led research degree programmes**

RESOLVED:

(i) that with effect from 2013/2014 the Institute of Communication Studies be permitted to include practice-led research degree programmes under the arrangements set out in Annex II of the Minutes of PSAG (14/01/2013);

(ii) that amendments be made to the Regulations for Ordinance X, with effect from 2013/14, as follows:

**Doctor of Philosophy** – Article 26(a) footnote

**Master of Philosophy** – Article 36 footnote

(addition highlighted in **bold type**):

* Areas of creative practice are currently offered in the following Schools: **Institute of Communications Studies**, School of English, School of Fine Art, History of Art & Cultural Studies, School of Music, School of Performance & Cultural Industries, and School of Design; and at York St John University. Requirements for practice-led research degree candidatures are available in the relevant School/ York St John University Handbooks and from Research Student Administration.

(e) **Professional Doctorate in Paediatric Dentistry (DPaedDent)**

The Board was reminded that, at its meeting on 10 December 2012, it had approved the introduction of a new programme of study leading to the award of the DPaedDent with effect from session 2013/2014. It had also recommended consequential amendments to Ordinance X to reflect the introduction of the new programme and, subject to approval of these amendments, approved changes to the regulations to Ordinance X.

The Board was informed that PSAG had given further consideration to the new programme and now wished to recommend for approval an amended programme proposal. In addition it had considered Learning Outcomes and a programme of study specification.

RESOLVED: that approval be given, with effect from 2013/2014 to the following:

(i) the introduction of the Doctor of Paediatric Dentistry (DPaedDent) as set out in Annex I of the PSAG Minutes (25/03/2013);
(ii) the Programme of Study Specification and Learning Outcomes for the DPaedDent as set out in Annex III of the PSAG Minutes (25/03/2013)

(f) Supervisory Team – Layers of Support and the Wider Research Community

The Board noted that PSAG had agreed the inclusion of a statement in the Research Student Handbook and Guide to Supervisors which placed emphasis on the layers of support and wider research community within the Faculty/School available to the student (e.g. PGRT, Head of School). Details of the agreed statement were set out in Annex II of the PSAG Minutes (25/03/2013). This was consistent with the spirit of Chapter B11: Research Degrees of the QAA Quality Code.

(g) Programme of Study Specification for Integrated Degrees of PhD and Master (MA, LLM or MSc)

RESOLVED: that approval be given, with effect from session 2013/14, to the amendments to the general programme of study specification for the programme leading to the Integrated degree of PhD and Master (MA, LLM or MSc) as set out in Annex IV of the PSAG Minutes (25/03/2013).

(h) Continuity of Supervision Arrangements

Dr Gardner informed the Board that PSAG was giving careful consideration to the recommendation arising from the QAA Institutional Review concerning the continuity of supervision for those students with a single supervisor. The Group would return to discussions at its meeting in May. It would then consider information to be included in relevant publications (e.g., Research Student Handbook, Guide to Supervisors).

(i) Supervisors with more than 10 students

The Chair of the Board noted the arrangements in place for monitoring those supervisors with more than 10 students. He invited comments from the Board on whether the University should impose a “hard limit” on the number of students a supervisor could supervise. It was his view that 10 students represented a significant workload and he was concerned that the quality of supervision and student experience might be adversely affected where a supervisor had a larger number of PGR students.

FGSCs were invited to consider the possibility of imposing a limit on the number of supervisions to no more than 10 students (whether the supervisor was acting as main or co-supervisor). Comments should be submitted to the June meeting of the Board.

Faculty Graduate School Committees (GB/12/57(a) – (m))

The Board received Minutes of meetings of FGSCs as follows:

(a) Arts (07/02/2013)
(b) Biological Sciences (22/01/2013)
(c) Business (19/11/2012)
(d) Business (28/01/2013)
(e) Business (11/03/2013)
(f) Environment (28/01/2013)

1 Subject to the minor amendment to the programme specification set out in M12/263 (iii)
The Board received notes of meetings of the Examinations Group held on 21/01/2013 and 11/03/2013.

Dr Nic Stonehouse, Chair of Exams Group, informed the Board that the Group had considered, at its March meeting, a number of issues arising from the publication by QAA of Chapter B11 of its Quality Codes.

(a) Release of the Examiners’ Report to candidates

The Board fully supported the Group’s recommendation that the final, joint report should be made available to all candidates. It was also in support of releasing the report to the supervisor(s). The Board discussed the timing of the release of the report to candidates recommended for award and the Group’s proposal that this be released after publication of the pass list. The Board suggested that the report might be released at an earlier stage, possibly immediately after approval by the Exams Group, and before publication of the pass list. To facilitate this action the report might be released together with an indication that it is subject to ratification or that the first page, which included details of the recommendation for award, be withheld. The Group was invited to reconsider its recommendation in respect of the timing of the report’s release and its simultaneous release to supervisors.

(b) Recommendations available to examiners, timescales and definitions

RESOLVED:

(i) that the category of “Minor Editorial Corrections” be re-named “Editorial and Presentational Corrections”. The current definition of what represents this category was considered sufficient;
(ii) that the category of “Stated Minor Deficiencies” be re-named “Minor Deficiencies”;
(iii) that the following amendments be made to the Minor Deficiencies section of the Instructions to Examiners (shown in bold italic):

“The examiners’ report should explain clearly the nature of the deficiencies which should be confined to changes which are genuinely minor in nature (e.g. rewriting of sections, correcting calculations or clarifying arguments and the corrections of minor typographical errors). It should not be used when substantial additional work or research is required, when whole chapters had to be substantially rewritten or if the methodology requires substantial revision. “Referral” for resubmission should be considered in those circumstances. The decision to recommend the award of the degree with minor deficiencies as opposed to referral for resubmission must be based on academic grounds and should not be determined by the candidate’s personal circumstances and whether s/he will be able to complete the corrections within the 12-week time period.”
(iii) consequential amendments be made to the Programme of Study Specifications to reflect the changes agreed above, with effect from session 2013/14, as set out in Annex II to these Minutes.

(c) Attendance of the supervisor at the viva

Dr Stonehouse advised the Board that the Group had reviewed the current arrangements, whereby one of the candidate’s supervisors may attend the viva as an observer (with the prior agreement of the candidate) and whether this remained appropriate. A lengthy discussion had ensued which highlighted significant differences in practice between the disciplines. The Group, unable to reach a consensus of opinion suggested that the current arrangements remain in place and proposed to review the position at a later date.

The Board agreed to invite FGSCs to consider this issue and, where there was support for the presence of the supervisor at the viva to explain why the supervisor would wish to be present. Feedback on this issue should be submitted to Sarah Throp (s.throp@adm.leeds.ac.uk) RSA by the end of May for consideration at the next meeting of the Examinations Group (17/06/2013).

ISSUES FOR REPORT

Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) 2013 (GB/12/59)

The Board received a timetable for consideration of the outcome of PRES 2013. This included the requirement for Schools to produce an action plan and for FGSCs to discuss these in October/November 2013. A sub-group of Graduate Board would then review the action plans and FGSC comments to identify any themes for action at institutional level.

A PRES outcomes paper would then be produced and discussed at Graduate Board in February 2014 before feedback to students on University/Faculty/School actions.

Update from the Plagiarism Working Group: Proof Reading Policy (GB/12/60)

The Board noted that a considerable amount of work had taken place to prepare a University Policy on Proof Reading which encompassed the needs of both taught and PGR students. The policy had been discussed and agreed by sub-groups of both Graduate Board (Plagiarism Group) and TSEB.

RESOLVED: the Proof Reading Policy, set out in Annex III, be adopted for PGR students with effect from session 2013/2014.

Update report from York St John University on the outcome of the 2011 QAA Institutional Audit (GB/12/61)

The Board noted that the QAA had confirmed that all recommendations arising from the Institutional Review at YSJU, including two relating to research degree provision, had been met.

Cancellation of the February 2013 Meeting of the Board

The following papers were circulated for information to members of the Board in
February:

- Plagiarism Working Group: Proof Reading Policy (GB/12/42)
- Researcher Skills Training and Development Academic Steering Group (Terms of Reference and Membership) (GB/12/43)
- Update from the Working Group established to Review the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures (GB/12/44)
- Report from the Etheses Working Group (GB/12/45)
- Report from the PDR User Group (GB/12/46)

Any Other Business

Professor Haywood advised the Board that a DTP application to NERC was being prepared. Intelligence from competitor institutions suggested that these included matched funding from those universities for studentships.

Professor Harrison suggested that the Faculty, if it wished to apply for central funding immediately prepare a paper for consideration by VCEG. It was his view, however, that the strategic investment already made by the University (£45M) was a convincing argument in support of the bid and that this should be clearly articulated in the proposal.

For Information

- Dates of Graduate Board Meetings 2013/14 (and dates for PSAG and Exams Group) (GB/12/62)
- REF 2014: Key Dates (GB/12/63)
- Role Descriptions: Chairs of Examinations Group, Programmes of Study and Audit Group and Group on Scholarships, Studentships and Prizes (GB/12/64 (a) – (c))
- PGR Funding Group – Terms of Reference and Membership (unconfirmed) (GB/12/65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Ref</th>
<th>Required Action</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/192</td>
<td>Consider draft guidance notes on the responsibilities of the PGRT in light of feedback from FGSC consultation</td>
<td>Directors of PGR Studies Forum</td>
<td>April/May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/193</td>
<td>Provide regular summary of the outcome of appeals (including any lessons learnt) for consideration by Graduate Board.</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/206</td>
<td>Discussion of possible actions to support recruitment of lower represented groups</td>
<td>Chair/Education Officer</td>
<td>10/06/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/216</td>
<td>Submit change request to the PDR User Group</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>31/05/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/224</td>
<td>Discuss submission rate data (and complete pro-forma to be prepared and distributed by RSA)</td>
<td>FGSCs</td>
<td>21/10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/231</td>
<td>Comment on proposals submitted by the Working Group established to review the</td>
<td>FGSCs, Members of the Board</td>
<td>15/05/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Body</td>
<td>Issue Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/242</td>
<td>Review Faculty Protocols for the Implementation of the CoP for Research Degree Candidatures</td>
<td>FGSCs</td>
<td>10/06/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/247</td>
<td>Include statement on part-time students and commitment to study in RSH, Guide to Supervisors and reverse of the formal letter of acceptance</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>For session 2013/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/258</td>
<td>Discuss the suggestion that a limit be imposed on the number of students supervised by an individual supervisor (to no more than 10 students)</td>
<td>FGSCs</td>
<td>10/06/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/265</td>
<td>Discuss attendance of supervisor at the viva voce examination</td>
<td>FGSCs (responses for further consideration by Exams Group)</td>
<td>31/05/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/274</td>
<td>Circulate dates for 2013/14 meetings of Graduate Board and its Groups to FGSCs</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>30/04/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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