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Part 1: Preliminary items

Minutes of the previous meeting (Paper MDFB08.30)

2008.57 The Board received and approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

Dean for Education’s Report

2008.58 The Dean for Education reported on the following points:

(i) The General Medical Council (GMC) had reported on their Quality Assurance of Basic Medical Education (QABME) visit. The School had been slightly criticised for failing to articulate how student feedback is translated into action. The Board resolved that progress on this issue would be monitored through the Faculty Board. The GMC would conduct a standard follow-up visit in due course.

(ii) The GMC system of annual reporting would be changing for 2009-2010 with an enhanced reporting mechanism that would require extensive input from the School. The School was in the process of discussing the resource requirements of this new procedure. The new annual reporting procedure would check the alignment of the MBBS with the requirements
Two meetings had been held with the Strategic Health Authority about the management of SIFT money.

It had been suggested that function of the Deaneries was to change significantly and that medical schools would assume the responsibility for postgraduate training (as distinct from postgraduate programmes of study). A similar development was occurring within Dentistry. This change would be a momentous development for the School and would involve a large expansion of both clinical and non-clinical training.

The School’s and the College’s position in the Times university league table did not improve despite the achievements in the RAE. It was clear that if rankings were to improve both the School and the College would need to improve the educational experience. The same resource needed to be applied to the educational experience as had been applied to the College’s research activities. In the next academic session the School would conduct a visible and forceful campaign on improving the quality of the student experience.

The School had made a number of enhancements to its admissions procedures during 2009-2010. Fewer interviews had been conducted and these had been held earlier in the year than in previous years. In addition the School had refocused its approach to be recruitment focussed rather than purely selection focused. There were early signs of success and more students had listed the School as their first choice than in previous years.

**Part 2: Matters for Discussion/Decision**

**MBBS, BDS and the Credit Framework (MDFB08.31)**

The Board received the report on the MBBS, BDS and the Credit Framework.

(i) The Faculty Board had requested in March 2009 that a working group be established to implement the Queen Mary Academic Credit Framework and the revised Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) to the MBBS and BDS programmes. In addition to these requirements the working group had also looked at integrating the MBBS and BDS with the Bologna process.

(ii) Both the MBBS and BDS would consist of levels four through to seven with the final two years of the programme being taught at level seven. This approach was similar to approaches adopted by other HEIs and was compliant with the FHEQ. Hefce had confirmed that classifying the MBBS and BDS as level seven would not preclude students from undertaking further funded study under the Equivalent Level Qualification funding rules.

(iii) The School had decided to have each year classified as one 120 credit module totalling 600 credits for both the MBBS and BDS. The process would be finalised through the completion of module proposal which would be presented to the Faculty Board in November 2009.
(iv) The level descriptors demonstrated the learning achievements that were expected of students at each level demonstrating the expected academic progression.

(v) The level descriptors would be a blueprint for curriculum and assessment design and would be used in conjunction with Compass.

Institutional Audit 2010 (MDFB08.32)

2008.60 The Board received and noted the summary of the institutional audit process. It was noted that there had been a number of institutions who had been given a judgement of limited confidence recently including two University of London institutions (London Business School and the School of Oriental and African Studies). The Board noted that Professor Susan Dilly was the School's representative on the Institutional Audit Steering Group and that the Board would receive updates from the group.

Disability and Dyslexia Service – Support for Student Well-Being (MDFB08.33)

2008.61 The Board received and considered a report from the Disability and Dyslexia Service (DDS). The Board noted that the work of the DDS was an important part of the College's business and was instrumental to meeting student needs.

2008.62 The GMC would be stipulating in Tomorrow's Doctors 2009 the basic minimum requirements regarding medical students and disability. For example it would be listed as a requirement that students be sufficiently able-bodied to conduct CPR.

2008.63 The Board resolved that the Medical Education Committee, Dental Education Committee and Medical Assessment Committee would be asked to comment on the recommendations in the report. The committees would be asked to comment on the impact on the School's assessment processes and, in particular, the impact on OSCE examinations. Any resourcing requirements that came out of the discussions at MEC, DEC and MAC would be forwarded to the Education Resource Committee.

Approval of Unregistered Module Updates (MDFB08.34)

2008.64 The Board received a paper detailing the proposed arrangement for collecting unregistered module updates. The Board noted the following points

(i) For MBBS and BDS programmes module proposals had never been submitted as the programmes had not been modularised or credit rated. The School would be preparing module proposals for each programme that would rectify this situation.

(ii) The proposals in the paper would be applicable to all other School programmes.

2008.65 The School approved the proposed arrangement for collecting unregistered module updates

Transparency of Assessment (MDFB08.35)
2008.66 The Board received a paper detailing the minimum level of detail that would be established in module assessment records. The Board noted the following points:

(i) The paper detailed the shift in College policy in recording achievement as SITS would record assessment below the modular level.

(ii) The five assessment types presented were too narrow for the MBBS and BDS programmes and the Board was uncertain as to whether the types met with GMC requirements.

2008.67 The Board approved the principles behind the increased level of transparency but requested further input into the description of assessment.

Reassessment Methods (MDFB08.36)

2008.68 The Board received a report on the proposed rationalisation of reassessment methods. The Board noted the following points:

(i) The issue of reassessment was less of an issue for BDS and MBBS programmes as all elements of assessment were obligatory for resit examinations.

Award Rules (MDFB08.37)

2008.69 The Board received a paper detailing proposed amendments to the College’s award rules. The Board noted the following points:

(i) The amendments to the award rules would not apply to the MBBS and BDS degrees but would apply to the School’s intercalated and taught postgraduate programmes.

(ii) It was suggested that the merit level for taught postgraduate students was set too high at 65% and 60% would be a more appropriate setting. However it was also noted that this level could be amended through standard setting and marking all work that is considered to be of merit level at the appropriate percentage point.

(iii) The mark range for condoned failure on postgraduate taught programmes had been discussed at the Postgraduate Programme Leaders Committee. It was considered that setting the mark for a condoned failure at 30% was too low and that the minimum mark for condoned failure should be set at 45%. It was also noted that condoning failure in up to 30 credits in Postgraduate Diplomas was considered to be excessive.

2008.70 The Board approved the proposed amendments to the College’s award rules.

Internal Review Schedule 2008-2014 (MDFB08.38)

2008.71 The Board received the Internal Review schedule for 2008-2014. It was noted that both Medicine and Dentistry would be reviewed in spring 2012.
Part 3: Quality Assurance

Report from the Academic Developments Sub-Board (Paper MDFB08.40)

2008.73 The Board received the report from the Academic Development Sub-Board. The Board noted the following points:

(i) Two of the programmes proposals recently approved by the sub-board had subsequently been rejected by the Quality Enhancement Committee. It was noted that one of the proposals had been rejected because of a non-standard start date that had not been discussed with the Academic Secretary. It was also noted no members of the Academic Developments Sub-Board were appointed in the School’s representation to QEC. It was further noted that the programme proposers needed to give programme submissions the highest level of care and scrutiny before submitting their proposals for approval.

(ii) Programme proposals were not to be forwarded to QEC unless the full sub-board was satisfied that they fulfilled the strict approval criteria.

(iii) The sub-board had rejected the programme amendments from Educational and Staff Development and would reconsider these proposals at its meeting on the 19th June 2009.

2008.74 The Board approved the recommendations of the Academic Development Sub-Board.

Report of the Review of Surgical Skills and Sciences (Paper MDFB08.49(i))

2008.75 The Board received and noted the report of the review of Surgical Skills and Sciences programmes.

Report of the Review of Transcultural Mental Healthcare (Paper MDFB08.49(ii))

2008.76 The Board received and noted the report of the review of Transcultural Mental Healthcare programmes.

Part 4: Reports from Committees

Dental Education Committee

2008.78 The Board received an oral report on the Dental Education Committee. The Board noted that Professor Mark Hector would in future be listed as the lead for Dental Education Committee reports to the Board. It was noted that the General Dental Council (GDC) had visited the School’s dental hygiene programmes and had issued a broadly positive report. The GDC would be returning to look at the training of dental nurses.
Medical Education Committee (Paper MDFB08.42)

2008.79 The Board received and noted the minutes of the Medical Education Committee.

Admissions and Recruitment Committee (Paper MDFB08.43)

2008.80 The Board noted that topics relating to the Admissions and recruitment Committee had been discussed under the Dean for Education’s report detailed above.

Student Information System Project Report (Paper MDFB08.44)

2008.81 The Board received and noted the minutes of the Student Information System Project Board.

Information Services Board (Paper MDFB08.45)

2008.82 The Board received and noted the minutes of the Information Services Board. The Board noted that IT was a key area for improvement within the College and this view was put forward forcefully by the School at the Information Services Board.

Graduate School Committee (Paper MDFB08.46)

2008.83 This paper was withdrawn from the agenda as the minutes of the previous meeting were not available at the time of the Board meeting.

Quality Enhancement Committee (Paper MDFB08.47)

2008.84 The Board received and noted the minutes of the Quality Enhancement Committee.

Part 5: Other Matters

Dates of the next meeting

2008.85 The meeting dates of the Faculty Board for 2009-2010 were scheduled for

- Wednesday 25th November 2009
- Wednesday 10th March 2010
- Wednesday 9th June 2010

All meetings will commence at 14.00
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