

GRADUATE STUDIES BOARD**MINUTES**

Thursday 28 June 2012

9.00 a.m.-12.30 p.m. in CG35

Present: Dr Lisa Looney (Chair), Professor Liam Barry,
Ms Goretti Daughton, Dr Tracy Dixon, Dr Gabriel Flynn,
Ms Mairéad Nic Giolla Mhichíl, Ms Louise McDermott (Secretary),
Ms Patricia Moore, Dr Anne Morrissey, Professor Colm O’Gorman,
Ms Caitríona Rowsome, Dr Ana Terres

Apologies: Ms Gillian Barry, Dr Pat Brereton, Dr Bernadette Flanagan,
Dr Christine Loscher, Dr Enda McGlynn,
Dr Ciarán Mac Murchaidh

In attendance: Dr Anne Matthews

SECTION A: MINUTES AND RELATED ISSUES**1. Adoption of agenda**

The agenda was adopted subject to the inclusion of one additional submission under Item 12.

2. Minutes of the meetings of 3 May 2012 and 17 May 2012

The minutes were confirmed and were signed by the Chair.

3. Matters arising from the minutes

- 3.1** Noted that structured systems were now in place for identifying and communicating with students approaching the maximum registration period and students approaching the deadline for transfer to, or confirmation on, the PhD register. (Items 3.1 and 3.2)

- 3.2** Noted that an IUA workshop on Graduate Training Elements had taken place in DCU on 22 May 2012 and had proved very useful in developing a shared understanding of common issues across the sector. Various documents had resulted from the workshop: a report to the IUA outlining a number of issues of sectoral interest, e.g. different patterns in funding; specific problems that had been identified; a suite of documents containing information (one per university) for incoming students on entitlement to take GTEs at other institutions and issues such as module choice, fees, registration and rights/responsibilities; a table of grade equivalents across the universities. (Item 3.3)
- 3.3** Noted that a lunchtime workshop, facilitated by the Chair and by the Training and Development team in Human Resources, would take place on Tuesday 3 July 2012 and would address the issue of Personal Development Plans. While there is a good level of interest in this workshop, it would be desirable if a larger number of experienced staff engaged with it as well as the newer staff. Four ‘lunch and learn’ sessions for research students are planned for 2012/13 and will cover a variety of topics (e.g. preparing for the *viva voce* examination). The supervisors’ section of the Graduate Studies Office website allows access to a skills needs analysis tool (to be piloted in the week beginning 2 July 2012), and a second tool (the Marie Curie/EU development plan template) will be made available shortly. Noted that the new workload model in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences included a method of providing for supervisory duties that might prove useful in other Faculties. Dr Flynn and Dr Mac Murchaidh aim to ensure that there is no duplication in the linked colleges in terms of supervisory training already available in the University. The Chair noted that the 3U Partnership, launched on 26 June 2012, incorporated a project involving a model of supervisor and doctoral candidate training that currently relates to the discipline of Education Studies and the linked colleges but has the potential to be applied to other areas. (Items 3.4 and 12.6)
- 3.4** Noted that the University Standards Committee, at its meeting of 7 June 2012, had not approved the proposal on English-language requirements but had instead advised that two routes be explored to support research candidates who did not meet these requirements: the possibility that a different though equally demanding type of English-language test be used which would be specifically attuned to the needs of Science and Engineering students, and the possibility that a structured PhD framework be developed which would incorporate modules in English, with a progression bar beyond Year 1 for those who failed this module (see also Item 12.3 below). (Item 3.13)
- 3.5** Noted that it was being ascertained, with a School, whether or not an examination for confirmation on the PhD register had taken place. If it has not, it will need to be organised. (Item 4.7)

- 3.6** Noted that a student had been informed of the completion deadline expected of him. (Item 4.9)
- 3.7** Noted that wording had been changed, and moved, on a PGR3 form. (Item 4.12)
- 3.8** Noted that an issue in respect of clustering of nominations as external examiner had been mentioned to a Head of School. (Item 5)
- 3.9** Noted that an issue in respect of the level of detail on forms submitted to the GSB had been mentioned to the relevant staff member. (Item 5)
- 3.10** Noted that confirmation of an issue in respect of an internal examiner had been obtained, and the PGR4 form had therefore been deemed approved. (Item 5.5)
- 3.11** Noted that confirmation in respect of the supervisory and examining experience of a nominated external examiner had been obtained, and the nomination had therefore been deemed approved. (Item 5.19)
- 3.12** Noted that the justification for early submission in respect of a student that had been requested was not in fact required, as the student was not in fact submitting early. The PGR4 form was therefore deemed approved. (Item 5.20)
- 3.13** Noted that confirmation in respect of the independence of a nominated external examiner had been obtained, and the nomination had therefore been deemed approved. (Item 5.25)
- 3.14** Noted that two students had been informed of the maximum allowable length of the thesis. (Items 5.35 and 5.47)
- 3.15** Noted that Dr Tony Hall, National University of Ireland, Galway, had been approved on 15 May 2012, by means of Chair's action, as external examiner for a PhD student in the School of Education Studies, on foot of the request that an alternative to the original nominee be sought. (Item 5.39)
- 3.16** Noted that a student had been informed that the proposed length of the thesis was particularly short and should be reconsidered. (Item 5.42)
- 3.17** Noted that, in the case of a PhD candidate, an external examiner, and a justification for early submission, were being sought. (Item 5.60)
- 3.18** Noted that the Deputy President/Registrar, Professor Anne Scott, had reviewed the examination reports for the first two students to graduate from the Doctorate of Music in Performance programme in the Royal Irish Academy of Music and, on the basis of these and of all other information to hand, had advised that the student who

- wishes to submit early be permitted to do so. The relevant PGR4 form, including the nominated external examiner, Dr James Garratt of the University of Manchester, was approved. Noted that the external review of the DMusPerf programme is ongoing. (Item 5.64)
- 3.19** A request that a student be permitted to register for Year 1 of the PhD track was approved. (Item 6.2)
- 3.20** Noted that Budget Committee had made available a sum of money which the Registry intended to use to leverage the external examiner report system with a view to making the PGR2 (annual progress report) form available on line. Stressing that what will be involved is a document handling system rather than a comprehensive student records system, the Chair expressed appreciation to Ms Gillian Barry, Student Awards Manager, and her Registry colleagues for having identified the opportunity and requested the decision of Budget Committee. (Item 7)
- 3.21** Noted that the DCU PAC User Group had requested that two academics join it to represent the research community. Dr Tony Cafolla of the School of Physical Sciences will represent the Faculty of Science and Health and the Faculty of Engineering and Computing in this regard, and a nomination is awaited in respect of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and Dublin City University Business School. With respect to the report on online research applications through PAC, it was agreed that clarification would be sought about the applicant figures mentioned. It was noted that the University had renewed its contract with PAC for a further year and also that funding issues might have an influence on institutions' relationships with PAC in the future. (Item 8)
- 3.22** Noted that the importance of the role of the internal examiner would be mentioned to Heads of School. (Item 9.2)
- 3.23** Noted that module LC557 *Representations of Sexuality* had been withdrawn as a proposed Graduate Training Element. (Item 10.1)
- 3.24** Noted that modifications were being made to the module descriptor for LC536 *Political Terrorism*, in line with GSB recommendations, and the revised descriptor would be made available to the Chair. (Item 10.3)
- 3.25** Noted that, at its meeting of 7 June 2012, the University Standards Committee had approved the proposal on approval mechanisms for structured research awards. (Item 11.2)

- 3.26** Noted that the revised *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Degrees by Research and Thesis*, due for implementation in 2012/13, had been considered electronically by the University Standards Committee, and approved following some amendments, and had been approved by Academic Council at its meeting of 6 June 2012. On behalf of the GSB, the Chair expressed appreciation to the members of the USC for their very close engagement with the issue. She noted that one further revision would be made to the *Academic Regulations*, to reflect the decision by the USC at its meeting of 7 June 2012 (and approved by Academic Council at its meeting of 25 June 2012) to approve a credit rating in the range 240-360 for doctoral programmes. (Item 12.2)
- 3.27** Noted that the GSB would, at a future date, give consideration to the appropriateness of specifying 90 as the maximum number of credits that can be taken by postgraduate students in any one year. (Item 12.7)
- 3.28** Noted that, by means of Chair's action on 29 May 2012, module EF611 *Constructing a Research Thesis* had been approved as a Graduate Training Element in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science.

SECTION B: POLICY AND STRATEGY ISSUES

4. Proposed Graduate Training Element

Faculty of Engineering and Computing: EE601 *Numerical Techniques for RF Circuit Modelling*

Approved.

5. Recognition of Prior Learning for Research Students

- 5.1** Noted that, with respect to taught programmes, Faculties had been requested to lodge their current RPL policies centrally in the University, or to devise such policies where they do not currently exist.
- 5.2** Agreed that the Chair would slightly reword the draft RPL policy for research students and circulate it to the Associate Deans for Research and the Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning/Education with a view to having it discussed in Faculties and then having recommendations come to the GSB for consideration in Autumn 2012. Reference to professional doctoral programmes will be included as will, if appropriate, reference to the PhD track.

5.3 Issues for consideration by the Faculties include the extent of detail that is required in the information supplied by candidates, the extent to which the policy needs to be tailored according to Faculty/discipline, and whether final approval should take place within Faculties or should be the responsibility of the GSB. The importance of the portfolio as a means of demonstrating prior learning was noted, as was the need to make it clear to candidates what would be expected of them given that they intend to enter a programme at Levels 9/10. It was suggested that requiring candidates for admission to PhD to have co-authored papers would involve too high a level of expectation of them.

6. PhD by publication

6.1 Noted that, while this route to PhD suits only some candidates, interest in it is growing appreciably. Agreed that it would be important to ensure, as far as possible, an understanding on the part of all stakeholders that while it is an alternative route it is not an easier one than a traditional PhD or other forms of doctorate. Noted that supervisors and even examiners might well be unfamiliar with the format and the associated expectations.

6.2 A specific difficulty pertaining to this route was noted: the fact that much of the content of the PhD submission will already have been published, normally in peer-reviewed journals, and yet is subject to examination by an internal and an external examiner as is the case for any doctorate. Agreed that the fact that articles have already been published should not have the effect of pre-empting the judgement of the examiners and that it would be very important to ensure a clear understanding of this on the part of all concerned. The reflective element of the PhD, which is separate from the articles, will also be very important in influencing the examiners' judgement; it is all of the components of the submission that they will evaluate rather than the articles alone.

6.3 Agreed that the Chair would seek the advice of Mr Paul Sheehan, Director of Library Services, on copyright issues, including the suitability of submitting articles in MS Word or, alternatively, in pdf format. Agreed also that guidance would need to be provided on the means of carrying out corrections given that articles will already have been published. Issues of timing (e.g. with regard to acceptance for publication and actual publication) were also noted as being of considerable importance.

6.4 Agreed that the Chair would draft a set of guidelines for supervisors, students and examiners and would include reference to the above issues as well as a statement of the reasons DCU is supportive of PhD by publication and a broad indication of the types of journals in which candidates are expected to have published. She will then make them available for discussion in Faculties with a view to having

recommendations come to the GSB for discussion in Autumn 2012. Faculties will be requested to make recommendations on, *inter alia*, the extent to which requirements of candidates should be customised according to Faculty.

7. Proposals for approval of *co-tutelle* arrangements

- 7.1 Noted that there is a significant need for clarification and shared understanding in respect of joint and dual awards and that proposals should aim, *inter alia*, at avoiding situations in which considerable work is carried out to make arrangements with other institutions which the University will not support. Nor should joint or dual awards be sought retrospectively; the basis for the arrangements, and all associated operational issues, should be clear from the outset, in accordance with such policies as the University agrees. The importance of clear templates and processes was noted.
- 7.2 The Chair is in discussion with Mr Ciarán Ó Cuinn, Executive Director of External and Strategic Affairs, about the inclusion of elements relevant to graduate research in the ongoing University review of issues relating to Memoranda of Understanding and other types of agreement. Further discussion needs to take place, however, to determine the types of agreement that suit the various types of graduate research arrangements and the levels of sign-off that are required for these.
- 7.3 In the discussion of the issues relating to co-supervising involving external institutions, the following were noted:
- there is a variety of understandings in the University about the extent to which it is desirable to formalise arrangements
 - workload issues need to be taken into account (e.g. a formal arrangement may count as part of an individual's workload whereas an informal one may not)
 - it is important for the supervisor to have a good sense of the student's whereabouts (e.g. if the student is abroad in the context of a joint or dual award), though the Head of School may not need the same level of detailed knowledge
 - institutional and national commitments to the concepts of joint and dual degrees vary very significantly; the IUA tends to favour joint rather than dual degrees with a view to avoiding double counting of credits, but European funding agencies tend to use the terms interchangeably
 - joint degrees tend to involve a heavy administrative overhead
 - potential sources of joint or dual collaboration are: the University's focus on India and Indian universities; the Erasmus Mundus programme and the importance of favourable strategic positioning by the University with respect to it; the new 3U Partnership; other strategic developments such as the relationship with Dundalk Institute of Technology.

- 7.4 The following were agreed:
- in the current proposal, the reference to informal agreements should precede the reference to formal agreements
 - any joint or dual arrangements made by the University with other institutions should be based on policies agreed by the University rather than developing on the basis of needs arising from a particular situation
 - the Chair will summarise the GSB discussion to Mr Ó Cuinn and seek feedback from him
 - the Chair will make a submission on the issues for the consideration of the Education Committee at its meeting of 5 September 2012, with a request for recommendations (to cover the variety of situations in which agreements with other institutions are mooted, e.g. a formal approach to or from another institution, a funding proposal, an initiative by an individual supervisor).
 - The wording changes in the second part of the discussion document will be included in the next set of proposed revisions to the *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Degrees by Research and Thesis*.

8. Roles and responsibilities in research supervision and examination

- 8.1 Noted that issues relating to role descriptions (e.g. ‘supervisor’, ‘principal supervisor’, ‘primary supervisor’, ‘co-supervisor’, ‘secondary supervisor’, ‘mentor’) require clarification, and agreed that, pending such clarification, no changes to such descriptions should be made on PGR forms or in the student records system.
- 8.2 In relation to mentoring, specifically, it was noted that it is not currently a compulsory element of the supervisory process and also that the definition of what constitutes mentoring needs to be established.
- 8.3 Other issues for consideration were noted as being the difficulty experienced by a small number of Schools in terms of identifying sufficient numbers of members of staff who have already supervised to completion and the difficulties associated with lack of certainty about the likelihood that a supervisor on a temporary contract will have it renewed. With regard to the latter issue, the Chair noted that she had asked advice of HR in the context of the Research Career Framework.
- 8.4 Agreed that Dr Looney would draft a table outlining the qualifications, roles and responsibilities of examiners, similar to that already drafted in respect of supervisors, and would incorporate both tables into one document for the consideration of the GSB at its meeting of 10 September 2012 and subsequently for discussion in Faculties.

9. Terms of reference of the Graduate Studies Board

Approved subject to the substitution of the term ‘professional doctorate’ for ‘taught doctorate’ and to revision of the reference to the order of the agenda, if appropriate (noted that the agenda for the present meeting involves a reversal of the order of Section B and Section C, on an experimental basis, and that a decision will be taken as soon as possible as to the suitability of this). Noted that some GSB members are experiencing difficulties with Google Docs and that discussions about this matter are in progress.

SECTION C: INDIVIDUAL STUDENT ISSUES

10. Applications for transfer to the PhD register or confirmation on the PhD register

- 10.1 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.1, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.2 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.2, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.3 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.3, School of Chemical Sciences
Approved.
- 10.4 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.4, School of Chemical Sciences
Approved.
- 10.5 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.5, School of Chemical Sciences
Approved.
- 10.6 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.6, School of Chemical Sciences
Approved.
- 10.7 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.7, School of Communications
Approved.
- 10.8 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.8, School of Health and Human Performance
Approved.
- 10.9 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.9, School of Law and Government
Approved.
- 10.10 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.10, School of Mathematical Sciences
Approved.
- 10.11 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.11, School of Nursing and Human Sciences/NICB
Approved.
- 10.12 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.12, School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Approved.
- 10.13 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.13, School of Physical Sciences
Approved.

- 10.14 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.14, School of Computing
Approved subject to the submission of a new PGR3 form containing a revised 'Report on the programme of research' section and to clarification of the reference to a document to be submitted by a specified date. Agreed that the Chair would mention to the School the importance of appropriate completion of forms.
- 10.15 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.15, School of Biotechnology/NICB
Approved.
- 10.16 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.16, School of Biotechnology/NICB
Approved.
- 10.17 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.17, School of Biotechnology/NICB
Approved.
- 10.18 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.18, School of Biotechnology/NICB
Approved.
- 10.19 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.19, Dublin City University Business School
Approved.
- 10.20 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.20, School of Electronic Engineering
Approved.
- 10.21 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.21, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.22 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.22, School of Education Studies
Approved in principle. Agreed that the year (of PhD) into which the student would transfer would be stipulated following further discussion with the School about what the most reasonable timeframe for the student would be, within regulations. Noted that the School was in the process of developing a framework within which decisions about transfer from professional doctoral programmes to PhD programmes could be taken, that this framework would be discussed by the GSB once it became available and that it had the potential to provide guidance for other Schools which got similar requests from students. Agreed, however, that such requests should, ideally, not arise unless in exceptional circumstances (transfers such as that requested are not the norm internationally) and that it is important to establish with each student at the outset, to the extent possible, whether the professional doctoral route or the PhD route is the desirable one.
- 10.23 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.23, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.24 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.24, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.25 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.25, School of Biotechnology
Approved. Noted that what is involved is not a confirmation on the PhD register but a change of registration on the basis of new information.
- 10.26 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.26, School of Computing
Approved.

- 10.27 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.27, School of Computing
Approved.
- 10.28 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.28, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.29 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.29, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.30 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.30, School of Health and Human Performance
Approved subject to the submission of a revised PGR3 form which is to be typed, to include all relevant signatures and clarification as to dates, and to provide more detailed information on the examination process than is the case at present.
- 10.31 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.31, School of Biotechnology
Approved.
- 10.32 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.32, School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Approved.
- 10.33 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.33, School of Chemical Sciences
Approved.
- 10.34 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/10.34, Dublin City University Business School
Approved. Noted that the PhD is to be submitted in traditional format though this is not indicated on the form.

Noted that there were some cases in which a number of internal examiners were involved, some of them being postdoctoral researchers. Noted that there is nothing in *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Degrees by Research and Thesis* to preclude the involvement of postdoctoral researchers in the transfer/confirmation process and that it can provide them with valuable experience. Agreed, however, that the Chair would mention to relevant Heads of School that postdoctoral researchers may not act as internal examiners at the final examination stage.

Agreed that it is not good practice to select all supervisors and internal examiners from within the one Research Centre and that, to the extent possible, members of the relevant School should undertake these roles. Agreed that advice to this effect would be incorporated into the guidance document *Roles and responsibilities of those involved in postgraduate research supervision, support and examination* (see Item 8 above).

Agreed that, in a small number of cases in which no nominated supervisor is on a permanent contract of employment, the Chair would raise the issue with the Head of School.

Alluding to the large number of requests for transfer to/confirmation on the PhD register that had been submitted, the Chair expressed appreciation to all involved, noting that timely submission of such requests is very important in terms of the integrity of the processes relating to postgraduate research and that it is intended

that all requests will be submitted, as a matter of course, within the timeframe specified in *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Degrees by Research and Thesis*. She thanked the Registry for having issued reminders to supervisors about timely submission and noted that the diagram indicating timelines, which had been made available to supervisors and students, had also proved very helpful (and had been made available to St Patrick's College, as requested).

11. Appointment of external examiners

- 11.1 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.1, PhD, School of Biotechnology
Professor David Sheehan, University College Cork
Approved.
- 11.2 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.2, PhD, School of Communications
Dr Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, Cardiff University
Approved.
- 11.3 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.3, MSc, School of Chemical Sciences
Dr Grace Morgan, University College Dublin
Approved.
- 11.4 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.4, PhD, School of Education Studies
Professor Leslie Francis, University of Warwick
Approved.
- 11.5 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.5, MA, School of Education, Mater Dei
Institute of Education
Professor John Sullivan, Liverpool Hope University
Dr Patricia Kieran, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick
Approved.
- 11.6 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.6, PhD, School of Education Studies
Professor Valentina Dagiene, Vilnius University
Professor Lori Beckett, Leeds Metropolitan University
Approved.
- 11.7 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.7, EdD, School of Education Studies
Dr Naomi Elliott, Trinity College Dublin
Approved in so far as the replacement internal examiner is concerned.
Noted that the nominated external examiner had been approved at the meeting of the GSB of 3 May 2012 (Item 5.18 refers).
- 11.8 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.8, MSc, School of Health and Human
Performance
Dr Cian O'Neill, University of Limerick
Approved.
- 11.9 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.9, MSc, School of Health and Human
Performance
Dr Gareth Davison, University of Ulster
Approved.

- 11.10 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.10, PhD, School of Biotechnology/NICB
Professor Alan Dickson, University of Manchester
Approved. Noted that the School of Biotechnology should have been listed on the form under ‘School’.
- 11.11 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.11, PhD, School of Biotechnology/NICB
Professor Nicolas Mermod, University of Lausanne
Approved. Noted that the School of Biotechnology should have been listed on the form under ‘School’.
- 11.12 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.12, PhD, School of Health and Human Performance
Dr Miken Egaña, Trinity College Dublin
Approved.
- 11.13 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.13, PhD, School of Chemical Sciences
Dr David Gibson, Queen’s University Belfast
Approved.
- 11.14 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.14, PhD, School of Biotechnology
Professor Ann Burnell, National University of Ireland, Maynooth
Approved.
- 11.15 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.15, MEng, School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
Dr Mustafizul Karim, International Islamic University, Malaysia
Approved. Noted, however, that an additional supervisor would have been needed from February 2012 onwards, and agreed that Dr Looney would raise this issue with the Head of School.
- 11.16 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.16, PhD, School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
Dr David Kennedy, Dublin Institute of Technology
Approved.
- 11.17 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.17, PhD, School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Professor Paul Verhaeghe, Ghent University
Dr Gabrielle O’Kelly, University College Dublin
Approved.
- 11.18 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.18, PhD, School of Electronic Engineering
Dr Julie McCann, Imperial College London
Approved.
- 11.19 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.19, PhD, School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies
Professor Dale Knickerbocker, East Carolina University
Approved subject to confirmation that the external supervisor was approved in accordance with regulations.

- 11.20 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.20, PhD, Dublin City University Business School
Professor Susan Taylor, University of Maryland
Approved.
- 11.21 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.21, PhD, School of Education Studies
Professor Barry Hymer, University of Cumbria
Dr Jane Spiro, Oxford Brookes University
Approved.
- 11.22 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.22, EdD, School of Education Studies
Dr Rose Dolan, National University of Ireland, Maynooth
Approved.
- 11.23 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.23, PhD, School of Biotechnology
Dr Thomas Maskow, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research
Approved subject to clarification as to whether or not an additional supervisor might be required and confirmation of the experience of the nominating external examiner in terms of examining.
- 11.24 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.24, MSc, School of Computing
Dr Michael O’Grady, University College Dublin
Approved.
- 11.25 Student ref. GSB/2012/A4/11.25, PhD, School of Computing
Professor Stephen Robertson, Microsoft Research Cambridge
Approved in so far as the internal examiner is concerned. Noted that the nominated external examiner had been approved at the meeting of the GSB of 3 May 2012 (Item 5.37 refers).

Noted that, while the maximum word counts specified in *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Degrees by Research and Thesis* are intended to be limits rather than targets, they are often assumed to be the latter. Agreed that this issue would be discussed at a future meeting of the GSB.

Noted that the current design of the PGR4 form does not allow for easy verification of the independence of the nominated external examiner with respect to dealings with DCU over the past five years. The planned review of qualifications, roles and responsibilities of examiners will address this issue.

Noted that, while the PGR4 form elicits information about the nominated external examiner’s five most relevant publications, there is no stipulation as to the type of publication that should (or should not) be included.

Agreed that the Chair would discuss with a Head of School the possibility that external examiners might be sought from a wider range of institutions, and backgrounds, than is the case at present.

12. Other student issues**12.1 Request for admission to Year 3 of PhD research programme**

Candidate ref. GSB2012/A4/12.1, School of Electronic Engineering

Approved subject to confirmation that the institution in which the candidate is currently registered, University College Cork, would recommend him for progression.

12.2 Request for consideration of examination procedure re third revision of PhD thesis

Candidate ref. GSB2012/A4/12.2, School of Electronic Engineering

Approved subject to the corrections being signed off, if appropriate, by the School Research Convenor rather than the supervisor. Noted that it is important, in a general sense and where necessary, that resubmission conditions, and the resubmission timeframe, be specified at Faculty Awards Boards for Research Degrees.

12.3 Request for special-case admission to the Master's by research (full-time) programme

Candidate ref. GSB2012/A4/12.3, School of Computing

Not approved, on the basis of the decision made by the University Standards Committee at its meeting of 7 June 2012 (Item 10 of the minutes of this meeting refers), and approved by Academic Council at its meeting of 25 June 2012 (Item 5 of the minutes of this meeting refers) that candidates should not be admitted to the University without having met English-language requirements. (See also Item 3.4 above.)

13. Any other business

Agreed that, in view of the pressure of business that had obtained in 2011/12, it would be advisable to consider increasing the number of meetings, from the current six per year, for 2012/13. Dr Looney and Ms McDermott will discuss this and let the GSB know the new arrangements as soon as possible.

Date of next meeting:

**Monday 10 September 2012
9.00 a.m. in A204**

Signed: _____
Chair

Date: _____