



Senate

Paper title	Education Quality Board: minutes of 15 March and 17 May 2017
Outcome requested	Senate is asked to note the minutes.
Points to note and further information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters requiring Senate consideration have been included on the Senate agenda. • From 2017/18, EQB will be known as 'Education Quality and Standards Board' (EQSB).
Questions to consider	
Regulatory/statutory reference points	
Strategy and risk	
Reporting/consideration route for the paper	Senate only.
Author	Simon Hayter Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance)
Sponsor	Professor Rebecca Lingwood Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching & Learning)

Education Quality Board

Minutes of a meeting held on 15 March 2017

Present

Professor Rebecca Lingwood (Chair)

Sumeera Ahmad

Dr Alasdair King

Jane Pallant

Dr Lesley Robson

Dr Jo Brown

Ruari McGowan

Dr Eyal Poleg

Dr Roberto Veneziani

Dr Henri Huijberts

Gemma Meredith

Jane Reid

Lewis Williams

In attendance

Rachel Davies

Professor Thomas Prellberg

Stella Ekebuisi

Emma Rabin

Simon Hayter (Secretary)

Apologies

Brad Coales

Laura Gibbs

Professor Mike Watkinson

Dr Colleen Cotter

Professor Lucinda Hall

Professor Anthony Warrens

Dr Alan Cruchley

Christina Perry

Additional items for discussion

2016.49 The Board **invited** members to open for debate any of the agenda items that were otherwise to be taken without discussion. No such requests were made.

Declaration of interests

2016.50 The Board **invited** members to declare any potential declarations of interest. No such declarations were made.

Minutes of the previous meeting (16-03-01)

2016.51 The Board **approved** the minutes of 16 November 2016, without amendment.

Actions and matters arising (16-03-01)

2016.52 The Board **considered** the action points from its previous meetings.

2016.52.a *2015.27.f.i: IT Services to amend its acceptable use policy to state that it is not acceptable to copy or disseminate recorded material.*

IT Services had amended the text, but this did not go far enough and comprised only a personal use statement. The Head of E-Learning agreed to take this forward directly with IT Services.

2016.52.b *2015.71.b: Establish a working group to review the variation in assessment patterns and to establish broad guidelines on the development of assessment.*

Open. As noted at the previous meeting, the group would not be established until after the conclusion of the review of the QMUL Academic Credit Framework.

2016.52.c *2015.89.a: EQB membership: Contact the Deans for Taught Programmes, who should each nominate two representatives from their respective faculties.*

Complete. Jane Reid and Dr Henri Huijberts had joined the Board.

2016.52.d *2016.39.g: Confirm 2017 QMplus update dates and effects with regard to the MSc Physician Associate Studies and the MBBS Parts 4 and 5 term dates.*

Complete.

2016.52.e *2016.40.f: Refer DPpsych exit awards to Taught Programmes Board for approval.*

Complete, and approved by TPB on 23 November 2016.

2016.52.f *2016.40.g: Codify new professional doctorate exit award arrangements in the regulations.*

2016.40.f: Work with Dentistry to introduce and approve taught exit awards for the DClinDent.
Open. Regulatory changes would be considered at the May 2017 meeting of EQB.

2016.52.g *2016.44.b: Consider benchmarking of QMUL's quality processes against ENQA guidance.*

Complete. Considered as part of the March 2017 EQB agenda.

Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning)'s update (16-03-02)

- 2016.53 The Board **noted** a written update from the Vice-Principal, addressing recruitment, the QMUL Model, the Credit Framework, the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), the Office for Students consultation, the Teaching and Learning Conference and Drapers' Lecture, QMUL's Access Agreement, the Westfield Fund, student surveys, HEFCE Catalyst bid successes, Foundation Studies, and Engagement, Retention and Success events.
- 2016.53.a The Board **noted** that the TEF Working Group had submitted QMUL's TEF2 provider submission in February 2017, and begun a 'lessons learned' exercise to support future submissions. The TEF2 outcome was expected in May 2017. Based on metrics, QMUL expected a silver outcome; narrative text in provider submissions could positively or adversely affect outcomes, but this was not anticipated for QMUL.
- 2016.53.a.i The Board **noted** that subject-level (rather than institutional-level) TEF would be piloted but implementation had been delayed from TEF3 to TEF4 at the earliest. The Working Group had begun to consider the most desirable level of granularity for QMUL and to input to national discussion. Subject-level TEF pilots would be genuine pilots, with anonymity for institutions and no direct institutional impact.
- 2016.53.a.ii The Board **noted** that the House of Lords had proposed two amendments to the TEF, to sever the links between TEF outcomes and institutions' ability to (i) set increased tuition fees, and (ii) recruit international students. QMUL continued to monitor these discussions.
- 2016.53.b The Board **noted** that QMUL had responded to a consultation on funding models for the new Office for Students, with particular regard to the institutional levy.
- 2016.53.c The Board **noted** an update on National Student Survey response rates at QMUL, in light of the QMSU NSS boycott. Responses rates stood at 36 per cent (down 14 per cent on the same point in 2016), though the survey remained open until 30 April 2017. A response rate of at least 50 per cent was required for results to be publishable.
- 2016.53.c.i The Board **noted** a need for data on response rates at other institutions. Senate had undertaken to seek these data. It was known that response rates had increased significantly at a number of comparator institutions, though these had not necessarily encountered boycotts. 27 Students' Unions had enacted boycotts.

Study abroad credit load and grade conversion scales (16-03-08)

- 2016.54 The Board **considered** a number of recommendations for new credit load equivalencies and mark conversions for QMUL students studying abroad.
- 2016.54.a The Board **approved** a standard mark conversion scale for Russia.
- 2016.54.b The Board **approved** a credit-load equivalency and institution-specific mark conversion scale for the University of Ottawa, Canada.
- 2016.54.c The Board **approved** a credit-load equivalency and institution-specific mark conversion scale for the University of Toronto, Canada.
- 2016.54.d The Board **approved** credit-load equivalencies for Monash University and the University of Sydney. The existing standard Australian mark conversion scale for would apply.
- 2016.54.e The Board **approved** credit-load equivalencies for Columbia University, Drexel University, and Howard University. The existing standard USA mark conversion scale would apply.
- 2016.54.f The Board **approved** a credit-load equivalency for the University of Auckland. The existing standard New Zealand mark conversion scale would apply.
- 2016.54.g The Board **agreed** that the mark conversion schemes for Ottawa and Toronto, which did not include suggested marks within the translated QMUL mark ranges, would use the mid-point of each range as the suggested mark, with the exception of the lowest (0-39) range.

External Examiners' Summary Report 2015/16 (16-03-03)

- 2016.55 The Board **considered** a summary report of comments and issues raised by external examiners in 2015/16. The reports were generally positive.
- 2016.55.a The Board **noted** that SEBs were required to formally respond to external examiners where reports raised issues of concern, with the responses copied to ARCS. Response rates were not satisfactory, with around one third of the total required responses missing (with variance by faculty). Some responses might have gone directly to externals without informing ARCS, though SEBs had been specifically reminded not to do so.
- 2016.55.a.i The Board **agreed** that statistics on missing responses would in future be presented in APR meetings, and that those with high non-response rates would be reported to EQB.
- 2016.55.b The Board **noted** that a number of reports raised issues around marking trails, and consistency of the application of marking schemes. Evidence of marking, in particular, had been an issue – six academic appeals had hinged on this issue in the past year, two of which had had the potential to cause reputational damage. The matter had been raised with the Deans for Taught Programmes for address.

Report of the External Member to the PGT Degree Examination Boards 2015/16 (16-03-04)

- 2016.56 The Board **considered** the report of the External Member to the Postgraduate Taught Degree Examination Boards held in 2015/16. The report was positive and commended a number of QMUL's processes. 2015/16 had been the final year in post for the External Member.
- 2016.56.a The Board **noted** that the External Member had raised some concerns over the high proportion of Distinction classifications awarded for a small number of programmes in the Blizzard Institute. External examiners and the Taught Programmes Board had also raised this issue. The Blizzard had undertaken to review the appropriateness assessment methods for these programmes.
- 2016.56.b The Board **noted** that the External Member had mentioned a number of unusually protracted assessment offence investigations, which had prevented the consideration of six students at the Degree Examination Boards. This was unusual, and was attributed to particular difficulties in arranging panels, partly linked to students' availability. The cases had since been resolved.
- 2016.56.c The Board **noted** a suggestion from the External Member that the role was no longer necessary given increasing standardisations of approach both within QMUL and nationally, internal expertise at QMUL, and sectoral audit activities such as the HEFCE APR and the TEF. The External Member role was particular to QMUL, and not widely used in the sector.
- 2016.56.c.i The Board **noted** the value of the role, particularly in lending weight and scrutiny to internal recommendations, and to confirm the appropriateness of decision-making at boards. However, it was agreed that at postgraduate level, with the recently achieved commonality of regulations and relatively few complex cases, attendance at all board meetings each year was perhaps unnecessary. These points did not apply at undergraduate level, however.
- 2016.56.c.ii The Board **agreed** to retain the role but leave it vacant. It was suggested that the UG External Member might occasionally attend a PGT board to conduct spot checks on processes.

Annual Report on Student Casework 2015/16 (16-03-05)

- 2016.57 The Board **considered** annual summary reports on academic appeals, non-academic appeals, assessment offences, complaints, and disciplinary and fitness to practise procedures. The report had also been considered by the Senate, and would be considered by the Council.
- 2016.57.a The Board **noted** that an internal audit of complaints and appeals by KPMG had resulted in a positive outcome, and led to a project to revise processes around local record-keeping.
- 2016.57.b The Board **noted** that a number of cases had centred on student dissatisfaction with feedback and with clarity in marking processes. Senate had approved the implementation of results surgeries in 2015, but these had not been adopted in all schools and institutes. It was agreed that the matter would be referred to the Deans for Taught Programmes for consideration. It was also noted that the Assessment and Feedback Task and Finish Group would make recommendations in this area to the May 2017 meeting of the Board.

Action: J Pallant

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (16-03-06)

2016.58 The Board **noted** that the HEFCE Annual Provider Review 2017 required institutions to demonstrate compliance with the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)'s standards and guidelines. This might be a requirement for 2017, only – the future of the Quality Assurance Agency had been uncertain at the time the review exercise was planned; it had since been reconfirmed, and it was likely that HEFCE would revert to the QAA's Quality Code for Higher Education in future years.

2016.58.a The Board **agreed** that QMUL would undertake detailed mapping against the ENQA standards and guidelines in time for the 2017 HEFCE APR. It was noted that ENQA generally operated at a high level, and it was anticipated that QMUL would be fully compliant in all respects.

Action: J Pallant

HEFCE Annual Provider Review update (16-03-07)

2016.59 The Board **noted** an update on the 2016 HEFCE Annual Provider Review, which had replaced the institutional review visits conducted by the QAA. The Council had provided the required assurances on QMUL's quality assurance and enhancement processes, and the results of the return were awaited. No issues had been raised with QMUL to date.

2016.59.a The Board **noted** that the process was new to the Council. The Committee of University Chairs (CUC) had provided a high-level briefing document, which included a suggested pro forma for an annual report on quality and enhancement to support governors in their roles. The Senate had confirmed that QMUL would use this approach, and agreed that the Education Quality Board would have oversight of this process, including preliminary approval prior to consideration by the Senate and the Council.

Annual Programme Review: Summary of 2016 SMD and S&E meetings (16-03-09)

2016.60 The Board **considered** summary reports of the 2016 Annual Programme Review meetings for schools and institutes in Science & Engineering and Medicine & Dentistry. The Board raised no particular comments on these reviews.

2016.60.a The Board **noted** that the APR process was shortly to undergo an external review in order to determine how to get the most value from the process.

2016.60.a.i The Board **noted** that the Taught Programmes Action Plan (TPAP) would form a particular focus within the review. Although some schools and institutes found it a valuable tool in informing their work on an ongoing basis, other found TPAP of little use except in preparing an annual report for APR.

2016.60.b The Board **noted** that the action matrix used to track developments from QMUL's student surveys was to be extended to cover some other elements of the student experience, and that this might in future feed into APRs.

2016.60.c The Board **noted** and supported a suggestion to hold thematic APR meetings, with the summary report focusing more narrowly upon one or more major topics each year.

2016.60.d The Board **considered** the timing of meetings, noting that S&E and SMD held meetings in semester one, while H&SS held meetings in semester two. It was noted that there was no 'best time' to hold an APR, and no recommendation was made on the timings. The importance of regular meetings (no matter the timing) to identify and address issues on a continuous basis was noted.

Periodic Review of the School of Physics and Astronomy 2016: Report (16-03-10)

2016.61 The Board **noted** the report of the Periodic Review of the School of Physics and Astronomy, held in December 2016. The School would submit a written update on progress against the Review's recommendations in May 2017, and would attend the Board for a final update 12-months after the review.

Periodic Review of the School of Mathematical Sciences 2016: 12-month update (16-03-11)

- 2016.62 The Board **noted** a progress update from the School of Mathematical Sciences, 12 months after its periodic review.
- 2016.62.a The Board **noted** that the School had taken satisfactory measures to address the recommendations of the review. In particular, a number of new working groups focused on student experience, curriculum review, and employability had been established and had made good progress.
- 2016.62.b The Board **considered** the value of the periodic review exercise from the perspective of schools and institutes. The review was seen as a useful intervention, which could add impetus and momentum to ideas already in development and could push a school to consider beneficial processes outside of its usual sphere.

LLM resit policy (16-03-12)

- 2016.63 The Board **agreed** an amendment to the Academic Regulations for LLM programmes. The 2017/18 and later regulations would introduce capped module marks for resits, and use the 'best fail' rules already in place for other postgraduate awards (rather than uncapped resits and use of the most recent marks, as previously used for the LLM).

Academic Credit Framework consultation (16-03-13)

- 2016.64 The Board **considered** the outcomes of a recent consultation on QMUL's credit framework, including four recommendations based upon the feedback received.
- 2016.64.a The Board **noted** that the recommendations were as follows:
1. QMUL moves to a model based upon multiples of 5 credits, affording the flexibility desired by those schools and institutes, without compelling others to make radical changes to their taught provision. Where a school/institute makes changes as a result of this, they should be mindful of any effects on other schools/institutes, on timetabling, on total assessment load for students, and on staff workloads.
 2. Modules should be approved at only prescribed values, as follows: 5 (for QMUL model modules, only), 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, 45, 60, 90, 120.
 3. There should not be separate UG and PGT credit frameworks.
 4. Schools and institutes should revisit the credit values of non-standard-weighted modules to bring them into line with the revised framework, should that be approved.
- 2016.64.b The Board **endorsed** the recommendations of the paper, noting that these would be presented to Senate for final consideration at its June 2017 meeting. A revised version of the paper and the amended credit framework would be considered prior to that meeting at the May 2017 Education Quality Board. The Senate would also be asked to endorse an audit of the plans of schools and institutes to make changes under the revised arrangements.
- Action: S Hayter**
- 2016.64.c The Board **noted** the section of the consultation document concerning the QMUL Model, which clarified that even where schools intended to retain multiples of 15 credits it was necessary to accommodate QMUL Model modules, some of which would be valued at 10 credits.

QMSU Vice-President (Education)'s report (16-03-14)

- 2016.65 The Board **noted** an update from the Student's Union.
- 2016.65.a The Board **noted** that the QMSU elections for 2017/18 had recently concluded, with the highest ever voting numbers. Mary Ojo had been elected Vice-President Education, from August 2017.
- 2016.65.b The Board **noted** an update on the Student Experience Seminar, which in 2017 would focus on learning materials. A report would be considered at the next meeting of the Board.

Groups reporting to Education Quality Board

2016.66 The Board **noted** the minutes and reports of the groups detailed below:

- QMUL Model Working Group, 21 December 2016 ([16-03-15](#))
- E-Learning Steering Group, 27 October 2016 ([16-03-16](#))
- Library User Forum, 7 December 2016 and February 2017 report ([16-03-17](#))
- Student Surveys Coordination and Development Group, 22 November 2016 ([16-03-18](#))
- Student Experience Advisory Group, 22 November 2016 ([16-03-19](#))
- Taught Programmes Planning Group, 8 December 2016 and 18 January 2017 ([16-03-20](#))
- Engagement, Retention and Success Steering Group, 15 December 2016 ([16-03-21](#))

Teaching Recognition Project update ([16-03-22](#))

2016.67 The Board **noted** an update on the Teaching Recognition Project, which aimed to see 100 per cent of teaching staff recognised with or working towards a teaching qualification or HEA (or equivalent) accreditation by the end of 2018/19. HEA data indicated that 47 per cent of staff had achieved recognition at the time of the Board.

Next meetings

2016.68 The Board **noted** that future meetings had been scheduled as follows:

- Wednesday 17 May 2017, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 20 September 2017, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 15 November 2017, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 21 February 2018, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 16 May 2018, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room

Actions

2015.71.b	Establish a working group to review the variation in assessment patterns and to establish broad guidelines on the development of assessment. <i>Action to be held open until the conclusion of the consultation on the Academic Credit Framework.</i>	R Lingwood / S Hayter
2016.40.g	Codify new professional doctorate exit award arrangements in the Academic Regulations.	M Childs
2016.40.h	Work with the Institute of Dentistry to introduce and approve taught exit awards for the DCLinDent.	
2016.57.b	Refer student casework issues around student feedback and lack of marking trails to the Deans for Taught Programmes for consideration, focusing particularly on results surgeries.	J Pallant
2016.58.a	Coordinate benchmarking of QMUL's processes against the ENQA standards and guidelines for the HEFCE APR.	J Pallant
2016.64.b	Revise and update credit framework and accompanying paper for EQB and Senate (May/June 2017), and initialise audit of schools' plans in response to the outcome (post-Senate).	S Hayter

Education Quality Board

Minutes of a meeting held on 17 May 2017

Present

Professor Rebecca Lingwood (Chair)		
Sumeera Ahmad	Dr Jo Brown	Dr Colleen Cotter
Professor Lucinda Hall	Dr Henri Huijberts	Ruari McGowan
Jane Pallant	Dr Christina Perry	Dr Eyal Poleg
Jane Reid	Dr Lesley Robson	Dr Roberto Veneziani
Dr Guglielmo Volpe	Jo Webb	

In attendance

Dr Simon Booy	Mary Childs	Brad Coales
Stella Ekebuisi	Simon Hayter (Secretary)	Dr Tony Michael
Dr Fariborz Motallebi	Professor Sandra Nicholson	Emma Rabin

Apologies

Dr Martin Carrier	Dr Alan Cruchley	Dr Carole Davis
Dr Dominic Hurst	Dr Alasdair King	Gemma Meredith
Professor Julia Shelton	Professor Anthony Warrens	Professor Mike Watkinson
Lewis Williams		

Additional items for discussion

2016.69 The Board **invited** members to open for debate any of the agenda items that were otherwise to be taken without discussion. No such requests were made.

Declaration of interests

2016.70 The Board **invited** members to declare any potential declarations of interest. No such declarations were made.

Minutes of the previous meeting ([16-04-01](#))

2016.71 The Board **approved** the minutes of 15 March 2017, without amendment.

Actions and matters arising ([16-04-01](#))

- 2016.72 The Board **considered** the action points from its previous meetings.
- 2016.72.a *2015.71.b: Establish a working group to review variations in assessment patterns and to establish broad guidelines on the development of assessment.*
Open. The group would not be established until the conclusion of the Credit Framework review.
- 2016.72.b *2016.40.g: Codify new professional doctorate exit award arrangements in the regulations.*
2016.40.f: Work with Dentistry to introduce and approve taught exit awards for the DCLinDent.
Complete.
- 2016.72.c *2016.57.b Refer student casework issues around student feedback and lack of marking trails to the Deans for Taught Programmes for consideration, focusing particularly on results surgeries.*
Complete.
- 2016.72.d *2016.58.a Coordinate benchmarking of QMUL's processes against the ENQA standards and guidelines for the HEFCE APR.*
Complete.
- 2016.72.e *2016.64.b Revise and update credit framework and accompanying paper for EQB and Senate (May/June 2017), and initialise audit of schools' plans in response to the outcome (post-Senate).*
Complete.

Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning)'s update (16-04-02)

2016.73 The Board **noted** a written update from the Vice-Principal, addressing matters including the TEF, the Access Agreement, an NSS and PTES update, teaching space utilisation, the QMUL Model, and Queen Mary Digital.

SETLA stocktake (16-04-03)

2016.74 The Board **considered** the third annual stocktake of progress against the aims of the SETLA Strategy 2014.

2016.74.a The Board **noted** that the stocktake showed positive progress overall, though a number of metrics still fell short of their targets.

2016.74.b The Board **noted** a number of issues with SETLA indicators of progress, particularly in respect of 1.1iii (number of staff discussing and recording conclusions about a component of their teaching and learning with an experienced colleague), and 3.1ii (training and support of non-teaching staff involved with students' activities to improve their ability to enhance the student experience), for which satisfactory mechanisms for data capture had not been identified.

2016.74.c The Board **noted** that, while many of the aims and objectives of the SETLA Strategy remained pertinent, the changing external environment and internal developments such as degree apprenticeships and the QMUL Model meant that there were additional measures that would sit well within the Strategy. These would be considered in the development of the QMUL Strategy 2018 and the SETLA Strategy 2019.

SETLA risk register (16-04-04)

2016.75 The Board **noted** updates made to the SETLA risk register since November 2016. The Board did not suggest further revisions.

E-Learning Staff Evaluation of E-Learning 2016/17 (16-04-05)

2016.76 The Board **considered** a report on the results of a staff survey on e-learning provision at QMUL. The survey had been the first of its kind.

2016.76.a The Board **noted** generally high levels of satisfaction with e-learning provision, and in particular with QMplus, QReview, and Turnitin. The quality of e-learning support was also highlighted.

2016.76.b The Board **noted** that the survey had raised a number of points for action. There had been a lack of awareness around some technologies. There were certain misconceptions around QReview, including mistaken beliefs that there were no editing facilities and that access was unrestricted. There were concerns that QReview negatively affected attendance rates. There had been some frustrations with the requirement to access e-learning support via the IT Services helpdesk, rather than contacting the team directly.

2016.76.c The Board **endorsed** a number of recommendations proposed in the report, noting that work on many of the proposals was underway. These included amendments to the look and feel of QMplus, work to raise awareness of features within QReview, a feasibility report on indicator lights to show when QReview was recording, and a trial call-back service for enquiries. Work to establish the impact of QReview recordings upon attendance would also be considered.

Academic Credit Framework (16-04-06)

2016.77 The Board **considered** a paper that made recommendations for amendments to the QMUL Academic Credit Framework. An earlier iteration had been considered at the previous meeting. Only minor amendments had been made since that time. The Board reviewed the recommendations in light of feedback from the faculty advisory groups.

2016.77.a The Board **agreed** that there would not be a requirement to amend programmes to include a ten credit space for a QMUL Model module in cases where schools retained the use of 15 credit modules. In such cases, a student would instead take a 15 credit QMUL Model module, or else multiple modules to the total value of 15 credits. It was agreed that the paper would be amended to make this point clear.

Action: Simon Hayter

- 2016.77.b The Board **noted** a suggestion to allow students to over-register by up to five credits each year to avoid problems in tessellating modules to an exact value of 120 credits. Such systems were used at two institutions included in the benchmarking exercise. The Board noted the likelihood of administrative and technical issues, and of students ending with incorrect total credit values. Financial issues were also noted – a student taking 125 rather than 120 credits would see the teaching allocation split 13 ways rather than 12. However, the Board agreed that the matter could be reviewed in future years.
Secretary's note: additional issues would include an advantage accorded to those who over-registered, as these students would have more opportunities to pass the minimum credits required for award.
- 2016.77.c The Board **endorsed** the paper and recommended that the proposals should be approved by Senate in June 2017.

Feedback Task and Finish Group report (16-04-07)

- 2016.78 The Board **considered** the report of the Feedback Task and Finish Group, which had developed recommendations based upon the QMSU Student Experience Survey 2015/16. The recommendations of the Group were divided into four categories.
- 2016.78.a The Board **noted** that the first set of proposals related to information for students:
1. *Student handbooks should include the following:*
 - a. *an explanation of what feedback is, and how it fits into teaching and learning. The explanation should outline what a student can expect from staff, but also the responsibility a student has for reflecting on the feedback they receive and using it to inform their studies, and the expectation that the student be proactive in seeking (further) feedback if necessary, making it clear who they might seek it from.*
 - b. *an indication of the different types of feedback, or mechanisms for providing feedback used in the school/institute (e.g. group feedback, sample solutions, one-to-one feedback, feedback forms).*
 - c. *a clear statement about marking/feedback turnaround times and the mechanisms for following up when deadlines are not met. An individual/role (and contact details) should be identified in the handbook as being responsible for follow-up.*
 - d. *an explanation, if relevant, about the potential use of peer marking in modules, and its benefit as a developmental tool.*
 - e. *an explanation, if relevant, about the moderation process, the supervision of markers, and ensuring consistency in marking where more than one marker is involved in the process.*
 2. *Module information (i.e. QMplus) should include a clear statement of learning outcomes, assessment and feedback formats, marking criteria, modes of teaching and learning and contact information. It should be the responsibility of the Module Leader to ensure that this information is included, but schools/institutes should deploy a checking mechanism (e.g. programme leader, or administrator).*
 3. *It should be clear to both staff and students who in each school/institute has responsibilities for ensuring that appropriate information is provided for all modules and programmes (e.g. module leaders, programme leaders) – both adding the information and checking that the information is there.*
- 2016.78.a.i The Board **noted**, in relation to recommendation 1.a, the importance of managing student expectations in relation to additional feedback, in order not to unfairly advantage individual students, and so as not to place inappropriate workloads upon staff. It was noted that many TAs were not paid for sufficient hours to deliver feedback in a way that would be meaningful under this recommendation, and that this posed questions around resourcing.

2016.78.a.ii The Board **noted**, in relation to recommendation 2, that an existing template within QMplus could hold much of these data. However, the Board expressed concern that incorrect information could be provided, unless the data were drawn from central records systems. The Board **recommended** that QMUL should consider the development of a centralised and computer-based system for academic developments in order to provide reliable data easily, and to expedite programme and module approval processes.

Action: Jane Pallant

2016.78.a.iii The Board **approved** recommendations 1-3. Recommendation 1 required immediate action, to make amendments to school/institute handbook templates.

Action: Simon Booy

2016.78.b The Board **noted** that the second set of proposals related to resources to support students and staff, and to embed good practice:

4. *Complementary online resources should be developed to support the development of good practice among staff and help students understand how to make the most of the feedback they receive, and understand ways to learn. A list of content that could be included in such resources is provided in Appendix D [of paper [16-04-07](#)]. A link to the student resource should be included in school/institute handbooks and relevant literature circulated to students. Academic Development should be proactive in promoting the resources and additional collaborative support they can offer to enhance teaching practice. Schools and Institutes may have materials and examples of good practice that could be shared via the resource sites. This would also help ensure that the resources are appropriate for a range of academic disciplines.*
5. *Education Development should ensure that the ADEPT programme addresses feedback appropriately*
6. *Schools and institutes should ensure that there are clear lines of responsibility for ensuring that good practice in use of feedback as part of teaching and learning is shared and embedded. Role holders should be working together to ensure there is a coordinated approach to teaching and learning. Responsibilities should be written in to role descriptions. Good practice, where identified, should be recognized and rewarded. Where there is a need for development and support this should also be addressed. The following duties should be included in these role descriptions:*
 - a. *Module leaders – to design feedback strategies to support learning in their module and ensure that these are put into practice; to ensure the relevant information is published in QMplus (as per the minimum requirements outlined in Section I above); and ensure TAs/ demonstrators are properly prepared for marking and feedback.*
 - b. *Programme leaders – to ensure that all modules on the programme have effective, clear feedback practices in place that are sufficiently consistent and, where appropriate, incrementally developmental across years. The Programme Coordinator should also facilitate the sharing of good practice to help these things come together. NB Some Schools/Institutes may have year coordinators, who would take on similar duties as programme leaders (e.g. monitoring consistency across students' simultaneous module experiences).*
 - c. *Directors of Taught Programmes – to maintain oversight of good practice via T&L groups, Annual Programme Review and Periodic Review.*
 - d. *Personal Tutor/Academic Adviser – within the QMUL Model this role takes on additional importance, working with students to ensure their personalized learning plan is appropriate. Tutors should be scheduling regular, periodic meetings with each student to encourage them to reflect on what they have learned through feedback and how they might use it to progress. Meetings might include end-of-year and/or start-of-year review/planning meetings. Specific timing of meetings should align with recommendations for the Personal Tutor role coming forward through the QMUL Model implementation.*

- 2016.78.b.i The Board **approved** recommendations 4-6, and also approved an additional recommendation: to seek to establish consistent terminology in relation to programme and module convenors/organisers/leaders, personal/academic tutors/advisers, etc.
- 2016.78.c The Board **noted** that the third set of recommendations related to examination feedback:
7. *Schools and institutes should publicise the fact that students can ask to see their comments and marks (via the School/Institute handbooks).*
 8. *Schools and institutes (e.g. module leaders or personal tutors) should be proactive in inviting students in to discuss exam results. It should be left to Schools/Institutes to determine the most effective structure for this, but Directors of Taught Programmes should have responsibility for overseeing the process, typically, scripts are retained by Schools/institutes for four weeks after results are released).*
- 2016.78.c.i The Board **noted** that, in 2015, the [Senate had approved a requirement for all schools and institutes to run 'results surgeries'](#) to provide feedback on examinations to help reduce the numbers of unnecessary academic appeals. This policy had been approved as part of the response to the OIA good practice guide. Schools and institutes had discretion on the means of implementing that requirement, and it was noted that consistent application of the existing requirements would address the recommendations.
- 2016.78.c.ii The Board **agreed** to write to schools and institutes to remind them of the requirement for results surgeries, noting that this existing requirement addressed the recommendations in full.
Action: Jane Pallant
- 2016.78.d The Board **noted** that the fourth set of recommendations related to the experience of first year students, and to the QMUL Model:
9. *For guidance on feedback, what students can expect, and what is expected of them at university to be included in the information provided to students before they start their programme (SBCS and QMSU have both produced pamphlets on feedback). Guidance should align with and refer to the QMUL statement on "Our Community", particularly the expectation that students should have "commitment to [their] own learning experience" (<http://www.qmul.ac.uk/ourcommunity/>).*
 10. *For the duties of the role of the personal tutor as defined in relation to the new QMUL Model, to include regular meetings with students to reflect on their programme, the marks and feedback they have received and how they might use that reflection to inform the coming year.*
- 2016.78.d.i The Board **approved** recommendations 9 and 10, noting that QMUL had separately agreed to conduct work in 2017/18 looking at the role and expectations of personal tutors.
- 2016.78.e The Board **agreed** that actions arising from the approved recommendations would be coordinated by the Chair of the Feedback Task and Finish Group.
Action: Simon Booy

Study abroad mark conversion: China (16-04-08)

- 2016.79 The Board **approved** a mark conversion scale for QMUL students studying abroad in China.

Academic Regulations 2017/18 (16-04-09)

- 2016.80 The Board **considered** proposed changes to the Academic Regulations for 2017/18.
- 2016.80.a The Board **noted** that there were few changes for 2017/18. Points of note included standardised progression and award rules for degree apprenticeships; formal regulations on eligibility and reassessment arrangements for QMUL students studying overseas; and an amended regulation to grant QMUL the discretion to refuse applications from former students who had failed a programme and reapplied for the same programme or one with substantial overlap (provision had already been in place to decline applications from those who had previously passed, or failed but left with an exit award).

- 2016.80.b The Board **noted** that students registered on QMUL's joint programmes in China would not be required to undertake QMUL Model modules if they came to the UK as part of their studies.
- 2016.80.c The Board **endorsed** the proposals and recommended that the regulations should be approved by Senate in June 2017.

Academic Regulations for Research Programmes 2017/18 (16-04-10)

- 2016.81 The Board **considered** proposed changes to the Academic Regulations for Research Programmes for 2017/18.
- 2016.81.a The Board **noted** that the regulations had also been considered by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board. Changes included the codification of progression and award rules (including exit awards) for professional doctorates; QMUL internal examiners would be permitted to serve up to three times each year; and the standard embargo period on these would be reduced from two years to one year in accordance with guidance from the research councils (students retained the option to apply for a longer embargo period).
- 2016.81.b The Board **endorsed** the proposals and recommended that the regulations should be approved by Senate in June 2017.

Assessment Handbook 2017/18 (16-04-11)

- 2016.82 The Board **considered** proposed changes to the Assessment Handbook for 2017/18.
- 2016.82.a The Board **noted** that there had been no significant policy changes in respect of assessment, and that there were very few amendments to the document.
- 2016.82.b The Board **agreed** to add new or expanded clauses on the need for schools/institutes to run results surgeries to give examination feedback to students for the avoidance of appeals ([as agreed by Senate in June 2015](#)), and on the need to leave clear trails of evidence to show where work had been moderated.
- Action: Simon Hayter**
- 2016.82.c The Board **noted** that schools could experience difficulties in giving appropriate advice on the fit to sit policy to students with mental health conditions. It was noted that these could be best managed through reference to the fitness to study policy that had been introduced in 2016/17.
- 2016.82.d The Board **endorsed** the document subject to the amendments above, and recommended that the Assessment Handbook should be approved by Senate in June 2017.

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (16-04-12)

- 2016.83 The Board **considered** the results of an exercise to map QMUL's quality and standards processes against ENQA benchmarks in preparation for the Annual Provider Review 2017.
- 2016.83.a The Board **agreed** that QMUL satisfied all criteria of the ENQA standards and guidelines.

Annual Programme Review 2016/17: H&SS summary report (16-04-13)

- 2016.84 The Board **considered** a summary report of the Annual Programme Reviews of schools in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in 2016/17.
- 2016.84.a The Board **noted** that, from 2017/18, H&SS schools with the exception of SLLF would revert to holding APR meetings in semester one.
- 2016.84.b The Board **noted** that student representatives had engaged with the process, and made useful contributions to the reviews.
- 2016.84.c The Board **noted** that the School of History had undertaken a trial of online examination feedback, and expressed interest in the results of the trial.

Use of module evaluation in relation to the NSS and the TEF (16-04-14)

- 2016.85 The Board **considered** a number of recommendations for amendments to the list of core statements used in module evaluation. The changes were principally intended to create better alignment between the measures of module evaluation and those of the NSS and the TEF.
- 2016.85.a The Board **noted** a desire on the part of some schools for increased flexibility in the phrasing of some statements, but concluded that this would result in the loss of the ability to compare data both between years and between schools.
- 2016.85.b The Board **noted** broad satisfaction with the revised statements. Schools and institutes would be given an opportunity to comment on the statements, and Education Quality Board would consider the final recommendations for approval by circulation.

Action: Emma Rabin

Periodic Review of Physics and Astronomy 2016: Three-month update (16-04-16)

- 2016.86 The Board **considered** a report from the School of Physics and Astronomy, documenting progress against the recommendations made in the periodic review.
- 2016.86.a The Board **noted** progress on the recommendation that the Faculty should continue to develop KPIs as a basis for engaging schools with relevant data and ensuring the monitoring of provision: a Student Experience Manager had been appointed to review the data.
- 2016.86.b The Board **noted** satisfaction with the School's progress, and further noted that a final update report would be submitted for consideration 12 months after the review.

Periodic Review of Engineering and Materials Science 2016: 12-month update (16-04-17)

- 2016.87 The Board **considered** a final report from the School of Engineering and Materials Science, documenting progress against the recommendations made in the periodic review.
- 2016.87.a The Board **noted** that progress against all of the recommendations was on track. The Athena SWAN submission had been deferred until November 2017 to take account of feedback received for recent submissions from other schools.
- 2016.87.b The Board **approved** the report, concluding the periodic review process.

Periodic Review of Biological and Chemical Sciences 2016: 12-month update (16-04-18)

- 2016.88 The Board **considered** a final report from the School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, documenting progress against the recommendations made in the periodic review.
- 2016.88.a The Board **noted** that progress against the recommendations was on track. Those actions marked as 'ongoing' concerned items where recurrent actions had been put in place.
- 2016.88.b The Board **noted** that the School had been unable to make significant progress in reducing the staff-student ratio; this action was under review at an institutional level.
- 2016.88.c The Board **approved** the report, concluding the periodic review process.

QMSU Vice-President Education's update (16-04-19)

- 2016.89 The Board **noted** an update from the QMSU Vice-President Education on the Student Experience Survey, the library, faith issues, the NSS boycott, and social and study spaces.

QMSU Student Experience Survey 2016/17 (16-04-20)

- 2016.90 The Board **considered** the report of the QMSU Student Experience Survey 2016/17.
- 2016.90.a The Board **noted** that the survey had focused on the provision and usage of learning resources. The report made a number of general recommendations, with particular relevance at school/institute level.
- 2016.90.b The Board **agreed** with the recommendation for QMSU to distribute the data sets and findings to individual schools/institutes for review and action.

Groups reporting to the Education Quality Board

2016.91 The Board **noted** the minutes and reports of the groups detailed below:

- Grade Point Average Task and Finish Group, 21 March 2017 ([16-04-21](#))
- QMUL Model Working Group, 9 February 2017([16-04-22](#))
- E-Learning Steering Group, 2 February 2017 ([16-04-23](#))
- Library User Forum, 22 February 2017 ([16-04-24](#))
- Student Experience Advisory Group, 26 January and 23 March 2017 ([16-04-25](#))
- Taught Programmes Planning Group, 21 March 2017 ([16-04-26](#))
- Engagement, Retention and Success Steering Group, 22 March 2017 ([16-04-27](#))

Teaching Recognition Project update ([16-04-28](#))

2016.92 The Board **noted** a written update on the Teaching Recognition Project.

Amendments to SSLC agenda and minutes templates ([16-04-29](#))

2016.93 The Board **approved** amendments to the SSLC agenda and minutes templates, noting in particular a new separate division for assessment and feedback (previously, this had formed part of the teaching and learning section).

Renaming of the Education Quality Board

2016.94 The Board **approved** a recommendation made by the Senate to rename the Board 'Education Quality and Standards Board', to better reflect the scope of its work.

Study abroad credit and mark conversion: South Korea

2016.95 The Board approved a request to consider a forthcoming study abroad conversion scheme, for South Korea, by Chair's action. An approved scheme was required for 2017/18.

Action: Rachel Davies

Next meetings

2016.96 The Board **noted** that future meetings had been scheduled as follows:

- Wednesday 20 September 2017, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 15 November 2017, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 21 February 2018, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room
- Wednesday 16 May 2018, 1400-1600, Colette Bowe Room

Actions

2015.71.b	Establish a working group to review the variation in assessment patterns and to establish broad guidelines on the development of assessment. <i>Action to be held open until the conclusion of the consultation on the Academic Credit Framework.</i>	Rebecca Lingwood Simon Hayter
2016.77.a	Amend Academic Credit Framework paper to make clear that schools are not required to create a 10 credit 'slot' for QMUL Model modules in each developmental year before sending the paper to Senate.	Simon Hayter
2016.78.a.ii	Look into the possibility of a computer-based system for the management of academic developments.	Jane Pallant
2016.78.a.iii	Submit amendments to the school/institute handbook template document as specified by the Feedback Task and Finish Group.	Simon Booy
2016.78.c.ii	Remind schools/institutes of the requirement to offer results surgeries.	Jane Pallant
2016.78.e	Coordinate work to address the approved recommendations of the Feedback Task and Finish Group.	Simon Booy
2016.82.b	Amend Assessment Handbook to include clauses on results surgeries and evidence trails for moderation.	Simon Hayter

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---------------|
| 2016.85.b | Consult with schools and institutes on revised core statements for module evaluation, and seek Education Quality Board's approval by circulation. | Emma Rabin |
| 2016.95 | Submit credit and mark conversion schemes for students studying abroad in South Korea for approval by Chair's action. | Rachel Davies |