



Senate

Paper Title	Education Quality & Standards Board, 20 September 2017: Executive Summary
Outcome requested	The Senate is asked to note the summary report, and approve the Education Quality & Standards Board Terms of Reference and Membership for 2017/18 (appendix 1).
Points for Senate members to note and further information	A high level summary of the discussions and decisions of the Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB) meeting held on 20 September 2017. For fuller details on any of the points mentioned, including full papers and minutes, members are directed to the EQSB QMplus page: https://qmplus.qmul.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=6851
Questions for Senate to consider	Is the Senate satisfied with the decisions and workings of the EQSB? Does the Senate have any additional items to refer to the EQSB.
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 and Learning)

Education Quality and Standards Board
Executive summary of the meeting held on 20 September 2017

Full papers and minutes for the Education Quality Board are available in QMplus:
<https://qplus.qmul.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=6851>

1. The Board **reviewed** its membership and terms of reference.
2. The Board **noted** that study abroad mark conversion schemes for South Korea and Russia had been **approved** by Chair's action.
3. The Board **noted** that amendments to the core question sets for module evaluation had been **approved** by Chair's action.
4. The Board **noted** an update from the Vice-Principal (SETL) (subsequently circulated as an all-staff email). Key points included:
 - a. QMUL's NSS results, which had had an 83.4 per cent overall satisfaction rating, 0.7 per cent below the national average.
 - b. The replacement of the QMUL Student Survey (QMSS) with the UK Engagement Survey (UKES), and a defined 'survey season' in semester two.
 - c. QMUL had put itself forward as a candidate for participation in a subject-level TEF pilot scheme.
 - d. QMUL's Access Agreement 2018/19 had been approved.
5. At the request of the Partnerships Board, EQSB **agreed** new policies (or clarifications) around the establishment of new collaborative programmes:
 - a. A limit for double-counting of credit on double award programmes was established. This was set at the existing limit permitted for advanced standing for the award in question. There was discussion as to whether a higher limit should be permitted where modules were jointly created and delivered by the two (or more) institutions specifically for the programme in question; that issue was not fully resolved and will be revisited.
 - b. The Partnerships Board sought additional guidance on how to establish the academic suitability of a partner organisation. The EQSB noted that guidance already existed, and required review on an individual basis. The EQSB suggested that the Partnerships Board might make greater use of the expertise of the Taught Programmes Board, and of league tables. Partners should be of at least equal international standing to QMUL.
6. The Board **considered** proposals to remove one institutional review stage from the Student Complaints Policy, and to review the system for the recording of complaints. Revised proposals would be considered by the Senate.

7. The Board **considered** a number of policy issues related to assessment and award that had been raised by Senate, Degree Examination Boards, and other bodies, to determine whether any of these required review. The Board **agreed**:
- a. To constitute a working group to develop guidance on appropriate volumes of assessment for modules at given levels and credit values, and to encourage innovation in assessment design.
 - b. Not to review the policies on holding assessment marks to integers and module and College Marks to one decimal point. It was agreed that rounding could considerably distort student outcomes (for better or worse) and that QMUL should have confidence in its marking.
 - c. To develop guidance on the review of module marks, particularly at borderlines, as practices varied between schools (including whether this was permitted at all).
 - d. Not to review the late assessment submission penalty, but to encourage schools/institutes to more evenly distribute submission deadlines. The need for one consistent policy was deemed paramount, the majority of schools were satisfied with the current policy (which was deemed in line with practices elsewhere), and the Board was concerned that students who submitted on time would be disadvantaged if the penalties were made more lenient.
 - e. Not to review the policy on making an award as soon as the minimum requirements were met (meaning that remaining resit attempts were lost). The cases in which the resits could make a difference to student outcomes were very few, and the existing policy was in line with practice elsewhere. The External Member to the DEB had cautioned against a change.
 - f. That where it was mathematically impossible for a student to progress or be awarded even if they passed any remaining resits, they would be deregistered, so as not to set students up for failure.
 - g. That the GPA project would be placed on hold. The Language Centre had completed a successful pilot using letter grades in marking corresponding to fixed numerical marks. This had increased the range of marks and reduced disagreements between markers, but it had become apparent that GPA calculations would take data from module, not assessment, marks; at this point a GPA would equate only to an analogue of the College Mark.
 - h. That any proposals received for review of the award year weightings would be considered, but that there was no immediately clear rationale for amendment. It was agreed that, were such proposals received, QMUL would not consider using different rules for the same awards in different faculties, as a common QMUL standard was required.
 - i. That QMUL would review the policy on deregistration of students from modules for non-engagement, with the possibility of removing this process. It was posited that the process was somewhat outdated, and that students who had paid fees should be entitled to the full amount of teaching and assessment even if they chose not to engage.
8. The Board **considered** a draft of QMUL's Annual Assurance Report for Council, the revised version of which was presented to the Senate.
9. The Board **considered** reports of the Periodic Reviews of EECS and the IHSE.

10. The Board **considered** the report of the External Member to the UG Degree Examination Boards, and agreed to revisit the policy on examiner attendance at formal examinations.
11. The Board **noted** an update from the QMSU Vice-President (Education).
12. The Board **noted** recent minutes from the E-Learning Steering Group, Library User Forum, QMUL Model Working Group, Taught Programmes Planning Group, Student Surveys Coordination and Development Group, OFFA Access Monitoring Group, and Student Experience Advisory Group.
13. The Board **noted** an update on the Teaching Recognition Project, which aimed to achieve HEA (or equivalent) recognition for 100 per cent of teaching colleagues by 2018/19. At the start of the third year of the project, 47.7 per cent of teaching staff had been recognised with HEA Fellowship. This could rise to a potential 58.0 per cent if all current submissions for recognition of equivalent awards were recognised.

Appendix 1

EQSB Terms of Reference 2017/18

1. To consider and advise Senate on institutional strategies and policies which enhance learning, teaching and assessment across all Queen Mary programmes, by:

- [a] promoting excellent, research-informed teaching practice and curriculum design, and encouraging innovative approaches to learning;
- [b] supporting the development of staff involved in teaching and assessment;
- [c] promoting developments in learning technologies and resources;
- [d] supporting widening participation and outreach activities;
- [e] taking steps to maximise the academic and career success of our diverse student body;
- [f] analysing relevant performance indicators in relation to student progress and achievement, and student satisfaction.

2. To monitor indicators of progress in the Student Experience, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy.

3. To consider and advise Senate on policies and mechanisms for assuring academic standards and quality at Queen Mary through a risk-based approach.

4. To scrutinise and report to Senate on the outcomes of quality assurance mechanisms, including:

- [a] matters arising from the conduct of examination boards, including external examiners' reports;
- [b] reports from external agencies, including the QAA, HEFCE, PSRBs and Research Councils;
- [c] reports and action plans arising from annual programme reviews, periodic reviews and student surveys.

5. To establish groups to undertake specific tasks related to the Board's remit and to consider recommendations from these groups.

6. To provide regular reports to Senate, including recommendations for further action where appropriate.

EQSB Membership 2017/18

Ex officio

Professor Rebecca Lingwood, Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching & Learning) (Chair)

Dr Colleen Cotter, Dean for Taught Programmes (Humanities & Social Sciences)

Professor Julia Shelton, Dean for Taught Programmes (Science & Engineering)

Professor Anthony Warrens, Dean for Education (Medicine & Dentistry)

Professor Mike Watkinson, Director of the Doctoral Training College

Professor Lucinda Hall, Life Sciences Institute Deputy Director for Education

Dr Rosemary Clyne, Academic Lead for International Student Experience

Christina Perry, Academic Lead for Engagement, Retention & Success

Jonathan Morgan, Academic Registrar & Secretary to Council

Jane Pallant, Deputy Academic Registrar

Sally Mitchell, Assistant Director (Academic Development)

Dr Carole Davis, Head of Educational Development

Kate Price, University Librarian

Stella Ekebuisi, Head of E-Learning

Laura Gibbs, Chief Operating Officer

Mary Ojo, QMSU Vice-President (Education)

Two academic representatives from each faculty

Dr Eyal Poleg, Humanities & Social Sciences

Dr Guglielmo Volpe, Humanities & Social Sciences

Dr Jo Brown, Medicine & Dentistry

Dr Lesley Robson, Medicine & Dentistry

Dr Henri Huijberts, Science & Engineering

Jane Reid, Science & Engineering

Five student representatives

Dolapo O, Undergraduate Humanities & Social Sciences

Samruddhi Joshi, Undergraduate Science & Engineering

Jonas Schlautmann, Undergraduate Medicine & Dentistry

Vacant, Postgraduate taught

Vacant, Postgraduate research

In attendance

Simon Hayter, Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance) (Secretary)

Dr Simon Booy, Executive Officer (Student Experience, Teaching & Learning)

Diana Buckley, Executive Officer (Student Experience, Teaching & Learning)

Igor Gavran, QMSU staff representative

Chairs of all groups reporting to the Board (where these are not members of the Board)

Dr Dominic Hurst, Library User Forum

Professor Alastair Owens, Staff Development Advisory Group

Chairs of the Degree Examination Boards

Professor Catherine Nash, Humanities & Social Sciences (Undergraduate)

Professor Wayne Morrison, Law (Undergraduate)

Dr Alasdair King, Humanities & Social Sciences (Postgraduate)

Professor Ian Walden, Humanities & Social Sciences (Postgraduate)

Vacant, Science & Engineering (Undergraduate)

Dr Fariborz Motallebi, Science & Engineering (Postgraduate)

Dr Alan Cruchley, Dentistry (Undergraduate)

Dr Sandra Nicholson, Medicine (Undergraduate)

Dr Martin Carrier, Medicine & Dentistry (Postgraduate)