Queen Mary
University of London

Senate

Paper Title	**Draft Annual Assurance Report to Council 2018-19**
Outcome requested	Senate is asked to **consider** the draft annual report on quality assurance and to make recommendations for the final draft of the report which will be considered by Council on 21 November 2019.
Points for Senate members to note and further information	Council is required, as part of the annual accountability return to the Office for Students (OfS), to give assurances on academic standards and quality at Queen Mary. The final statements for Council to consider have not yet been provided by the OfS but these are likely to be along the lines of those provided in previous years as follows: For the academic year 2018-19 and up to the present date: • The governing body has received and discussed a report and accompanying action plan relating to the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and student outcomes. This included evidence from Queen Mary's own periodic review processes, which fully involve students and include embedded external peer or professional review. • The methodologies used as a basis to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes are, to the best of our knowledge, robust and appropriate. • The standards of awards for which we are responsible have been appropriately set and maintained. Council has previously agreed that it will undertake this responsibility on the basis of a report prepared on behalf of Senate. The report is presented in two parts. The overview report which summarises headline issues, together with a more detailed Academic Assurance Report that has been prepared in line with the Council of University Chairs' illustrative practice note on academic assurance. The report does not cover student complaints and appeals as these have provided in a separate report to Senate and Council earlier in the year.
Questions for Senate to consider	• Is Senate content with the structure and content of the report?

	• Are there any additional examples, success stories or initiatives that should be included in the report? • It is proposed that for the future, in the event that the OfS does not require Council to confirm the statements above as in previous years, that the annual report on quality assurance to Council should focus on the conditions of registration with the OfS in relation to quality and standards as follows: • **Condition B1**: The provider must deliver well-designed courses that provide a high quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed. • **Condition B2**: The provider must provide all students, from admission through to completion, with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education. • **Condition B3**: The provider must deliver successful outcomes for all of its students, which are recognised and valued by employers and/or enable further study. • **Condition B4:** The provider must ensure that qualifications awarded to students hold their value at the point of qualification and over time, in line with sector recognised standards. • **Condition B5:** The provider must deliver courses that meet the academic standards as they are described in the Framework for Higher Education (FHEQ) at Level 4 or higher.
Regulatory/statutory reference points	The Office for Students Regulatory Framework Higher Education and Research Act 2017 UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Quality Assurance Agency) The Higher Education Code of Governance (CUC)
Strategy and risk	Aligns with the Queen Mary Strategy 2030 Excellence in Education Excellence in Student Engagement Excellence in Student Employability Excellence in Learning Environment
Reporting/ consideration route for the paper	Draft approved by Education Quality and Standards Board on 18 September 2019 Consideration by Council on 29th November 2019.
Authors	Academic Registry and Council Secretariat
Sponsor	Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)

Annual Assurance Report from Senate 2018–19

1.   Overview

1.1   Senate is nominated in the Queen Mary Charter as the body with overall responsibility for the academic activity of the university, subject to the general superintendence and control of Council. In practice, Senate assigns individual responsibility to the Vice-Principals for the management of academic quality and standards in the faculties, as well as for the development of cross-cutting academic strategies. It also delegates responsibility for detailed scrutiny of certain issues—the quality of the academic experience; curriculum approval and review; postgraduate research; academic partnerships; and research ethics—to a small number of boards. Senate's role is therefore to hold the Vice-Principals and the chairs of the boards to account, as well as to decide on matters of principle, while giving assurance to Council through regular reports that it is fulfilling its responsibilities effectively.

1.2   The boards of Senate that have responsibilities most closely aligned with the assurances to be given by Council are:

- Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB), chaired by the Vice-Principal (Education), which establishes academic regulations and quality assurance mechanisms, considers the outcomes of reviews of the academic provision, and develops policies to improve the quality of the academic experience;
- Taught Programmes Board (TPB), chaired by the Vice-Principal (Education), which scrutinises and approves the standards, content and arrangements for the delivery of new taught programmes;
- Partnerships Board, chaired by the Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships), which judges the appropriateness of potential partner institutions in teaching and postgraduate research;
- the Degree Examinations Boards, chaired by senior academics appointed by Senate, which consider recommendations from schools and institutes on the academic progress and achievement of individual students in order to gain assurance that institutional procedures for setting and maintaining standards have been followed and that assessment regulations are being applied consistently and fairly;
- Research Degree Programmes and Examinations Board, chaired by the Head of the Doctoral College, which combines the functions of EQSB, TPB and the Degree Examinations Boards for postgraduate research.

1.3   The above arrangements are set out in the Academic Governance Framework and supported by the Academic Secretariat. Reviews of academic governance are conducted periodically alongside the corporate governance reviews. The review of academic governance in 2015–16, that was reported to Council, concluded that Queen Mary has a comprehensive academic governance framework that provides structured opportunities for members of staff and students to engage on issues at all levels of the institution and conforms to sectoral expectations. A full review of academic governance will take place during 2019-20.

1.4   Sectoral expectations on how universities should manage academic standards and deliver a high-quality student experience are set out in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education provided by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), the body designated by the Secretary of State to carry out the quality and standards assessment functions on behalf of the Office for Students (OfS). Queen Mary meets these expectations through its academic regulations and a comprehensive set of institution-wide policies found on its website at http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality-assurance/index.html.

The arrangements include:

- policies and processes through which Queen Mary assures the standards, content and arrangements for the delivery of new taught programmes before they are offered to students;
- mechanisms for reviewing the 'health' of programmes on an annual basis, using information on student recruitment, progress and achievement, as well as feedback from students;
- mechanisms for reviewing local arrangements in schools and institutes on a six-year cycle;
- the involvement of students and student views in programme approval and review processes;
- the involvement of external specialists (who have been appointed through formal mechanisms to ensure their suitability and independence) in student assessment and programme approval and review processes;
- formal governance arrangements and the work of the Academic Secretariat to ensure that the arrangements are implemented.

Further information on these arrangements is provided in the summary of the Annual Assurance Report 2018-19 as part of the background reading for Council members.

1.5 Significant areas of work during 2018-19 have included:

- The Academic Regulations and policies on Academic Misconduct, Interruption of Studies, and Appeals were reviewed and rewritten in full, to make the documents more concise and accessible for students and staff.
- Improvements to Welcome Week and transition activities for students.
- The timetable improvement project which placed student preference at the core of the timetable and developed a set of timetable quality measures in response to student feedback.
- The impact of the Going for Gold Strategy, formally launched in 2018, on Queen Mary's approach to challenges related to academic standards and the quality of the student experience. The Going for Gold strategy has been innovative in its approach and has introduced the distributed leadership model, co-creation with students and the development of partnership learning communities. Key highlights of this important work which has impacted on quality and standards include:

  - work to develop an enhanced model of academic advising to be piloted in 2019-20. This project builds on a model of good practice developed in the School of Biological and Chemical Sciences where enhancements to advising practice have had a positive impact on progression and retention;
  - the development of a set of agreed core principles on assessment and feedback;
  - a pilot of mid-semester programme feedback sessions that reached 2000 students canvassing real-time feedback on topics such as academic advising, timeliness of feedback, and the student voice.
  - the recruitment and training of teams of student interns to conduct research into factors affecting student academic experience and outcomes- the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) attainment gap, experiences of commuter students, and factors affecting student retention.

- improvements to the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR), a record of a student's studies, which the recording of extra-curricular activities, awards and prizes so that students can evidence the breadth of their skills and experience beyond the scope of their degree;
- a working group in response QMSU's 'Big Change' Survey 2018-19 which concentrated on campus life and changes to the estate, focusing on initiatives to encourage students to spend more time on campus outside of lectures and to 'fully live amongst their learning'.

1.6 During the 2018–19 academic year Council has considered the following items in relation to academic assurance:

- a report following each meeting of Senate
- Annual Student Casework Report
- Presentations from the Vice-Principal (Education), the QMSU Executive Officers, and the Vice-Principal (Research).

Academic Registry and Council Secretariat
September 2019

Annual Assurance Report 2018-19

This report provides a summary of the full annual assurance report for 2018-19. It details the arrangements and policies in place at Queen Mary for the continuous improvement of the student academic experience and student outcomes, together with mechanisms for managing academic standards.

1. Periodic reviews of schools and institutes

1.1   Each school and institute at Queen Mary undergoes a periodic review every six years to assess the currency of its provision in light of developments in the discipline and to evaluate local mechanisms for improving the student experience on a continuing basis. The review also evaluates the effectiveness of academic governance structures and tests whether institutional policies and procedures are operating as intended to assure and enhance the standards of the provision.

1.2   Each review is conducted by a panel comprising:

- the Vice-Principal (Education);
- the QMSU Vice-President (Education);
- the Vice-Principal (Research), or a nominee from the Doctoral College;
- a member of staff from another Faculty;
- a member of staff from the Academic Development team;
- the Dean (or Deputy Dean) for Education;
- two external reviewers with expertise in the discipline and the management of academic quality and standards;
- representatives from the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat.

1.3   The panel engages in a series of meetings with students and members of staff, and also considers a detailed Self-Evaluation Document and supporting documentation requested from the school or institute under review. Panels normally meet before the day of the review to agree lines of enquiry and to consider the desk-based review of provision by the specialist external reviewers.

1.4   A detailed report of each periodic review is prepared by the Academic Registry and Council Secretariat, highlighting issues to be addressed and examples of good practice to be shared. In future, recommendations will be classified on the basis of their importance. The school or institute is required to prepare and implement an action plan in the light of the report, which is monitored by the Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB) after three months, and again after twelve months. As of 2018-19 reports and action plans are also shared with the relevant Faculty to enable support to be provided in achieving recommendations and to facilitate the dissemination of good practice.

1.5   Periodic reviews were conducted during 2018–19 in the following schools and institutes:

- School of Economics and Finance – 14 March 2019
- School of Politics and International Relations – 09 May 2019

1.6   A summary of the issues identified at these 2018-19 reviews, and the three and twelve-month updates from earlier reviews reported during 2018-19, is provided as an appendix to this report (Appendix A). Some key points to note are as follows:

- Items that are outstanding at the twelve-month review point are subsequently monitored through the Annual Programme Review process;
- The restructuring of Academic Development during the latter part of 2018-19 has meant that limited progress has been made in progressing the recommendations of the May 2018 review

of Educational Development. It is suggested that the recommendations of the review are considered during the formation and implementation of the proposed QM Academy.

1.7   A revised form of partnership review for major partnerships was introduced in 2016-17. The purpose of partnership review is to undertake a 'health-check' to inform the partnership renewal process and informs the next periodic review of the sponsoring school or institute. The review of the partnership with Nanchang University, offered in collaboration with the School of Biological and Chemical Sciences and the School of Medicine and Dentistry, took place in October 2018.

2.   Programme approval

2.1   Institutional processes for programme approval are designed to comply with the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. These expectations include a significant role for an External Adviser to provide independent and objective feedback on new programme proposals and to benchmark academic standards. External Advisers are usually senior members of academic staff who combine discipline expertise with experience of programme development elsewhere in the higher education sector. They are provided with formal guidance on their role, and there must be evidence that they have discharged their role adequately, and that the school or institute has responded appropriately to their comments, before a new programme gains approval. A review of the guidance for External Advisers, together with their submissions, was undertaken during 2017-18; revised documentation has been provided for 2018-19 and beyond with a view to optimising the commentary received on proposed new programmes of study.

2.2   Programme approval processes are overseen by the Taught Programmes Board (TPB), which has an overview of the academic standards of programmes and modules across Queen Mary. TPB has a specific remit for the detailed consideration of new programmes of study and associated modules, as well as programmes and modules that are delivered collaboratively, through distance learning, or involve work-based learning. Responsibility for minor amendments to existing programmes and modules is delegated to Learning and Teaching Committees in schools and institutes, which must be constituted in accordance with the Academic Governance Framework. TPB reports to each meeting of the Senate on its work, as well as the activities of the Learning and Teaching Committee. The Board continues to be involved in the approval of modules, which offered through the Queen Mary Summer School programme. Membership of the Board includes senior members of academic staff, students and Professional Services staff, all of whom receive an induction on their role.

3.   Annual Programme Review

3.1   The Annual Programme Review (APR) process is designed to utilise the ongoing programme monitoring performed by schools and institutes throughout the year. Outputs of monitoring processes are captured in a template that allows for reflection and identifies areas for development or for dissemination as good practice. In 2017-18, EQSB approved changes to the APR process for the review of the 2017-18 academic years. The main changes were as follows:

- A move to a more risk-based approach with a focus on reporting on areas/programmes which may need more attention;
- Encouraging integration of or cross-referencing to the Student Experience Action Plan or Taught Programmes Action Plan to reduce duplication;
- APR meetings between the Dean for Education and the school/institute were removed as a compulsory element;
- Common submission date for APR reviews for all schools/institutes;
- Revised dataset to allow more comprehensive oversight of the student lifecycle in one spreadsheet.

3.2   Although the template used to support the new process was changed, the areas which it covered remained the same as would be expected in a programme review (enrolment, progression, awards etc.) and schools/institutes continue to demonstrate good engagement with this exercise and have incorporated the changes to the process into their internal systems. However, the implementation of some elements of the amended process proved challenging as outlined below:

- Issues with the data quality for the revised dataset meant that there were delays in circulating the UG spreadsheet and some of the data could not be produced in the agreed format. It was also not possible to produce the revised PGT dataset so this data was presented in multiple spreadsheets as in previous years;
- The submission date for the APR documents (30 November) was too early to allow for most schools/institutes to submit these to their Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) and Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC) for comment as anticipated;
- The end review of the documents submitted by schools/institutes was affected by time constraints on key staff meaning there were delays in reviewing the documents and providing feedback to schools/institutes.

3.3   In order to address these issues, the following solutions have been discussed with the Deans for Education:

- Extending the submission deadline for the reviews to allow schools/institutes time for TLCs and SSLCs to sign-off documents;
- Use of separate templates for UG and PGT to tailor the questions to the type of provision
- The Strategic Planning team is in the process of finalising APR dashboards for UG and PGT in the PowerBI tool. This will make it easier for schools/institutes to look at headline information and then filter to programme level for closer analysis as well as allow monitoring of Strategy 2030 KPIs;
- Allowing more time for the faculty-level review at the end of the process, taking account of holiday periods and the new end of semester examinations.

It is hoped that these changes will improve the delivery of the APR process this academic year and a further review will be held at the end of the period to consider whether the process needs to be amended further or a more comprehensive review is required.

3.4   In an additional change to last year, schools/institutes will be asked to report on any programmes delivered collaboratively with an external partner on a separate form to allow Partnerships Board to review these in line with its mandate for monitoring the delivery of these activities.

4.   Module evaluation

4.1   There were no changes to the delivery of the module evaluation scheme in 2018-19. The core statements for dissertation/project modules remained unchanged and there was only one change to the core statements for taught modules which was the inclusion of a question to monitor QMUL model modules. Schools and institutes continue to add additional statements to collect feedback on specific aspects of programme delivery for their academic discipline(s).

4.2   In semester one of 2018-19, module evaluation data was impacted by the loss of five boxes of forms for scanning by the courier *en route* to Edinburgh. Despite efforts by the university, the courier was unable to locate the boxes so this data was lost. This mainly impacted schools in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (H&SS) (Centre for Commercial Law Studies, and the Schools of History, Geography, Languages, Linguistics and Film, Politics and International Relations, and English and Drama) to a greater or lesser extent as the main users of paper forms but the School of Physics and Astronomy in the Faculty of

Science and Engineering (S&E), and the Wolfson Institute in the School of Medicine and Dentistry were also affected. Schools were offered the option to set up online surveys for the missing modules – some schools opted to do this whilst others decided to try and collect feedback from students via other mechanisms.

4.3   A different courier company was used to deliver the scanning in semester two and this issue has not recurred but the result is that some schools will not have semester one module evaluation data for monitoring purposes and for APR reports.

4.4   As noted in last year's report, in 2018-19 schools and institutes were asked to consider whether they would move to the use of online evaluations if they are currently using paper forms. Whilst there was an awareness of the benefits of going online (particularly in relation to receiving results more quickly and reducing the administration burden), there are still concerns about the potential impact of using online surveys in regard to response rates. In 2017-18 responses rates for online surveys averaged at 36% as opposed to 58% for paper surveys, in 2018-19 the figures stood at 22% for online surveys compared to 46% for paper (the 2018-19 figure is based on semester two only as semester one response rates would be skewed by the data lost by the couriers).

4.5   Under the Going for Gold work stream, student interns were hired to run focus groups to gather student views on module evaluation and the use of online surveys. The main points noted by the interns in their report were as follows:

- students did not feel that their feedback was acknowledged or that changes were being made in response to evaluations;
- evaluations took place too late to make improvements to the module whilst they were studying;
- evaluations are too general and the questions are mundane and repetitive;
- students supported the use of online evaluations but felt that students should be asked to complete these evaluations during scheduled teaching sessions as it was less likely they would do surveys this in their own time unless they were very unhappy with the module.

        It may be useful to investigate whether the opinions expressed are repeated in a larger group of students.

4.6   If evaluations were to be moved online, Academic Registry and Council Secretariat (ARCS) has been exploring options with E-Learning and IT as to whether this could be delivered via QMplus alongside the rest of the module materials and resources. The Questionnaire activity tool in QMplus delivers some of the functionality that would be required but further development work is needed in order to meet all the key requirements for evaluations such as adding extra questions, student anonymity and the reporting functions. If it is not possible to deliver this in QMplus and Queen Mary opts to move to online evaluations, other systems including external IT solutions may need to be investigated.

5.   **Student Staff Liaison Committees**

5.1   In addition to module evaluation and student surveys, one of the key mechanisms for students to engage with the quality of their experiences at Queen Mary is via the Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs). The SSLC is comprised of key members of staff from the school/institute and course representatives elected from the programme cohort. Schools/institutes are expected to hold one meeting per semester though several opt to hold them more frequently.

5.2   In order to ensure that all aspects of the students' experiences are discussed, there is an agenda template for SSLC meetings that covers areas such as academic developments, assessment and feedback, organisation and support and learning resources. Reports from External Examiners, module evaluation feedback, Periodic Review outcomes and Annual

Programme Review reports are also required to be discussed at SSLCs. Course representatives are also encouraged to add agenda items for discussion.

5.3 SSLCs are well-established within schools and institutes at Queen Mary and are an important contribution to ensuring that the student voice is heard. Course representatives from SSLCs often sit on other committees within the school/institute, including library forums or Teaching and Learning Committees. SSLCs are a key monitoring tool for both the university and Queen Mary Students' Union (QMSU) and seek to facilitate a collaborative for enhancing the student experience.

5.4 In addition to course representatives, QMSU is planning to introduce school representatives and faculty forums in 2019-20 that will allow for more collective discussion and action between schools/institutes and within faculties. The university and QMSU will also be investigating ways to support and strengthen the student voice in SSLCS including promoting the inclusion of a student co-chair at each meeting.

6 External examining

6.1 Each taught programme, or cognate group of modules in some disciplines, has an external examiner. The purpose of the external examiner system is as follows:

- to ensure that Queen Mary's degrees are comparable in standard to those awarded by other UK universities;
- to ensure fairness and consistency in assessment procedures and student classification;
- to scrutinise the effectiveness and appropriateness of the assessment system;
- to assure the wider community of the standard of Queen Mary's degrees and the fairness of its assessment procedures

6.2 Queen Mary's external examiners are appointed in accordance with nationally agreed appointment criteria, in line with the Quality Assurance Agency's *UK Quality Code for Higher Education.* The formal responsibility of each external examiner is to the President and Principal; while ARCS process the external examiners' reports, an external examiner may make a confidential report to the President and Principal at any time.

6.3 In addition to external examiners at subject and module level, Queen Mary also has an external member of its undergraduate and postgraduate Degree Examination Boards (DEBs). External examiners attend Queen Mary's Subject Examination Boards (SEBs) and the use of external members for DEBs mirrors this approach, with the external members being drawn from among professional services staff with relevant experience (usually an academic registrar or equivalent) from another university. The external member comments on the conduct of the Degree Examination Boards, the academic regulations, assessment governance and any related issues fur further consideration.

6.4 Schools and Institutes are required to respond to each report from each external examiner where any issues of concern are raised, and to lodge a copy of their response with ARCS. The Education Quality and Standards Board consider a summary of issues raised by external examiners, which monitor emerging themes.

6.5 In 2017-18, the majority of examiners (90% UG & 90% PG) confirmed that the curriculum design of Queen Mary programmes were *Good* the remainder being *Satisfactory.* No programmes were reported as having *Poor* curriculum design. No institutional concerns were raised by external examiners or the external member in 2017-18, or so far in 2018-19; reports are still being received and collated for 2018-19. Areas highlighted as 'best practice' have been commended and shared within Faculties. Notable issues raised by externals so far in 2018-19 have included:

- Discussion of statistical data, and particularly a desire for better quality and more readily accessible longitudinal data to review the performance of individuals, cohorts, and modules across multiple years. The new 'Power BI' tool was piloted for examination boards this year, and included much of this data – feedback was generally very positive, but uptake was limited in this pilot year. Suggestions generally centred on ease of use.
- The vast majority of comments were positive, and confirmed that external examiners had confidence in Queen Mary's academic standards.
- The report of the External Member to the DEBs was positive and expressed full confidence in Queen Mary's academic standards. There were similar comments to those raised by external examiners on longitudinal data, but the External Member both recognised and commended the progress that had been made so far.

7. Policy and process review

7.1 Queen Mary conducted a review of a number of its academic policies in 2018-19. The Academic Regulations were redrafted in their entirety, with the aim of making them more concise and accessibly for a range of audiences. The length of the regulations has been cut by a third without losing any necessary content, and the document now contains many more internal and web links to signpost readers to further information.

7.2 New policy documents on interruption of study, academic misconduct, and appeals were also written (again with a primary aim of increased clarity and accessibility, but also including some changes to academic misconduct penalties). These have been well-received by staff so far, and a similar review of the Assessment Handbook, a substantial document detailing our assessment and examination board policies, is planned for 2019-20; this will include updates relating to semester-based examinations, which will run for the first time in January 2020 with the aim of improving the student experience. Reviews of the Code of Student Discipline and the Student Complaints policy are also planned, as is a larger scale review of the Extenuating Circumstances Policy.

7.3 The Quality Assurance Agency's *UK Quality Code for Higher Education* - used to assure the standards and quality of UK higher education, and a key reference point for UK higher education underwent a significant redevelopment in 2018. ARCS has previously undertaken a detailed mapping of the previous version of the UK Quality Code to Queen Mary's internal quality assurance arrangements and any resulting recommendations or enhancements have been considered by EQSB. The mapping exercise commenced in 2018-19 initially focusing on mapping institution-wide processes, is planned to conclude in 2019-20 and to report to a future meeting of the Board.

7.4 In April 2019, Queen Mary appointed KPMG to perform a review of the Queen Mary's framework for the approval and contracting of international partnerships. The result of the audit was 'Significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities.' The recommendations for minor improvements have been reviewed and will be incorporated into a revised partnership proposal process which uses a risk-based partnership model to streamline the process, underpinned by an effective due diligence framework. Partnerships Board as part of its work plan will consider the new process for approval for 2019-20.

8. Going for Gold

8.1 The Going for Gold Strategy, formally launched in 2018, aims to co-create with our students an inclusive education that is intellectually stimulating and enables them to become successful global citizens. Its impact on Queen Mary's approach to challenges related to academic standards and the quality of the student experience as is described in the evaluation report in preparation by the Nous Consulting Group and to be reported at the October 2019 Council meeting.

8.2   The approach towards Going for Gold has differed from that taken with previous Queen Mary initiatives through the use of the distributed leadership model, co-creation with students, and the development of partnership learning communities. Considerable advances have been made in each of these areas, although it is recognised that continued work is needed at all levels for these to become a *de facto* way of working. Key highlights include:

- The use by Schools and Institutes of an agreed common Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP) template aligned to the four Going for Gold Pillars - Excellence in education, excellence in student engagement, excellence in student employability, and excellence in learning environment. This ensures a consistency in information capture, allowing monitoring at faculty, and at institution level, and enables the School/Institute to lead their teams and drive forward their own strategies and also those that contribute towards the faculty, and institution priorities.
- The formation of a partnership learning community amongst academic and professional services staff, and students, which initially started as a series of discrete projects and initiatives with staff and students working in partnership (specific examples highlighted in Sections 7.3 - 7.6). Activities have sought to rebalance the staff-student relationship and move beyond listening to the student voice to working with students as equal partners;
- It is envisaged that this working, learning and partnership will become an increasing part of the culture and ethos of the institution, for example through the monthly 'Going for Gold Operations' meetings, other leadership activities lead by the Vice-Principal (Education) and the Queen Mary Student Union (QMSU), and continuation of the close working relationship between staff and the QMSU staff and student representatives.

Key highlights pertaining to student academic experience and student outcomes are as follows:

9.3   Excellence in education

Online module feedback

9.3.1   This is addressed in Sections 4.4 - 4.6.

Academic Advising

9.3.2   A series of 20 structured interviews with representatives from schools and institutes were carried out by the Deputy Vice-Principal (Education - Strategic Projects) with a view to developing a comprehensive understanding of the current practice in Academic Advising, primarily for undergraduate students but also with some discussion of postgraduate taught students. The aim of the exercise was to:

- agree (across all schools and institutes) potential recommended improvements to the Academic Advisor scheme that could be piloted in 2019-20;
- share best practice and harmonise as far as is reasonable, taking account of discipline-specific differences.

9.3.3   The full report will be circulated at the start of the 2019-20 academic year and considered by EQSB with a view to implementation as soon as is practicable. Consensus amongst staff and students was such that two 'quick wins' relating to consistency of student academic experience have already been achieved and implemented:

- an agreement across all schools and institutes to use the term "Advisor" in place of a plethora of terminology including 'Personal Tutor', "Academic Advisor" and "Adviser". This is now as-standard in the institution-wide undergraduate Student Handbook 2019-20 template;
- the creation of a set of online resources (https://www.qmul.ac.uk/advising/) written to assist staff in understanding the advisor role and providing a resource to enable staff to

consistently support students' academic development, to signpost effectively, support them with practical issues and enable them to make the most of their time at university.

Assessment and Feedback

9.3.4   It is widely agreed that good assessment and feedback are central to the success of a university's offer to students - ensuring effective student learning, maximising student achievement, fostering retention, and assuring positive outcomes, and Queen Mary, like many HEIs, is encountering low levels of satisfaction in this area (67.1%, 63.5% and 64.1% in 2017, 2018, and 2019 respectively with the 2019 value being 5.4% below benchmark)

9.3.5   The May 2019 EQSB approved the outcomes of the 2018-19 institution-wide consultations, which proposed changes in assessment and feedback practices for implementation during 2019-21. Both the consultation report and EQSB agreed that the focus for enhancement would be likely to vary between disciplines but would be implemented according to the following set of key principles:

- programme-level assessment should avoid multiple assessment of the same learning outcome;
- module learning outcomes should be considered in the context of the programme as a whole in order that their function within a programme is clear to students;
- 'Assessment for Learning' rather than learning for assessment;
- 'Students as Partners' approach in assessment and feedback;
- Assessment and feedback that: assesses the knowledge, skills and capabilities that are relevant to the professional practices of the discipline; actively contributes to students' understanding of what they need to do to; reflects the diversity of the student population; avoids multiple assessment of learning outcomes and reducing over-assessment; and focuses on fostering academic integrity.
- Enhances the feedback and assessment literacy of staff and students;
- Supports those who assess student work through the building communities of practice, thereby assuring that assessment is consistent between markers.

9.3.6   Looking forward, the Deputy Vice-Principal (Education – Programmes) has been asked to take forward the implementation of this strategy as part of the planned work on portfolio review.

9.4   Excellence in student engagement

Programme feedback

9.4.1   A pilot study was run by the Faculty Education Managers from H&SS and S&E, during Semester A of 2018-19 with students in lecture theatres in order to understand the quality of their academic experience so far. The use of the 'mentimeter' utility enabled real-time staff-student interactive discussions and demonstrated to students that their voices were being heard in real time.

9.4.2   The study spanned 37 modules and reached 2000 students across both H&SS and S&E Faculties. A number of core questions were asked, targeting topics such as academic advising, timeliness of feedback and student voice in line with NSS questions tied to TEF metrics with supplementary questions provided at school-level. A summary report of the exercise will improve future thinking in this area.

9.4.3   Students responded positively to the opportunity to give feedback in real time and to see their views reflected and shared by their peers. Schools were seen to respond quickly to the

students, often with detailed responses. Additional surveys and forums arose from the issues raised through this exercise, further enhancing the staff-student partnership.

Student research internships

9.4.4   Teams of student interns were appointed to conduct research into factors affecting student academic experience and outcomes: the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) attainment gap, the issues facing commuting students, and factors affecting student retention. 240 applications were received for ten places with students appointed after a selection day event followed by face-to-face interviews. Students were placed in mixed-Faculty teams and provided with training in research methods so as to enable them to conduct effective focus groups, surveys and produce a group written report.

9.4.5   Key findings per theme, in the form of suggested actions, are as follows:

a) Reducing the Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) attainment gap

- greater cohesion between university-affiliated groups researching this issue;
- the creation of safe spaces to engage in discussions around the BAME attainment gap;
- additional student-facing activities that consciously foster engagement with BAME students;
- the requirement for all departments to emphasise the link between job success and work experience, raising awareness of the importance of internships as well as other opportunities outside of their degree;
- the creation of a BAME Alumni Network that also allows current students the option to connect with BAME alumni for mentorship opportunities and improving student outcomes.

b) Issues facing commuting students

- identifying students who self-identify as commuting students at the point of enrolment (i.e. students that travel for more than 60 minutes to get into their respective campus);
- the creation of a webpage on the QMSU and Queen Mary websites written by a commuting student, to include tips and event information;
- a relaunch of the QMSU Commuter Students Society;
- short-stay accommodation for commuting students;
- events for commuter students with an earlier start time including the addition of afternoon events to the Welcome week calendar;
- prompt notification of lecture cancellations and changes.

c) Factors affecting student retention from the student perspective

- increased opportunities to access and communicate with their seminar leaders and lecturers;
- additional opportunities for feedback;
- provision of more detailed information when choosing modules;
- increased awareness of available grants and bursaries as to assist with the financial cost of living and studying in London;
- flexible approach to timetabling, e.g. enabling working students to swap seminar groups when they have a clash with work commitments;
- an improved understanding of the lack of 'a sense of belonging' expressed by some students;
- increased focus on supporting international students' into academic and UK culture;
- greater collaboration between student support services and greater promotion of services open to students;
- greater investment in mental health services.

9.4.6   A number of the above actions are already in train for 2019-20 with others under active consideration being taken on board. EQSB and other forums can expect to hear more about further action in this area.

9.4.7   Student interns were also recruited to work with the 2018-19 QMSU Vice-President (Education), carrying out scoping exercises for the QMSU Annual Student Experience Survey 2018, which asked students *"Could your Educational Experience at Queen Mary be more diverse?"* the report and recommendations from which are expected at the November 2019 EQSB meeting.

9.4.8   Looking ahead towards 2019-20, discussions are in train regarding the creation of a more formal internship scheme. This is to be managed through Careers and Enterprise in the form of 20 student internships funded through monies obtained through the Access and Participation Plan submission and will facilitate student-led research into topics connected with improving student retention.

9.5   Excellence in student employability

Careers and Enterprise

9.5.1   Careers and Enterprise (C&E) has led on a number of activities during 2018-19 designed to support improved student outcomes:

- the design and implementation of a comprehensive programme of career management support for graduates from 2016-17 and 2017-18;
- to increase the number of students completing meaningful work experience (as arranged by Queen Mary);
- The development of 16 C&E-school partnership agreements to provide a framework for the delivery of future school-specific activities.

The effectiveness of these initiatives will be monitored over time.

9.5.2   Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR), which provides a comprehensive report of a student's education, were first made available in July 2017 for undergraduate and postgraduate students enrolled in the academic year 2016-17. Section 6.1 of the HEAR can contain information regarding the extra-curricular activities, awards and prizes completed by / awarded to a student to allow as many students as possible to evidence the breadth of their skills, experience and knowledge.

9.5.3   An institution-wide data gathering exercise was completed in 2018-19 leading to the collection and approval by EQSB of 75 defined extracurricular activities, awards and prizes, each with a clearly defined set of criteria that needs to be met and verified[1]. The process has subsequently been built into 'business as usual' activities for 2019-20 onwards with new validated activities to be added on an annual basis.

9.6   Excellence in learning environment

'Sticky Campus[2]'

---

[1] http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/students/sec/gradintelligence-account-/extracurricular-activities

[2] *Sticky Campus* - a place where students would want to spend time even when they have no formal teaching sessions to attend. It embraces everything that is truly student-centric so that students fully live amongst their learning. [Online] https://www.jisc.ac.uk/rd/projects/sticky-campus-roadshow

9.6.1　During 2018-19 the QMSU President, the QMSU Vice President Barts and The London, and Queen Mary Estates and Facilities Directorate staff embraced partnership working with a view to enhancing campus flow-through and 'stickiness'. This achieved a number of 'quick wins' across campus including the installation of lockers in a number of buildings and at a more local level, highlighting the need for specific facilities within schools to support the needs of commuting students.

9.6.2　Greater staff-student engagement has been embodied within the creation of a 'Sticky Campus Working Group' co-chaired by the Vice-Principal (Education) and a QMSU Executive Officer, which will be continuing into 2019-20. The scope of business conducted by the Group is narrowly focussed upon the proposal, approval, implementation and oversight of facilities across all of the Queen Mary campuses. It uses the results of the QMSU Big Change university-wide survey, which in 2018-19 focussed on the Queen Mary campuses, and how campus life could be improved.

9.6.3　This area of work has not been without challenges and some concerns remain. While student representation on all Estates and Facilities committees may have been achieved, there is more work to be done during 2019-20 to ensure that the student voice is fully embedded. However, it is positive to note that the student voice is now heard much earlier in major building projects, such as the proposed new building for the School of Business and Management.

Space management and timetabling to support education.

9.6.4　Work has been underway to improve student timetables and increase module choice for the 2019-20 academic year. This has been achieved by putting student module selection data and student preference information at the centre of the timetabling process. In order to maximise student choice of available modules, students were asked to make their selections ahead of the timetabling exercise. This change in process enabled the accommodation of 3234 unique combinations of modules within the timetable, representing a 69% increase from the previous year.

9.6.5　In addition to increasing student module choice, efforts have also been made to ensure that timetables better reflect student preferences. Over 900 students participated in a student timetable preference survey and this provided the following quality measures for student timetables, namely minimal instances of:

- 3 hour gaps (or longer) between teaching sessions in one day;
- 4 hours of teaching in a row without a break;
- number of students with teaching every day of the week;
- number of students travelling to a Queen Mary campus for just one hour of teaching in a day;
- teaching starting before 10:00 and continuing beyond 17:00.

9.6.6　These measures were then used to shape the timetable for 7000 continuing students. This was achieved through a combination of technology-based solutions and manual interventions at the individual student timetable level. The resulting timetable, despite accommodating substantially more module choice, out-performs the timetable from the previous year in all of the measures listed above. Improvements include 1895 fewer instances of 3+ hour gaps, 789 fewer instances of teaching until 6pm and 486 fewer instances of students having teaching every day of the week.

9.6.7　Students will be surveyed annually to measure satisfaction levels and collect preference information in order to enable continuous improvement of student timetables.

Looking ahead

9.7 It is noteworthy that two areas of particular focus in 2018-19 showed an increase upon 2018 NSS scores with the "student voice" and "assessment and feedback", increasing by 1.7% and 1.1% respectively.

9.8 A number of the Going for Gold workstreams will be furthered to form a substantive part of the Queen Mary 2030 Education Strategy. EQSB and other forums will hear more about this in subsequent meetings with the immediate direction to be shaped in part by the outcome of the Nous Consulting Group evaluation in October 2019 (Section 7.1).

Authors: Katherine Bevan, David Boyle, Simon Hayter, Jane Pallant, and Emma Rabin.
September 2019

Appendix A: Periodic Review outcomes

	BLIZARD INSTITUTE (Review Date: June 2017)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: February 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)**
1	The Institute should define its unique selling points, in order to develop a clear strategic vision.	Production of Education Strategy and 5 year plan	Action initiated - In September 2017 The Institute held a retreat for all staff involved in Education. One of the key discussion points from the event was branding and a clear strategic vision for the future. This remains a complex question, which is affected by internal organisational issues and external market changes. The Institute aim to produce a full education strategy in 2017-18.	Action initiated - The Blizard Institute continue to develop their education portfolio and expanding both faculty and support staff structures to meet demands for growth. However it has not been possible to put in a firm 5 year plan as this will require input from SMD faculty, strategic planning and other central service teams. It must be considered part of a wider discussion relating to resources and capacity.
2	That via the Educational Activity Survey the Institute: a) Develops a transparent and sustainable workload allocation model for staff, ensuring that expectations are clear; b) Ensures that academic staff are on the appropriate contracts.	Design and Implementation of local teaching data collection exercise- BEAM	Action in operation - The Blizard Institute have now completed the design and delivery of a new Educational data collection exercise called BEAM. Uptake from 138 academic staff members surveyed has been 98%, and data is currently being prepared for analysis. It is hoped that this information will lead to more effective use of educational resources, fairer allocations of MBBS teaching activity, and improved programme design, development and sustainability.	Action in operation - The BEAM survey system is now in it's second cycle, having produced a thorough and comprehensive set of data for all education staff. Changes are being made to improve compatibility with the SWARM system, which will be running alongside it. Data from BEAM has been used to ensure academic staff are on appropriate contracts.
		Job plan type review for all educational staff based on activity	Action in operation - The Institute have undertaken comprehensive staffing reviews of all programme suites, with the aim of reducing dependency on external staff and providing sustainability. As a result of this review, the Institute have recommended the creation of a new junior academic post to support operational delivery in education. Several new programme suites will be allocated additional academic staff for activities such as marking, feedback and academic supervision.	Action in operation - Posts approved and current at various stages of recruitment. Annual discussions with programmes regarding resource planning and student capacity are taking place in November/December each year.
3	Further development of induction process for new staff.	Development of new internal CPD training programme for educational staff	Action initiated - Plans are currently underway for the production of a short internal training programme for staff involved in taught programme delivery. This will cover practical elements of programme management, such as understanding of regulations and QA processes and other internal support structures.	Action initiated - The Blizard have outlined key areas for academic training, based on recent student survey data. These are being translated into development of 4 x specialist training afternoons covering Teaching and Assessment, Module Organisation, Personal Tutors and Academic Advisors and Exam Boards and Assessment. The Blizard also plan to run a training afternoon for programme leads, which covers topics relating to wider academic and student management.
4	That the promotion practice is reconsidered to: a) Ensure that the appropriate value is given to both research and educational achievement including the mandatory acquisition of a teaching qualification or HEA Fellowship; b) Recognise the wider contributory factors for promotion as per the revised QMUL guidelines.	Systematic monitoring and promotion of HEA membership.	Action in operation - This question formed a major part of the Educational retreat in 2017. HEA fellowship uptake amongst Institute staff remains low, and the Blizard Institute Education Committee are currently reviewing ways to increase. Teaching staff are also being encouraged to apply for promotion, which is discussed at appraisal. An open door policy for teaching staff to discuss this with Institute Director is now in place.	Action in operation - The Blizard continue to promote HEA membership amongst academic staff, with a specific focus on those with TS job plans. In 2017-18 the Institute managed to get 22.3%percentage of relevant staff enrolled on/completed HEA accreditation.
5	That the Institute: a) Ensures that appropriate processes are in place to monitor and maintain the quality of teaching delivered by non-QMUL staff; b) Provides better training to staff about governance and quality assurance processes; specifically, in relation to the development of programmes and modules.	Production of engagement and expectations template for all external contributors	Action initiated - A template has now been produced for all non-QMUL staff who are planning to engage with Blizard Institute Taught programmes in any capacity. The template clearly outlines expectations and deadlines associated with work and includes details of any remuneration that is expected in line with QMUL financial guidelines.	Action in operation - A template for 'non-substantive academic engagement' has been produced for programmes with external contributors. This clearly outlines expectations, deadlines and the type of recognition that will be given for input- eg. Honorary contract, external lecturer payment.
6	A comprehensive review of all programme specifications, and the development of a mechanism for ensuring that this information is kept accurate and up to date.	Review of Programme Specifications	Action initiated - All programme specifications have been reviewed, and outstanding/required amendments to be put through teaching and learning committee in time for 2018-19 delivery.	Action in operation - All Programme Specs are now up to date.
7	That the Institute formalises its academic and pastoral support structures to ensure that these are clear, objective, and sustainable for students at all levels.	Provide clarity and consistency across academic and pastoral support structures	Action initiated - Information regarding available support structures and academic expectations relating to students' support have been circulated to programme teams, but a thorough review and consolidation of this delivery remains outstanding.	Action in operation - The Blizard continue to work on promoting the important of personal tutors/academic supervisors, tying in with discussions relating to staffing resources and academic training.
8	That the Institute develops mechanisms for monitoring and ensuring student engagement, as well as establishing clear identities for all students. Consideration should be given to including guidance about the appropriate use of social media in programme handbooks.	Ensure regular records of engagement are collected, and issues concerning engagement on distance learning programmes are addressed.	Action initiated - The Institute on-site programmes all maintain regular engagement logs, including attendance registers and card readers for undergraduate students. Ensuring engagement by distance learning professional students remains challenging.	Action in operation - All onsite programme have now switched to using electronic attendance card reading to monitor attendance.
9	A review of the Institute's assessment strategy, to ensure that all assessments are appropriate for the learning outcomes of the module. In particular, it is recommended that the Institute reconsiders the use of open book MCQs on the Trauma Sciences programmes.	Review of assessment suitability for all taught programmes	Action initiated - A full review of assessment, marking and feedback across the Institute is currently being undertaken. In addition to this, programme teams have been encouraged to review individual assessments in light of module feedback, and a number of changes have been made on the Trauma Sciences, Aesthetics and Global Health programmes.	Action in operation - Individual programmes have reviewed quality of existing assessments, but further discussion needed on quantity of assessments and timing in relation to certain programmes.
10	That the Institute: a) Develops a consistent, transparent, and sustainable policy for providing feedback to students on all programmes; b) Considers mechanisms for clarifying and managing the expectations of both staff and students in relation to feedback.	Review of marking and feedback policy	Action in operation - Full review and proposed standardisation of feedback mechanisms (where possible) is currently underway.	Action in operation - Review conducted in April 2018, with a number of standardised templates being produced to fit the various types of PGT/UG assessment offered by programmes. Programmes have been provided with guidance for generation of appropriate marking criteria (rubrics).
11	That the Institute considers holding SSLC meetings more frequently, or develops more informal mechanisms for receiving and addressing student feedback more promptly.	Review SSLC meetings and other mechanisms for addressing student feedback.	Action in operation - SSLC meetings to be held 3 times per year, however programme teams have been encouraged to develop closer links with their representatives in the hope that more issues can be addressed locally and in a timely manner.	Action in operation - The Blizard are happy that mechanisms for student feedback have improved, moving from a 'you said we did' mentality to a 'we noticed we changed' system of operation. Students are still encouraged to address local level issues promptly with programme administrators in the first instance.

	BLIZARD INSTITUTE (Review Date: June 2017)			
	Recommentation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: February 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)**
12	That the Institute continues to investigate possibilities for providing dedicated space for postgraduate taught students.	Find more suitable teaching space	Action still to be addressed - Demand for dedicated postgraduate teaching space remains, but resources are currently unavailable to create space that is required. The senior common room (SMD) has now been more widely promoted to PGT students as a venue for socialising and group study. The faculty continues to suffer from a shortage of larger size (30-50) capacity teaching rooms.	Action still to be addressed - Suitable space on Whitechapel campus remains problematic, particularly with increasing numbers. Options for space at Mile End remain open in some cases, but this presents timetabling issues for students moving between campuses. No suitable social/study space for PGT students in Whitechapel, as Senior Common Room now in use for teaching.
13	A Faculty-level review of journal needs to ensure that appropriate resources are available for staff and students	Conduct a full review of specialist journals required for all programmes	Action still to be addressed - Review has not yet been undertaken	Action still to be addressed - Review has not yet been undertaken

	BARTS CANCER INSTITUTE (Review Date: December 2017)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: May 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: February 2019)**
1	Consideration is given to developing a clear internationalisation strategy, and ensuring that the appropriate mechanisms are in place to monitor the quality and standards of any partnerships.	BCI will review its current international partnerships/collaborators and identify potential gaps and opportunities. To be reviewed at BCI TLC.	Action in operation - BCI is actively pursuing a Joint MSc in Laparoscopic Surgery and Surgical Skills with the University of Malta. Initial discussions have commenced with the International University of Malaysia.	Action in operation - BCI's strategy is to increase its distance learning provision through international collaborations. BCI is actively pursuing a Joint MSc in Laparoscopic Surgery and Surgical Skills with the University of Malta. Awaiting Senate approval. Initial discussions have commenced with the International Medical University of Malaysia.
2	Clarify and formalise the peer observation process for academic staff, and consider including PhD demonstrators in the process as a mechanism for supporting and developing their teaching skills.	Currently all academics who teach are required to submit a peer observation form along with their appraisal document. Currently only one form is required per academic year.	Action initiated - The percentage return on peer observation forms will be calculated following the annual appraisal cycle and reported to the BCI Board. Academic staff will be emailed at the beginning of each semester to remind them that they must complete the peer observation process. A list of peer observations will be compiled and circulated, including allocated observers for each staff member. To be introduced in 2018/19. BCI TLC to approve the introduction of the peer observation process to student demonstrators. If approved, this is for implementation AY2018/19.	Action in operation - Academic staff arer emailed each semester to remind them that they must complete the peer observation process. Peer observations are monitored as part of the review of Academic Performance standards. BCI TLC discussed the introduction of the peer observation processes for student demonstrators. It was agreed that demonstrators are observed informally during taught sessions and feedback is provided as appropriate. It was not felt necessary to formalise this process.
3	Develop mechanisms for recording the activities of academic staff, including: a) Clarifying the teaching contribution requirements for all academic staff, and ensuring that these activities are accurately recorded; b) Ensuring that the scorecard system takes account of approved periods of absence from the Institute; c) Ensuring that the scorecard system is reviewed within the context QMUL's HR policies and processes.	Currently using SWARM (piloted in 16/17) to capture teaching, research and other scholarly activity.	Action initiated - a) SMD Academic Performance standards will be communicated to staff as part of BCI's review of Academic Scorecards. Action initiated - b) Inclusion of approved periods of absence on Academic Scorecards to be reviewed by SMD SMT and, if agreed, implemented in next cycle. Action initiated - c) The Academic Scorecard is revised alongside the SMD/QMUL process. Staff performance is assessed against SMD performance requirements.	Action in operation - a) Teaching contributions are based on SMD Academic Performance standards, which were communicated to staff as part of BCI's review of Academic Scorecards.. Action in operation - b.i) BCI reviews academic scorecards annually and takes into consideration the entire REF reporting timeframe in its assessment of performance which allows for periods of absence. Action initiated - b.ii) Inclusion of approved periods of absence on Academic Scorecards to be reviewed by SMD SMT and, if agreed, implemented in next cycle. Action in operation - b.ii) We can confirm that inclusion of periods of approved absence on Academic Scorecards are to be discussed at the next BCI Exec Board on 11th March. The outcome of this discussion, complete with minutes of this meeting will be communicated to EQSB straight away Action in operation - c) The Academic Scorecard is revised alongside the SMD/QMUL process. Staff performance is assessed against SMD performance requirements.
4	Consider processes for reviewing draft examination papers to ensure consistency across modules, where appropriate.	A standard format for all exams on the MSc Cancer programmes was agreed for implementation in 2018/19 in response to the comments of the External Examiner	Action in operation - It was agreed at the BCI TLC in October 2017 to standardise exams on the MSc Cancer programmes as follows: 15 credit modules 30 MCQs 4 x 20 mark SAQs 7.5 credit modules 18 MCSs 4 x 10 mark SAQs Only the total mark for each SAQ was standardised – tutors could break this down into subparts as appropriate. The only exceptions were CANM937 and CANM938 where the exam has a different weighting. This has been implemented in 2017/18.	No further update.
5	Consider mechanisms for recognising individual efforts within group assignments, potentially through the introduction of anonymous 360 peer review.	Any changes to be introduced for 18/19	Action initiated - To be discussed at BCI TLC. Consultation to take place with SSLC representatives.	Action in operation - BCI TLC has reviewed all groupwork assignments. For group presentations, an individual assessment element has been introduced. Further consideration will be given to the introduction of anonymous 360 peer reviews for written group assignments.
6	Clarify and publicise the feedback turnaround policy for students.	At the BCI TLC in December 2017 a standardised feedback timeframe of 4 weeks was agreed.	Action in operation - The agreed timeframe has been communicated to current students. Action initiated - Feedback turnaround details will be included in programme handbooks, module guides and on coursework submission sheets from 2018/19.	Action in operation - The agreed timeframe has been communicated to current students. Feedback turnaround details have been included in programme handbooks, module guides and on QM+ pages for the AY 2018/19.
7	Review the work required by postgraduate-research students for the 9-month and 18-month progression points to ensure that students are not overburdened unnecessarily and these progression points are supportive of the students' future successes.	9 and 18 milestone reports are SMD/QMUL requirements and BCI guidelines are designed around these. To be discussed at the BCI PGR tutor meeting, SMD Graduate Studies Committee and with the Research Degrees Office.	Action still to be addressed	Action in operation - Discussed at both SSLC and PGR Tutor team meeting in May 2018. Students were in favour of maintaining the current workload. Students queried the possibility of increasing the assignment word count for the 9 month report. Noted that not all London universities require a 9 month report. Students felt 18 month report more useful as results may not be available at 9 months. Believe 18 month report is a good framework for thesis. Suggested having time out of the lab in order to write 18 month report and potentially increasing word count.
8	Undertake more focussed analysis of the PTES scores, and agree some measurable actions to address any notably low or declining scores.	Chart the 3 year trend in answers following receipt of 2018 PTES results. Review at TLC.	Action still to be addressed - PTES results are reviewed at BCI TLC. As a national survey, BCI has no control over the questions nor does BCI have detailed knowledge of student's other commitments. It is therefore difficult to gauge whether responses to questions such as "The timetable fits well with my other commitments" are appropriate.	Action in operation - 2018 PTES results were compare with the previous two years results and with internal module evaluations. An action plan to address low-scoring elements was presented to SMD TLC. Student expectations have been more closely managed at induction and through handbooks and QM+.

	BARTS CANCER INSTITUTE (Review Date: December 2017)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: May 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: February 2019)**
9	Develop a more transparent and sustainable system for pastoral support.	All PGR students have an assigned postgraduate tutor assigned to them for the duration of their studies.	Action in operation - Following discussions at the BCI TLC & BCI PGR tutor meetings, postgraduate tutors have been reallocated. 2 new tutors were appointed and all CRFs now have a clinical postgraduate tutor. All PGR students have received an e-mail to confirm who their tutor is. PGR students are notified of the tutor when they enrol and advised to arrange an introductory meeting in their first 3 months.	Action in operation - Following discussions at the BCI TLC & BCI PGR tutor meetings, postgraduate tutors have been reallocated. 2 new tutors were appointed and all CRFs now have a clinical postgraduate tutor. All PGR students have received an e-mail to confirm who their tutor is. PGR students are notified of the tutor when they enrol and advised to arrange an introductory meeting in their first 3 months.
		Review PGT mentor scheme.	Action initiated - Currently students have 3 x 1-2-1 meetings with their Programme Director (mid-way through SEM 1 and after the release of provisional SEM 1 and SEM 2 results). PGT students also have a list of mentors that can be approached, but they are not assigned a specific tutor. At the March 2018 BCI TLC it was agreed that for 2018/19 PGT students would be assigned a named mentor each. The purposes of the scheme would be summarised as part of induction.	Action in operation - At the March 2018 BCI TLC it was agreed that for 2018/19 PGT students would be assigned a named mentor each. The purposes of the scheme would be summarised as part of induction. This has now been implemented.
10	Consider mechanisms for further integrating postgraduate-taught students into the Institute community. QMSU and BLSA should continue to be invited to attend future induction sessions for these students.	Continue to invite QMSU to BCI induction events AY 2018/19 Discuss at the PGR SSLC whether PGT students could be invited to participate in BCI PhD Forum events. PGT students to be invited to attend monthly BCI mixers.	Action in operation - BCI invited the QMSU to the PGT induction in AY 2017/18. Details of BCI weekly seminars are included in the PGT weekly update e-mails.	Action in operation - Continue to invite QMSU to BCI induction events AY 2018/19 Discussions at PGR SSLC, May 2018, regarding whether PGT students could be invited to participate in BCI PhD Forum events. Agreed. Suggestion from students that PGT reps be invited to attend PhD Forum.PGT students to be invited to attend monthly BCI mixers. (2018/19)
11	Continue to develop careers events for postgraduate-taught students.	BCI will continue to develop a careers events for PGT students	Action initiated	Action initiated - This will be developed during AY 18/19. Action in operation - We can confirm that PGT student career guidance is now an integral part of our postgraduate taught mentorship scheme we launched this year. We believe our approach exceeds panel's recommendations as our PGT students now get individual guidance, tailored to their background and career aspirations.
12	Consider additional opportunities in London to expose students to external organisations and events, such as the flagship seminars at the Francis Crick Institute.		Action in operation - Details of the Cancer Interest Group at the Francis Crick Institute have been posted on BCInet. Opportunities relevant to PGT students are included on the BCI QMplus landing page and in weekly update e-mails.	Action in operation - Details of the Cancer Interest Group at the Francis Crick Institute have been posted on BCInet. Opportunities relevant to PGT students are included on the BCI QMplus landing page and in weekly update e-mails.
13	Consider developing more robust and sustainable statistics training for postgraduate-research students.	For discussion at TLC. BCI PhD Forum workshops are recorded and made available to PGR students via QMplus.	Action initiated - The PhD Forum have offered 2 statistics workshops. These have been recorded to be shared on QMplus.	Action in operation - The PhD Forum have offered 2 statistics workshops. These have been recorded to be shared on QMplus. Discussed at May SSLC meeting. Learning Development offers three different statistics trainings for PGR students. Details have been circulated. Noted that if difficult to enrol on programmes Learning Development to be asked to consider offering programme at CHSQ.
14	The Panel commended the initiative of the Ian Hart Vacation Scholarships, and recommended that the Institute review the funding arrangements to consider whether the scheme could be made more accessible to students from lower income households.	The current scheme is funded through a CRUK clinical training grant.	Action in operation - SMD has initiated a living wage payment for students undertaking Ian Hart and Rod Flower scholarships.	No further update.
15	Increase efforts to encourage established staff, for example through the promotion process, to gain recognition of their teaching by applying for HEA Fellowship.	Encourage established staff to gain recognition of their teaching by applying for HEA Fellowship.	Action in operation - BCI has introduced a new training and mentoring scheme for academic staff which mandates that all staff must achieve HEA fellowship. The benefits of HEA fellowship have been conveyed to established staff. All HEA fellowship status is monitored within BCI. Achievement of fellowship will be an appraisal objective where appropriate.	Action in operation - The benefits of HEA fellowship have been conveyed to established staff. All HEA fellowship status is monitored within BCI. Achievement of fellowship will be an appraisal objective where appropriate.
16	Develop a clear strategic plan ifor managing space issues in the short and medium terms	Various space plans and proposals have been submitted to SMD.	Action initiated - BCI is awaiting the outcome of an application to Barts and the London Charity to fund development of the Joseph Rotblat Building to provide more laboratory and office space in the short to medium term whilst planning permission is sought to re-develop the John Vane Science Centre.	Action in operation - Barts and the London Charity has provided funding to develop the Joseph Rotblat Building to provide more laboratory and office space in the short to medium term whilst planning permission is sought to re-develop the John Vane Science Centre. Redevelopment is currenty expected to take place during 2019.

	WILLIAM HARVEY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (Review Date: March 2018)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2019)**
1	Consider a prize for research-led teaching.	PGR committee to consider whether annual student-nominated prize for 'supervisor of the year' or similar could be instituted	Action initiated - This has been agreed and PC currently drafting the process for award for approval by education committee	Action in operation - Process decided and first research-led teaching award (research supervisor of the year) presented at the William Harvey winter review. Annual award agreed.
2	Monitor the career outcomes of students at UG, PGT and PGR levels.	This would benefit from a centralised approach as will be required across all programmes for TEF. Also linked to QMUL recommendation 'QMUL reviews alumni support and communication via an alumni email'. Therefore, first actions are: discussion at UG meetings (intercalated committee); PGT meetings (Teaching and learning committee) and PGR meetings. WHRI to follow up standardised approach eg survey via alumni email addresses.	Action initiated - On agenda for the first meetings of the Autumn term for: SUTL (UG) TLC (PGT) PGR committee (PGR) to aim for a centralised approach. WHRI institute manager working on developing an alumni group which may also provide a route for data collection.	Action initiated - Issue taken by individual representatives to: SUTL (UG) TLC (PGT) PGR committee (PGR) to aim for a centralised approach. Outcome of discussions implied that centralised method of holding data on alumni (particularly in light of new GDPR legislation) would be the best approach for this and WHRI still await further developments in this regard.
3	Appropriate quality assurance mechanisms should be in place to monitor the teaching contributions of external professional practitioners and those on honorary contracts, in consultation with Academic Development.	a) Initial discussion about the practicalities of this with the SMD head of QA. b) Development of guidance based on agreement with head of QA for Programme leads regarding quality monitoring of external teachers. c) Inclusion of guidance in staff handbook under development.	Action in operation - MD has discussed with SMD Head of QA and also reviewed information provided by other institutes where applicable – information has now been included in the Staff Education Handbook.	No further update
4	The Panel commended the clarity of the programme specifications for the MSc/PGDip in Endocrinology and Diabetes and MSc/PGDip Clinical Drug Development, and recommended that the review of other programme specifications should continue using these as a template.	Review of specifications currently underway. Awaiting meeting with registry about some specific issues – date pending Registry personnel availability	Action in operation - Specifications completed.	No further update
5	The Panel commended the 'You Said, We Did' feedback provided for the MSc in Sports and Exercise Medicine, and recommended that this approach should be utilised in other programmes.	This model already discussed and shared at WHRI education day as well as at an education committee meeting. SEM staff asked to share their templates for use on other programmes. Reminder and template to be re-sent to all programme directors.	Action in operation - Model and template from SEM previously shared and reminders and redistribution on agenda for Oct 2018 Education Committee meeting.	No further update
6	The Panel commended the positive balance between formative and summative assessments used in the MSc/PGDip in Clinical Endocrinology and the MSc/PGDip in Sports and Exercise Medicine. The Panel recommended that this model should be explored for other programmes.	Programme leads to review at management committee meetings 2018.	Action initiated - Assessment discussion listed as agenda item under 'training' for education committee October 2018. This will initiate a quality discussion with the aim of leads initiating their own review over the coming academic year.	Action in operation - Model and template from SEM previously shared and reminders and redistribution also discussed Oct 2018 Education committee meeting
7	Include student representation on the Education Board and other decision-making bodies.	Invite SSLC lead annually to attend education board ex officio in Autumn term 2018.	Action initiated - New student intake currently enrolling, once SSLC lead is selected they will be invited to the education board.	Action in operation - SSLC lead invited to and has attended the education board. Reported back by email that she found it to be a very positive and constructive experience.
8	Clarify and publicise the feedback turnaround policy for students	Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg. Including feeback guidance and reference to QM policy etc).	Action in operation - Education handbook completed, reviewed and amended and made available to all staff via link to WHRI intranet. Includes information and links around student feedback policy and	No further update
9	Ensures that student feedback is disseminated to staff in a consistent manner, particularly in relation to varying approaches within WHRI and SBCS			
10	Examine assessment in a number of areas, including: a) Consistent application of QMUL policy in relation to potential plagiarism; b) The timing of assessments to avoid the issue of coursework bunching for students; c) Reviewing the 100% coursework on some Distance Learning programmes to ensure that adequate cross-checks are in place to confirm student identity; d) Reviewing the MCQ and SAQ approach to assessment in the BSc Pharmacology and Innovative Therapeutics to ensure that the marking burden did not escalate.	(a) Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg. Including plagiarism etc) – can act as basis for later audit if needed. (b),(c),(d) Programme leads to review. These items to be added to TPAP and reviewed at Education committee.	Action initiated - Assessment discussion listed as agenda item under 'training' for education committee October 2018. This will initiate a quality discussion with the aim of leads initiating their own review over the coming academic year.	Action initiated - Assessment discussion completed at Education committee. Individual leads have now initiated their own reviews where relevant.
11	Ensure that SSLCs are running with an approved agenda and that the external examiner reports are considered at these meetings, in line with QMUL policy.	SSLC agenda and meeting dates to be reviewed and set for the incoming students (currently it is still the enrolment period)	Action initiated - SSLC's already in place and use the QMUL agenda. To timetable once per term and release dates in advance (note that this may mean some students who are studying at distance or variable mode may not be on campus on specified dates.)	Action in operation - SSLC agenda and meeting dates reviewed and set for the incoming students
12	Timetable a specific event where PGT students can complete the PTES in order to improve response rates.	Single event will not catch all students particularly not distance learners or where students timetables do not match the date, however this will be tabled as a social/coffee/SSLC meeting during the period that PTES is running.	Action still to be addressed - PTES results and very low response rates across the board for this year noted; for next year clear dates will be set out as well as a more concerted campaign for distance learners.	Action in operation - PTES dates signposted to course leads, individual courses have been running 'PTES completion' events to encourage responses. Distance learners are receiving regular encouragement to complete.
13	The Panel commended the student led William Harvey Research Institute (Pharmacology) Society and recommended that similar societies be encouraged and supported within the Institute, by working with the Barts and The London Students' Association and QMSU.	BL Endocrine Society already in place and has been running for the past 3 years; BL SEMS society created and incorporated into London-wide SEMS Society already; other programmes to investigate similar links.	Action in operation - Links in place for: pharmacology, endocrinology, forensics, sports and exercise medicine.	No further update
14	Data on applicants and participants should be reviewed with a view towards widening participation.	Data reviewed after each intake and each intake marketing adjusted accordingly.	Action initiated - first intake demographics reviewed (and reported to Athena SWAN); further intakes will continue to have data collected routinely	Action in operation - First intake demographics reviewed (and reported to Athena SWAN); further intakes will continue to have data collected routinely
15	Clearly signpost students to resources available at the Mile End and Charterhouse Square campuses and make supervisors aware of the resources across QMUL in order to direct students to support available.	Add this information wherever not already present into course handbooks and into the staff handbook under development	Action in operation - Course handbooks all updated for this year.	No further update

	WILLIAM HARVEY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (Review Date: March 2018)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2019)**
16	Consider mechanisms for ensuring an integrated experience for students on the WHRI/SBCS allied programmes.	BSc Pharmacology Committee newly formed April 2018; purpose includes for Module leads to give updates, review teaching, share good practice and discuss ways to enhance the student experience and also to be aware of QMUL academic regulations. Item to be passed to that committee who can report back via education committee. Good practice can be shared with module leads on other SBCS modules.	Action initiated - BSc committee continues to meet – due to report at the end of the academic year.	Action in operation - BSc committee continues to meet – reports regularly to education committee
17	Encourage and support PGR students to gain teaching qualifications.	Students to be signposted to qualifications consideration to be given to time commitment required for CILT and PgCAP balanced against research targets.	Action still to be addressed - because these courses enrol in Autumn term and report of uptake not due back until end of academic year.	Action initiated - Paragraph added into the PGR student handbook - if students are interested they should talk to supervisor and DGS who can discuss/advise on suitability, benefits and time management. Also covered in the introductions for all new PHD students. Uptake expected to be relatively low due to significant research training commitment during science PhD
18	Robust structures should be put in place to support strategic growth in the future, including: a) Monitoring administrative staffing levels to support future growth of the Institute;	Recent review (January 2018) with workload allocation and increase in administrative staff agreed. Recruitment currently underway. Annual review of administrative support part of workload planning process	Action initiated - Additional administrative staff now in place (administrative support from SBCS still pending recruitment to vacant post); workload review in light of student enrolments by January 2019.	Action in operation - Additional administrative staff now in place
	b) Consistent application of QMUL's academic regulations across all taught programmes;	Academic regulations already referred to at all exam boards. Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg around extenuating circumstances, plagiarism etc)	Action initiated - Additional administrative staff now in place (administrative support from SBCS still pending recruitment to vacant post); workload review in light of student enrolments by January 2019.	Action in operation - Staff Education handbook completed, reviewed and amended and made available to all staff via link to WHRI intranet. To be updated annually by education lead in conjunction with education manager
	c) A review of the Institute's mechanisms for managing academic standards and quality assurance, in line with QMUL's policies and procedures;	Continued working with teaching and learning committee and taught programmes board regarding development of new courses and appropriate QA and oversight. Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg around processes for new course development etc)	Action initiated - Additional administrative staff now in place (administrative support from SBCS still pending recruitment to vacant post); workload review in light of student enrolments by January 2019.	Action in operation - Work on course development continuous and ongoing; Staff Education handbook completed, reviewed and amended and made available to all staff via link to WHRI intranet. Includes information and links to standards, QA, policies. To be updated annually by education lead in conjunction with education manager
	d) Appropriate training in place for staff on QMUL's policies and academic regulations, especially with regard to assessment offences.	Development of WHRI education staff handbook signposting all relevant regulation and expanding guidance where necessary (eg. around extenuating circumstances, plagiarism etc) Amendment of annual timetable of education committee meetings so that the first meeting of the term includes a focus on training, guidance, policy and sharing good practice (topics to rotate).	Action initiated - Additional administrative staff now in place (administrative support from SBCS still pending recruitment to vacant post); workload review in light of student enrolments by January 2019.	Action in operation - Staff Education handbook completed, reviewed and amended and made available to all staff via link to WHRI intranet. Includes information and links to assessment regulations. To be updated annually by education lead in conjunction with education manager
19	Examine the composition of the student body, particularly with respect to widening participation in line with QMUL's policy.	Data review of all enrolments for the past 3 years by gender, overseas/home/EU status and any other characteristics recorded on on SITS for evaluation at education board. This is aligned with an Athena SWAN action plan objective and therefore we will work with Neil Rayment on accessing the PGT data.	Action initiated - UG data reviewed and benchmarked – discussion / dissemination at education committee PGT data being reviewed together with other institutes – first report will be at Athena SWAN SAT meeting in November 2018 PGR data currently being gathered and reviewed.	Action in operation - UG data reviewed and benchmarked – discussion / dissemination at education committee PGT data being reviewed together with other institutes – data gathered but analysis has awaited the (delayed) recruitment of a data officer who is now in place. He has this listed as an early task and will report back with the information to the institute when reviewed. PGR data has being gathered and reviewed with respect to gender and ethnicity. F > M in accordance with SMD overall.
20	Review the programme information provided to students, including programme specifications, handbooks, and prospectuses, to ensure: a) Consistency of information, particularly with regards to reducing the variability within the course handbooks; b) That student expectations were managed, for example with respect to opportunities for clinical experience.	Programme specification review underway	Action in operation - Programme handbooks redrafted and reviewed for the current intake.	No further update
21	Develop the peer observation of academic staff, including: a) Ensuring that peer observation was discussed during staff appraisals; b) Ensuring that peer observation was recorded as having happened; c) Reviewing the allocation of peer observations to ensure diversity and that it was not a reciprocal arrangement between two members of staff.	Peer review new arrangements already underway.	Action initiated - Peer observation process and pairings disseminated for 2018/19. Data on completion for review at the end of the academic year.	Action in operation - Peer observation process and pairings disseminated for 2018/19. Data on completion for review at the end of the academic year at the last education committee meeting as a standing item
22	Review the work allocation model SWARM to assess the allocation and weighting and ensure that it does not underestimate workloads.	Currently under review as part of centre reviews – data being returned to centre leads by May 2018.	Action initiated - SWARM individual data reviewed as part of the performance management process – individual concerns have been discussed. Overall change in SWARM tariffs currently under discussion and amendments are being reported back to SMDEB.	Action in operation - SWARM individual data reviewed as part of the performance management process – individual concerns have been discussed. Overall changes in SWARM tariffs have been made for SMD based on feedback from all Institute Directors
23	Recommendation to QMUL: Review alumni support and communication via an alumni email.		Action still to be addressed	
24	Recommendation to QMUL: Review the assessment policy regarding the threshold difference for double-marking, particularly for scores on the pass/fail boundary.		Action still to be addressed	Action in operation - This issue was considered by EQSB in May 2018, and the Board was satisfied that the process was appropriate as it stood.

	WOLFSON INSTITUTE OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE (Review Date: May 2018)			
	Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)	12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2019)
1	Greater acknowledgement of the level of fellowship with the Higher Education Academy (now AdvanceHE) achieved by existing staff.	To ensure HR records are up to date To ask holders to add to their post-nominal titles	Action in operation - SMD updated spreadsheet to HR Sent email requesting holder add to their post-nominal titles We have a strong record and are not promoting it sufficiently	Action in operation - SMD updated spreadsheet to HR Sent email requesting holder add to their post-nominal titles We have a strong record and are not promoting it sufficiently Now discussed at newly created Education Committee
2	Any programme proposals exploiting the growth areas in mental health/preventive neurology be taken forward as a priority.	To set up a meeting to discuss options for a potential course in the future.	Action initiated - No action as yet. The tension between research delivery and new course planning is a real one with little capacity. Might we consider investing in new course development using existing income from teaching?	Action initiated - The tension between research delivery and new course planning is a real one with little capacity. Options for increasing capacity are being explored by the Institute Director and the Institute Manager
3	The Institute's Executive Board should take a proactive approach to leadership to shape the future direction of the Institute, including; a) a) development of Institute-specific objectives in relation to both teaching and research, and alignment of the two; b) b) a stable staffing strategy for UG teaching commitments; c) c) more robust business cases to secure teaching resources to support current and future postgraduate provision; d) d) institute-specific strategies for PGT and PGR student experience, teaching and learning; e) e) management and improvement of teaching spaces; f) f) provision of adequate study spaces and resources for postgraduate students; g) g) greater interaction/collaboration between the individual Centres in relation to postgraduate teaching.	To develop teaching strategy	Action initiated - To hold a brainstorm session in the new year to agree a teaching strategy. Barriers include existing academic staff having time to devote to developing new courses/modules without impacting on their research. To discuss how to overcome this. Room 130 in the Wolfson to be taken into central timetabling and the AV to be refreshed.	Action initiated - To discuss further at upcoming Academic Retreat where research and teaching strategies and priorities will be set. Barriers include existing academic staff having time to devote to developing new courses/modules without impacting on their research. To discuss how to overcome this. Room 130 in the Wolfson to be taken into central timetabling and the AV to be refreshed. A review of Institute space is due to take place over the next few months and will include provision for PG students. An Institute Education Director has been appointed and an Education Committee has been established to oversee all teaching activities. Part of the remit of the Committee is to develop and implement the Institute's Education Strategy.
4	Build on collaborative work with the School of Biological and Chemical Sciences in respect of the following; a) that methods are introduced to improve teaching quality and administration; b) introductions of more formal links with Abnormal Psychology; c) the active promotion of its PGT programmes to BSc Psychology students.	Proposal and delivery of joint MSc Programmes with SBCS Attendance of PGT staff at SBCS events to promote PGT programme	Action initiated - PGT lead has met with SBCS Psychology lead to discuss joint MSc programmes	Action initiated - PGT lead has met with SBCS Psychology lead to discuss joint MSc programmes. Proposals are underway for joint MSc as soon as 2020. Several Wolfson lecturers now teach on SBCS modules and actively promote Wolfson PGT courses
5	The Institute Director to meet with the SMD Senior Executive to examine the Institute's challenges in teaching and learning. During this process, the Institute should identify areas for review with a view to potential improvements in its provision, including: a) policies for staff recruitment and investment in new activity ahead of obtaining student numbers/fee income; b) promoting master's programmes for intercalation; c) offering a Psychiatry module as part of iBSc Neuroscience; d) UG teaching and communications with IHSE concerning amendments to the MBBS timetable and related teaching issues.	To discuss at next Institute meeting with VP Health	Action still to be addressed - To add to agenda for January 2019 meeting. Capacity for teaching, developing new courses, managing staffing, and perhaps delivering to SMD courses as a priority over other non SMD courses, if the income streams are to increase.	Action still to be addressed - To discuss at May 2019 VP Health meeting. To also discuss at the Academic Retreat on 24 June 2019. Capacity for teaching, developing new courses, managing staffing, and perhaps delivering to SMD courses as a priority over other non SMD courses, if the income streams are to increase.
6	Consider phasing out the delivery of teaching by short-term teaching fellows in favour of longer (albeit fixed-term, if necessary) teaching focused appointments to ensure consistency in teaching and improve student experience.	No further teaching fellows to be recruited. Lecturing roles to be move the permanent appointments.	Action in operation - Contract for final PGT teaching fellow ended on 09/2019. No further TF roles will be recruited for PGT. PGT Staff are steadily being moved to permanent roles as their contracts come up for renewal.	Action in operation - Contract for final PGT teaching fellow ended on 09/2019. No further TF roles will be recruited for PGT. PGT Staff are steadily being moved to permanent roles as their contracts come up for renewal.
7	Utilise a transparent work allocation model, e.g. SWARM, to monitor allocations and to identify key stress points in teaching, research and administration to help to inform a clear staffing strategy.	The PGT team engages fully with the SWARM process each year.	Action in operation - SWARM data incorporated into staff scorecards	Action in operation - SWARM data incorporated into staff scorecards
8	Review policies on fee setting, bursaries and student-number targets in line with a more financially robust recruitment and staffing strategy.	PGT fees to be reviewed annually. Student targets to be reviewed in consultation with SMD Deanery	Action initiated - These fees are not set in isolation from SMD and QMUL, rarely driven by the Institute alone.	Action in operation - Wolfson PGT fees were reviewed for 18/19 and again for 19/20, an average increase of around 15%, bringing them more in line with QMUL standards, whilst remaining competitive. An initial meeting to agree student targets took place in October 2018; a follow-up has since been postponed by the Deanery. However, recruitment targets including a 5% overall student increase with no standalone module below 15 students currently look achievable based on student applications, currently up 42% on 2018/19 (April 2019).
9	Further discussions should take place to consider delivery through or at least utilising Queen Mary Online.	PGT team to consider adding a course to QMO	Action still to be addressed - about the impact of engaging QMO in Institute Programmes: 1) the impact on quality and student experience in a course that relies heavily on clinical experiences and interactions; and 2) the relative paucity of demand for distance learning mode in recent cohorts. Course content is not always best taught in a passive DL mode, and needs more investment sometimes than conventional courses in terms of staff input, although savings occur on teaching spaces. The technology for large virtual classrooms needs further development and investment.	Action still to be addressed - No progress since 3 month report

	WOLFSON INSTITUTE OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE (Review Date: May 2018)			
	Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 Month Update (EQSB: October 2018)	12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2019)
10	Review the part-time structure of programmes, including, for example, the introduction of 30-credit modules for part-time provision.	All courses currently offered as 60-credits only to be redeveloped as 30-credit formats. New PT pathways to be offered for 19/20 allowing for a better balance of credits between years.	Action initiated - PGT Programmes currently delivered as 3x60 credit modules are now available in 30-credit blocks that are being trialled with the new MRes. New part-time pathways are being discussed within the PGT team with an eye to commence in 19/20. There is a trade off in efficiency, staffing and assessment burden with smaller modules.	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month report
11	Appropriate quality-assurance mechanisms should be in place to monitor the teaching contributions of regular external professional practitioners, e.g. peer teaching observation.	External lecturers to be regularly quality assessed/peer reviewed as a matter of course.	Action in operation - A new system of assessment for external lectures was agreed by the PGT team in October 2018. Module leads will perform a brief quality checklist on all internal. Additionally, a rota of peer reviews for internal substantive PGT staff has been developed so that all internal staff delivering regular teaching will give and receive a peer review each year.	Action in operation - As per 3 month report
12	The Institute should no longer removes topics from examinations due to poor quality lecture capture or staff absence. If a pre-recording cannot be made available, alternate arrangements should be made so that the content can be assessed.	No more topics to be removed from exam syllabus due to sickness or poor-quality recordings.	Action in operation - This policy has been fully adopted by the PGT team. The examination curriculum will remain stable and any absences will be compensated with existing recorded material and/or seminar-style sessions delivered by Institute staff.	Action in operation - As per 3 month report
13	Develop a clear PhD recruitment strategy to improve its ability to recruit to funded places	To develop recruitment strategy.	Action initiated - To hold a brainstorm session in early 2019	Action initiated - PGR Director has been appointed and will lead on developing a recruitment strategy
14	Reviews mechanisms for supporting postgraduate-research students including: a) embedding training requirements and career-development planning into its PhD induction and progression mechanisms, with a career development plan to be completed for each postgraduate student by end of month one of their studentship by the supervisor(s) and the student; b) ensuring comprehensive guidance is given on how to access QMUL short courses also at other campuses; c) developing a short module in Statistics suitable for the Institute's PhD students to be taken in year one of their studentship; d) enabling the auditing of modules to fill knowledge gaps either in attendance or access to material through the VLE; e) regular monitoring of supervisors to ensure that they adhere to QMUL policies; f) providing closer guidance especially during the first year of doctoral studies, to enable students to pursue a sustainable research project; g) more accurate record keeping to monitor both student and supervisor activity; h) resuming regular PGR-specific SSLC meetings.	To develop and establish a clearly documented framework for supporting PGR students	Action still to be addressed - No action yet. New PGR Lead has been appointed who will lead this	Action initiated - New PGR Director has been appointed. The QMUL PGR personal development plan has been implemented for all students. Plans are in place to establish a PGR SSLC. Supervisors have been contacted by PGR Director to confirm changes to how supervision is managed
15	Continued investment (staff and finance) beyond current funding to maintain the MEDPRO/QMUL Model initiative.	Further investment	Action still to be addressed - This is a college, not Institute activity	Action still to be addressed - This is a college, not Institute activity
16	Establishment and sustained running of a PGR SSLC.	To set up SSLC	Action still to be addressed - No action yet. To liaise with new PGR Lead and Administration to set up	Action initiated - Plans are in place with the PGR Lead and Administrator to set up an SSLC for the upcoming term
17	Provide greater opportunities for (international and home/EU) student interaction, including; a) access to study support at Charterhouse such as printing and study space; b) assistance with the creation of student-led societies; c) more formal links with the sites of support offered at Mile End (Advice and Counselling, Disability and Dyslexia Service and Academic Writing). This included running part of the induction session at Mile End; d) enabling a wider collaboration with other parts of SMD in Charterhouse and Whitechapel.	Pursue greater integration with QMBL student's union in events for PGT students Facilitate or support joint events with Mile End services	Action in operation - BLSU attended the Wolfson PGT induction day for the first time in 21 September 2018. BLSU also organised a 'mini freshers fair' in October 2018 to enable Charterhouse Students to have greater access to student societies.	Action in operation - As per 3 month report
18	Review the possible causes for the poor attendance of the recent Careers workshop in light of its previous popularity.	Review the attendance at the Careers Workshop and generate an action plan, ahead of the session in May 2019	Action initiated - To be reviewed in Semester 2, 2018/19	Action in operation - A review of the careers workshop has been undertaken and a more vocational focus adopted, with more participation from course alumni and professionals.
19	Conduct a demonstration on how to access feedback on the VLE form part of the student induction.	Incorporate this into the eLearning section of the student Induction.	Action in operation - This was implemented for the 2018/19 student induction.	Action in operation - As per 3 month report
20	Assist PGT teaching teams to enable more opportunities for staff to meet/communicate with students on an individual basis for pastoral and academic support.	Incorporate into support processes	Action in operation - This was implemented for the 2018/19 student induction.	Action in operation - As per 3 month report
21	Meet with the SU to the discuss relaxation of the policy that students must make a purchase if they wish to use the Shield Café as an informal study space.	Relaxation of policy	Action still to be addressed - This is a college, not Institute activity	Action in operation - This was implemented for the 2018/19 academic year by the Student's Union.

	EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Review Date: May 2018)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: Autumn 2019)**
1	Queen Mary Senior Executive (QMSE) conducts a holistic review of educational development activities, with particular focus on: a) Ensuring that new academic staff receive appropriate workload dispensations in order to meet the probation requirement to achieve a teaching qualification and the institutional target to achieve HEA Fellowship;	Establish current university and individual School policies for time allocation related to obtaining a teaching qualification as part of probation Submit a report to QMSE, before the end of Semester B of 2018/19, that presents a) these data, b) an analysis of them against the expected time to spend on the established pathways to meeting probation, and c) recommendation for change of policy	Action initiated - We have now reviewed the existing institutional policy and are designing a survey aimed at identifying the specificities in the amount of time allocated per category of probationary staff for each academic School.	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.
	b) Clarifying the continuing professional development expectations for academic staff post-probation	Establish current expectations for CPD in teaching and learning of post-probationary staff by academic School. In the QMSE report mentioned in a), summarise and include the above findings, and make a recommendation for a minimum set time allocation for CPD in teaching and learning for all staff – on and post-probation.	Action initiated - The survey above will comprise a question on Schools' expectations for engagement in CPD in teaching and learning by category of post-probationary staff	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.
	c) Working with schools / institutes to ensure that existing academic staff receive appropriate workload dispensations to enable them to engage with continuing professional development (including but not limited to educational development activities) in order to enhance their practice	Meet with Schools' management to clarify time expectations of existing CPD opportunities and pathways for probationary and post-probationary staff, and explore ways for supporting both categories in a personalised way through both the Educational Development activities and School based and other developmental options. The negotiated outcomes from the meetings to be summarised and included in the report to QMSE (from a) and b) above) in support, and to provide context for the report recommendations for staff time allocation for probation- and post-probation engagement in CPD.	Action initiated - An initial contact with each School is in preparation and due before the end of October 2018.	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.
	d) Clarifying and formalising (if appropriate) the intentions and expectations for the provision of educational development activities to Teaching Assistants (or equivalent) and non-QMUL staff contributing to the delivery of QMUL programmes	Establish current policy and practice in the Schools. Include the findings and make recommendations for standardising the expectations for engaging in educational development activities by TAs and non-QMUL staff teaching on QMUL programmes in the report to QMSE mentioned in a), b) and c) above.	Action initiated - We are including specific questions in our survey (see a) and b) above) about the Schools' expectations for engaging in training, development, and qualifying for teaching of their TA and non-QMUL teaching staff.	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.
	e) Addressing the sustainability of the Teaching Recognition Project following the retirement of the current Project Manager and the ending contracts of the supporting staff	Review the current processes for teaching recognition at QMUL. Design a revised teaching recognition scheme that retains the best practice from its predecessor, the Teaching Recognition Project, and gears the processes of application, mentoring and support of applicants, and reviewing of applications towards the new institutional targets for staff teaching qualifications as part of the 'Going for Gold' (GoG) strategy. Submit a proposal paper outlining the new scheme to QMSE before the end of Semester B, 2018/19. Submit a Major Changes application to Advanced HE for the accreditation of the proposed changes to the scheme	Action in operation - 1. Educational Development and the wider Academic Development have commenced a process of simultaneous review and re-design of the teaching recognition scheme. 2. To ensure objectivity, the scheme will be reviewed independently (Ian Roberts, Head of Leadership and Professional Development) and the outcomes will be included in the revised scheme 3. In the interim, we: • Have revised and re-launched the preparatory workshops for applicants, in view of feedback and to meet demand with the launch of GoG • Are liaising with Schools about identifying prospective applicant mentors and application reviewers out of existing teaching qualified staff, and have already secured an average of 5 new mentors per Faculty • Have launched new training for mentors and reviewers	Action in operation - however limited progress since 3 month update. The scheme as currently stands has recently been reaccredited (early 2018) and following a standardisation workshop with an Advance HE representative were complimented on our scheme and the consistency of judgement shown by mentors and reviewers who had attended the workshop. No significant changes have been made that require a Major Changes application.
2	Review the parity of the taught and CPD pathways to fellowship, developing clearer guidance about the merits, differences, and appropriateness of the different pathways to, and levels of fellowship. The outcomes of this review should be formally considered together with schools / institutes and QMSE to accommodate the variety of views and staff development needs, and to agree a mutually beneficial way forward.	Review the equivalency, in terms of impact on individual practice and success at qualifying to teach, between the formal taught programmes in teaching and learning and the CPD alternative – the ADEPT 50 and ADEPT 100 point-based schemes, for probationary staff. Submit a paper outlining the findings to the Dean-of-Education-Advisory-Groups by Faculty, and discuss ways forward with the Deans and School Directors of Education. Submit a report with recommendations based on 1. and 2. to QMSE by the end of 2018/19.	Action initiated - A survey of participants on the point-based scheme is being designed right now, as a first step of data gathering on the schemes' impact on and suitability for training and developing probationary staff alongside the formal taught programmes; the survey (and possibly focus groups) results will be compared to existing data on the impact of the taught programmes on participant practice, and the programmes' participant evaluations.	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update. The points-based scheme was suspended due to staff shortages in the first half of 2019. This can be linked to the projects in 1 (a)-(c) to review and redesign a flexible CPD scheme, so that the pathways can be designed for parity.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Review Date: May 2018)			
Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: Autumn 2019)**
3 Consider more frequent and diverse mechanisms for effectively communicating with staff in schools / institutes and with HR about the provision and opportunities available	Identify named contacts from within Educational Development for each School, for direct liaising on School CPD needs Set up a system, negotiated with Schools, of regular (e.g. biannual) data reporting from us to the Schools on: • Number of School based staff who have engaged in Educational Development activities • The general evaluation of such activities by all participants	Action initiated - We have now identified contacts from the team for each School, and are in the process of initiating contact (to take place via the Academic Development initiated contacts mentioned under Recommendation 1, c) above).	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.
4 Continue to identify additional and alternative mechanisms for identifying and disseminating best practice across QMUL.	Establish a data bank of good practice from the existing and future submissions through the formal taught programmes (assessment) and teaching recognition scheme (applications); this will initially be for use within Academic Development only. Develop an open, QMUL wide resource.	Action still to be addressed	Action still to be addressed
5 Ensure the provision of clear, consistent feedback to participants, which will inform their future practice.	Run standardisation sessions for feedback on assessment for existing and new programme tutors Clarify and accentuate the programme assessment criteria around application to practice	The programmes team has now introduced regular moderation meetings prior to assessment submission on every module, at which all markers involved with the particular module assessment consider how best to enhance the consistency, quality and focus on application to practice of the feedback. As part of that, they look at past feedback on the same assessment. The first moderation meetings are taking place in October 2018. The team reviewed and revised the generic programme assessment criteria in time for the launch of the September'18 programmes. The new criteria focus strongly on analysis and demonstration of the application to participant's practice, and so will markers' feedback.	Action initiated - Limited progress since 3 month update. The programme team introduced new guidance on marking and moderation (available on request from Educational Development).
6 Work to ensure that the redesigned taught programmes: a) Account for the diverse disciplinary backgrounds of participants by ensuring that course materials do not focus too heavily on one particular subject area	Link programme content and resources to the data bank of good practice (from Recommendation 4. above) Subscribe through QMUL Library to a comprehensive online database of periodicals and e-books in higher education that cover the spread of disciplines represented on the programmes and at QMUL	Action in operation - In the interim of developing the data bank of good practice, we have now begun to develop learning resources in the forms of short video interviews, demonstrations and case studies of good practice by QMUL staff who have been identified by Schools and through the Educational Development's own activities. The first resources have already been included in the preparatory activities of our modules. We have subscribed to a comprehensive online database of education literature (journals and e-books), which is open to programme participants, all Academic Development staff, and all staff in Schools and Professional Services.	Action in operation - No further update.
b) Encourage a critical approach and provide opportunities for participants to explore and interrogate content	Continue to ensure there are sufficient opportunities for staff on the programmes to feedback on this aspect of their learning experience. Add a question to the module evaluations OR the end of module open feedback session (the last 30 min of the final module session) on the experienced level of critical engagement with the programme content and resources. Continue to review our learning resources for currentness	Action in operation - We have reviewed and revised the design of module sessions to allow for more group critical appraisal of theory, and exploration of theory to education practice at university, within and across the academic disciplines and related services. We have updated the module reading lists and preparatory activities for each session with the most recent, cutting edge pedagogic research	Action in operation - No further update.
c) Adopt a contextualised approach to prepare participants for the diverse student population of QMUL	Introduce into the module teaching around the institutional dashboards around the student body, as these become available Continue to draw on QMUL based research into student engagement, attainment, and attendance (e.g. by Engagement, Retention and Success; In: Academic Development), and on other research into the QMUL specific learner and learning context	Action in operation - We have dedicated sessions in each of the programme modules to student learning, experience and engagement in the QMUL context We continue to update the content and learning activities on the modules with the outcomes of recent research into QMUL student success	Action in operation - No further update.
7 Consider offering some shorter, more informal development sessions in order to encourage engagement of staff who may not have the capacity to attend more formal activities that require a greater time commitment.	Review the current provision of CPD for staff, including that run centrally by Educational Development and what we run with Schools, and seek closer links and alignment with the CPD provision in the Schools. Develop, together with the rest of Academic Development, a new framework for CPD that streamlines and coordinates related activities within, between and alongside the Schools.	Action initiated - Discussion and drafting of a new model for an institutional CPD framework are under way in Academic Development; the outcome will be consulted on with Schools and Faculties before the end of Semester A, 2018/19	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.

	EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Review Date: May 2018)			
	Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: Autumn 2019)**
8	Develop a systematic approach to researching and evaluating the impact of their programmes on participants, both in the short and longer terms.	Continue to conduct our research into the impact of the taught programmes on participant practice Feedback our findings to the Schools on a regular basis (e.g. biannually) Communicate participant module evaluations of the programmes to the Schools and EQSB	Action in operation - We continue our long-term research on the learning gain of participants on the programmes against programme outcomes We launched from September 2018 research into staff wellbeing on the programmes, and continue with our research into the development of cohort identify on our face-to-face programme variants We are presenting the results from 1. at the November'18 Action Research workshop for QMUL staff organised by the International Education Group at QMUL	Action in operation - No further update.
9	Results of this research should be distributed across QMUL as a mechanism for encouraging engagement by staff in the schools / institutes.	Feedback our findings to the Schools on a regular basis (e.g. biannually) Communicate participant module evaluations of the programmes to the Schools and EQSB	Action in operation - We are presenting the results from Recommendation 8.1.1 (learning gain) above at the November'18 Action Research workshop for QMUL staff organised by the International Education Group at QMUL	Action in operation - however limited progress since 3 month update. Evaluations of the taught programmes are collected by EvaSys in the usual way so should be as available as all other taught programmes. A summary was provided in the Educational Development response to the QM Academy consultation.
10	Work with QMSE to: a) Ensure that an appropriately trained Academic Development Mentor is appointed within each school / institute in order to ensure the parity of experience for all taught programme participants b) Ensure that the appointed Academic Development Mentors within schools / institutes receive appropriate workload dispensations to undertake their roles effectively. Consideration should be given to making this a dedicated role within each Faculty	Collect data on the appointment of School Academic Development Mentors (SADMs) by School, and the workload dispensation such mentors receive Review and co-develop with the Schools, through the Deans of Education Advisory Groups, the SADMs' role description in order to standardise it and the related workload dispensation across Schools Report on the results from 1. and 2. above to QMSE by the end of 2018/19	Action still to be addressed	Action still to be addressed
11	Consider more formal and sustainable mechanisms for developing and supporting Academic Development Mentors	Update the training and support for SADMs in view of the action plan for Recommendation 10. above.	Action initiated - In the interim, we are launching a Mentors forum, the first of which is planned for November 2018. The forum will include SADMs – who have until now acted as mentors on all QMUL CPD pathways (taught programmes, point-based schemes, and teaching recognition scheme) – alongside other staff who only mentor on the teaching recognition scheme. We plan the forum to meet two-, three times a year, and to be a space for mentors to exchange and discuss good practice, challenges, and recommendations for senior QMUL committees.	Action initiated - No further progress since 3 month update.
12	Updates the webpages and the Academic Development Mentor Handbook to ensure that all information is accurate and up to date. Consideration should also be given to providing a list of the Academic Development Mentors in each school / institute on the webpages in order to increase visibility of these contacts	Update the information for SADMs (the Mentor's Handbook and QM Plus SADM course), and all QMUL staff (via the relevant Educational Development webpages) in view of the action plan for Recommendation 10. above.	Action initiated - We have updated the handbook and the website content on Academic Development Mentors, launched a video introducing the mentors and their role as part of a preparatory package for participants on the taught programmes ahead of their academic induction, and continue to invite the mentors to the induction so they can meet with their mentees before the start of programme.	Action initiated - Limited progress since 3 month update. We did not provide a list of mentors in Schools because, perhaps due to lack of formal role, the assignment of these roles is very unstable. More often than not participants contact mentors directly only to be told they have contacted the wrong person: this is an issue that could be addressed in the action plan for (10) so that Schools and Faculties have an established procedure by which colleagues can seek in-school mentoring and support.
13	Formalise the registration and monitoring of participants on the ADEPT pathways to fellowship by using a QMPlus page to track engagement and progression with this route.	Review the process for registering and monitoring of participants on non-credit bearing pathways (specifically the point-based schemes) on the basis of the action plan for Recommendation 2. above. Review and implement a new system for registering and monitoring participants on the teaching recognition scheme	Action initiated - We have started a review of the related processes on the teaching recognition scheme, and are launching revised registration and progression monitoring from November 2018.	Action initiated - Limited progress since 3 month update. The Teaching Recognition project does now use a QMPlus page, though it is monitored using a spreadsheet in conjunction with HR. The Teaching Recognition administrator updates HR after each panel with new Fellowship awards.

INSTITUTE OF DENTISTRY (Review Date: June 2018)

	Recommendation	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)	12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2019)
1	Improvements to the SED when preparing for the next periodic review, including: • Involving a range of staff and students in the production of the documentation; • Providing relevant and up-to-date information in the supporting documentation; • Ensuring that descriptive information was evidenced by data and metrics which were tracked over time.	Noted for next review.	Action in operation - Review in 2018 coincided with examination season so student availability restricted. Further clarification requested on up to date information and metrics	Action in operation - noted for next review
2	Wth the support of the Faculty and Queen Mary, explore the potential of developing a closer working relationship with the Trust through a joint committee on planning and resources.	Trust Partnership Board and Service Level agreement to be established	Action in operation - 1st meeting of Board due Autumn 2018. Service level agreement awaiting signature	Action in operation - 1st meeting of Board took place in January 19 after delay for new Dean appointment. Next meeting April 16th 2019 – and then bimonthly. Service level agreement under final review April 2019
3	Revitalise and strengthen the Dean's Executive Group going forward.	Scope and membership increased. New Dean due to take office in January 2019.	Action in operation - 1st meeting took place September 2018	Action in operation - New approach under development with the appointment of the new Dean for Dentistry
4	Review PGR recruitment strategies and explore potential diversification into other markets.	Widening PhD advertising Meet with QMUL International Recruitment Manager	Action in operation - • New full time PGR administrator appointed • New PhD projects advertised on FindaPhD • Web site redesigned and PGR funding information being added • New PGR funding opportunities are being circulated by email to all academic staff • Research and PGR Administrator present on QMUL stand at IADR London 2018 to increase profile	Action in operation - Research and PGR Administrator attended IADR London 2018 and PGR Open Evening in November 2018 to promote opportunities to a varied audience of students - New industrial studentships have been secured for home students - The Institute of Dentistry agreed to accept China Scholarship Council recipients and waive fees for exceptional candidates
5	Undertake a systematic approach to the annual programme review the PGT portfolio to identify priority areas for further development.		Action initiated - Linked to Cost benefit analysis	Action in operation - 3 New courses in final stages – Minimally Invasive Dentistry (MSc); Dental Public Health (MSc) and Oral Medicine (D Clin Dent) - Exploring new courses with Dean for Education SMD - Complex internal QA process to be reviewed with new SMD Dean for PGT
6	Conduct cost-benefit analysis of running small postgraduate programmes and to consider whether there was a potential to have a future recruitment drive. Increasing PG numbers would also mitigate against potential issues of student isolation in small cohorts.	Working with QM Admissions to improve the recruitment process. Working with the international office to explore new areas for recruitment Cost benefit analysis being undertaken	Action initiated - Meetings with Admissions and International office took place over Summer 18 New staff appointed to oversee the process within the Dental School Cost benefit analysis due to be completed during Autumn 18	Action in operation • Increased applications and offers made for all courses for 2019 start • Profitability analysis underway to be reviewed with new Dean for Dentistry
7	Review programme specifications, with consideration of the following: • That the programme specifications should be reviewed annually for each current programme, and should be updated on current ARCS templates; • That the information held in programme specifications should be consistently aligned with what is published online on websites and in handbooks; • That the D Clin Dent programme specification should be updated for the next APR to correctly reflect the conjoint arrangement with the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh.	Programme specifications to be reviewed during Autumn 18 D Clin Dent specification to be updated Autumn 18	Action initiated	Action in operation - Updated programme specifications submitted in Spring 2019.
8	Review training provision for PhD students who deliver teaching, including for example: • Running a session on teaching and assessment methods; • Delivering a 'teach your first lesson' session; • Inviting PhD students who teach to relevant parts of the staff development days.	Introduction to teaching programme being developed within the Institute of Dentistry Exploring opportunities for students to become involved in teaching Students to be invited to Staff Development Days	Action in operation - The Doctoral College has been informed of the title of the teaching course in order to add CPD points. Content and dates for this course to be finalised in Autumn 18. Director of Graduate Studies and PGR Administrator to have a meeting with Director of Taught Programmes and Director of Undergraduate Programmes to discuss PGR teaching opportunities in Autumn 18	Action in operation • Introduction to teaching programme has been developed within the Institute of Dentistry – to take place on 10th May 2019 • Exploring opportunities for students to become involved in teaching • Students have been invited to Staff Development Days
9	Review timetabling processes to ensure that any cancellations or changes are effectively communicated to students.	Meetings with students planned to explore best way of cascading information	Action initiated - New Year leads appointed. SSLC to be consulted on communication.	Action in operation • New Year leads appointed – actively reviewing programme. • Reminder emails sent to staff • SSLC to be consulted on communication
10	Deteriorating equipment at the outreach centres should be upgraded at the earliest opportunity to avoid any potential risks to the attainment of intended learning outcomes or safe patient treatment.	Options analysis of Outreach centres being undertaken. Trust Partnership board and Service Level Agreement established to facilitate and streamline equipment replacement.	Action initiated - Due to be completed by Autumn 2018. 1st meeting of Partnership board due in Autumn 2018. Service Level agreement signed September 18	Action in operation • 1st meeting of Partnership board took place in January 19 and now bi-monthly meetings planned (next April 16th) • Cost benefit analysis to be undertaken by Trust confirmed at Partnership board in April 19 for report June 19
11	Reinstate a form of consistent and purposeful peer observation of teaching and that the Institute should liaise with the Queen Mary Educational Development team to progress this work.	Process being developed	Action initiated - Staff Development Day	Action in operation • Staff Development Day • Process piloted with Part time staff

INSTITUTE OF DENTISTRY (Review Date: June 2018)			
Recommendation	**Planned action(s)**	**3 month update (EQSB: October 2018)**	**12 Month Update (EQSB: May 2019)**
12 Develop a feedback policy which provides a clear timeframe for returning feedback. The development of a policy should also articulate a minimum level of feedback to ensure consistency in the feedback provided to students.	Policy review to be undertaken	Action initiated - Assessment Leads and Dental Quality Assurance committee to oversee process	Action in operation • OSCE examination feedback now timetabled • Staff development programme on feedback developed using student involvement. To be rolled out Summer and Autumn 19
13 Consider ways of gathering patient feedback in order to satisfy the recommendation of the General Dental Council (GDC) before the next visit. It was suggested that the Institute should consider simple mechanisms, such as paper questionnaires for a year group, or another pilot initiative which might advance this work.	Pilot paper based exercise begun September 2018	Action initiated - Pilot study due to be completed by end of Autumn term 2018. Early data encouraging.	Action in operation • Pilot study completed end of Autumn term 2018 • Positive feedback • Now being rolled out to the whole BDS programme with plan to include BSc in Oral Health
14 Encourage improved student engagement with handbooks, for example: • Running a QMPlus quiz at the start of the academic year; • Providing handbooks in a searchable format on QMPlus, either as a PDF Handbook or searchable QMPlus Handbook; • A lecture dedicated to reviewing the content of the handbook.	Students receive Year and course specific induction programme including reference to Handbooks Handbook design to be reviewed	Action initiated - Inductions took place in September 18. Dental Quality Assurance to review handbooks.	Action in operation • Inductions took place in September 18 with reference to handbooks as wells as the year ahead • Updated induction for Year 5 created and well received • Year leads reviewing handbooks
15 The Student Experience Action Plan should be further developed, with actions related to addressing the concerns from the NSS about feedback and organisational management.		Action in operation - SEAP updated to include NSS action plan and Periodic recommendations September 18. Feedback review initiated	Action in operation • SEAP updated to include NSS action plan and Periodic recommendations September 18 • Feedback review initiated • Reviewing approach to include PGT • SEAP being reviewed to reflect Going for Gold /TEF pillars
16 Recommendation for the Faculty: explore the issue of resources for providing access to dental journals for postgraduate students.	Journal provision to be reviewed.	Action initiated - Meeting with library forum	Action in operation • Barts Health Trust Library Services have funded new journals for the Postgraduate courses • QM Library is also updating the Dental Journal subscription

	SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE (Review Date: March 2019)				
	Recommendation	Priority	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB October 2019)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2020)
1	Further engagement with, and consideration of the institutional Education Strategy 2030, in the development of any internal School strategies.	Essential	Education Strategy 2030 to be tabled at relevant committees for consideration.	Action still to be addressed - The School is to await further documentation regarding the Education Strategy 2030 enabling plan, and this will then be referred to relevant committees once received for further consideration.	
2	Introduce a Director of Education role, to maintain academic oversight of provision at both undergraduate and postgraduate-taught level, in line with the Queen Mary Academic Governance Framework.	Essential	Appoint a Director of Education.	Action in operation - A Director of Education role has been agreed, and will be in place from 19/20.	
3	Conduct more detailed analysis of its NETP figures, in order to gain better understanding of the reasons behind them.	Essential	To undertake analysis of NETP figures.	Action still to be addressed - Once data have been received from the19/20 cohort, we will conduct further analysis of our NETP figures to try and gain a better understanding of the reasons behind them.	
4	Consider whether the benefits of offering joint programmes with other schools outweigh the potential costs to the student experience. There appeared to be a lack of clear learning outcomes for joint programmes, as well as a general lack of coherence, with conflicting information provided to students by different schools.	Advisable	Review benefits of offering joint programmes.	Action in operation - The School will continue to offer joint programmes as they offer pedagogical value and an opportunity for students that are interested in studying across subject areas. We will work closely with joint schools to ensure that our existing joint programmes have a clear service level agreement and that we work collaboratively when organising events and timetables. At PGT level we will discuss closing MSc Law and Economics and the programme variants, PGCert and PGDip for MSc Law and Economics and MSc Law and Finance, due to very low student numbers.	
5	Further consideration and development of the School's unique selling points.	Desirable	Develop a set of unique selling points.	Action initiated - This has been discussed with the School's Marketing Manager, who will work with us to assist us in developing our unique selling points.	
6	Ensure alignment with the institutional policy on the use of QReview, and consider the addition of subtitles to QMPlus material in order to address needs of students with accessibility requirements.	Essential	Review QReview policy at relevant committees to ensure School alignment with new policy.	Action still to be addressed - We will await the new QReview policy regarding this matter, and this will then be referred to the relevant committees for consideration.	
7	Further coordinated diversification of the assessment methods used at all levels.	Advisable	Undertake an assessment review to ensure diversification of assessment methods.	Action initiated - We have undertaken an assessment review post SEB at UG level through TESTA (Kelly Peake) assessment mapping exercise. We are doing the same through PSC (Postgraduate Studies Committee) at PG level.	
8	Explore more diverse methods of delivering teaching to large cohorts, including through technology-enhanced learning	Advisable	Undertake an assessment review to ensure diversification of assessment methods.	Action initiated - We have attempted to explore this, but have not found adequate solutions at this stage. We will continue to explore this, but we would be grateful for any direction or guidance in this respect.	
9	Consider alternative mechanisms for seeking feedback from, and disseminating information to the wider student body. The Panel noted that the School appeared to be heavily reliant on SSLCs and student representatives as a means of communication.	Essential	Introduce Mentimeter and focus groups.	Action initiated - We have discussed this at our UGS (Undergraduate Studies Committee) and we will introduce a policy for implementing Mentimeter sessions in lectures and will consider ad-hoc focus groups at both UG and PGT level to address specific issues, with a focus on involving students in programme developments/delivery. We will launch a 'SEF Progress' poster campaign to run alongside the Universities 'We Listen' posters to highlight developments to students. For UG students, we currently already hold two Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire sessions to seek feedback from them. We also have an open door policy for our Senior Tutors, Student Support Officers and Programme Managers. Additionally, we disseminate information to all students via email and QMplus.	
10	Consider obtaining feedback from students on postgraduate modules mid-way through the semester, in order to implement improvements for the cohort of students currently taking the module.	Advisable	Introduce a PGT online module review.	Action initiated - A PGT online module review will be undertaken in week 6 from 2019/20. For PGT students we already hold 2 SSLC's per semester, one mid-way through the semester, but will introduce a shorter mid semester online evaluation, to help module organisers identify any issues.	
11	Develop a more formalised approach to providing training to teaching staff to ensure that this provision is consistent and sustainable.	Advisable	Provide additional training sessions to Teaching Assistants.	Action initiated - This point relates to training of Teaching Assistants. There are already plans in place to offer additional training sessions to Teaching Assistants, this will involve workshops focussed on small group teaching with the aim of sharing good practice and of engaging with innovative small-group teaching techniques. We will also work towards ensuring that as part of the peer observation scheme, both the observer and observed meet after the observation to reflect on the experience.	
12	Consider providing opportunities for more junior staff to peer-observe and learn from more experienced staff within the School.	Desirable	No action required.	Action in operation - This already happens. The allocation is shuffled each year and is spread uniformly across junior and more senior staff. The UG Team will consider involving Teaching Assistants as observers in the process.	
13	Ensure that the MRes programmes and potential exit routes align with QAA definitions, and Queen Mary regulations.	Essential	Liaise with ARCS regarding the implementation of our restructured MRes/PhD to ensure the programme aligns with QAA definitions and Queen Mary regulations.	Action initiated - The School are in the process of re-structuring our MRes provision, with a view to expanding the research training to two years, ensuring students are exposed to adequate core training before beginning the PhD programme. As the proposed model is not currently offered at QMUL, it will be considered by EQSB in October 2019. In producing the proposal, the School carefully considered the two-year MRes models employed by highly successful Economics departments at Warwick and LSE. If the provision is approved at EQSB, the Part 1 form will be submitted to SRAG at the next opportunity in late 2019.	
14	Further consideration of the institutional progression requirements for undergraduate programmes with extramural years, and that the School ensure these requirements are clear to both staff and students.	Essential	No action is required.	Action in operation - All SEF extramural programmes already align with the academic regulations, so no further action is needed.	
15	Give further consideration to the alignment of programme and module learning outcomes.	Essential	To discuss in relevant School Committees	Action initiated - This was explored and discussed as part of a recent assessment review, and it was noted that more work needs to be done in this area. This is one of the key tasks for our new Director of Education and further discussion will need to take place at our UG and PGT teaching committees.	
16	Develop an advisory group of alumni and industrial experts to aid in curriculum development.	Desirable	Ask existing Advisory board to comment on curriculum development	Action in operation - The School currently has an Advisory Board, which is a group of prominent alumni and other friends of the School who work to help identify strategic directions for the School, support and publicise its research, establish and reinforce links to the industry and policy making, and support the School's students, especially through internships, careers talks and lectures. In the future we will also ask them to advise on curriculum development as recommended.	
17	Consider the development of a Module Fair where students can obtain more information about the content and learning outcomes of modules, ahead of module selection.	Desirable	Run a module fair before the module preselection deadline in Semester B 2020	Action initiated - The Undergraduate Studies Committee agreed that we would run a module fair before the module preselection deadline in Semester B 2020. This would involve poster presentations with staff available for Q&A's.	

	SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE (Review Date: March 2019)				
	Recommendation	Priority	Planned action(s)	3 month update (EQSB October 2019)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2020)
18	Ensure that module titles are properly aligned with the content being delivered.	Essential	Determine which modules are affected by title misalignment.	Action initiated - The recommendation that module titles are more closely aligned with the content being delivered is problematic as specific modules were not identified through the review. TCD considered and suggested that 'Innovation of Technology' could be affected after recent redevelopment. TCD to consider change of title for Innovation of Technology. PG and UG Senior Tutors to source feedback from students to determine which other modules are affected. At PGT level, we will ensure that recorded module presentations and full syllabi for Semester B electives are available to students via QMplus. Students will continue to have the opportunity to attend the taster lectures in the first week of Semester B.	
19	In line with the Queen Mary Assessment Handbook 2018-19, the School further embed soft skill development (such as essay writing) in years 1 and 2 of the undergraduate programmes, in order to better prepare students for writing their dissertations.	Essential	Look at opportunities to further diversity the assessment methods used within the undergraduate programmes	Action initiated - We have already begun to make significant progress in diversifying the assessment methods and introducing more written assignments. Of particular note for the skill development of our students was the introduction of the non-credit bearing module ECN001 Studying Economics and Finance in 2014/15, which evolved into ECN115 Economics in Action from 2017/18. We have a number of examples of modules where students are developing their academic writing skills, working on their time management, their ability to develop a sound argument supported by relevant research, and their ability to present information clearly and concisely in written form to an appropriate audience. However, we are continuing to look at opportunities to further diversity the assessment methods used within the undergraduate programmes, and we are working with Kelly Peake (Academic Development) to ensure that through their assessments students on all programmes are developing and building upon these skills as they progress.	
20	Provide further careers support for PhD students, so that they can explore opportunities beyond the field of academia.	Advisable	Liaise with School Career Consultants regarding providing additional Careers support provision.	Action initiated - The School have begun to explore options for providing a more comprehensive careers support for our PhD students beyond academia, including discussions with the School's Career Consultants about additional provision for research students and discussing the point with students at the March 2019 SSLC meeting. The School have recently agreed a partnership with the Central Bank of Malta, which will facilitate PhD students to undertake research visits at the Bank during their PhD, gaining valuable Central Bank experience, which would undoubtedly benefit any future career prospects in this area once the PhD is completed. Past PhD students have also undertaken placements at other Central Banks (England and Ireland) where this benefits their PhD research.	
21	Develop more networking opportunities to better integrate students across all groups and cohorts	Desirable	Continue to offer and develop these activities.	Action in operation - Action has already been taken within the School in order to involve students in more networking opportunities and we are currently developing initiatives, including the book club, careers activities, an Annual Guest Lecture Student Committee and a Spill the Tea Student Committee. Long running initiatives such as the Peer Assisted Support Scheme, Student Societies and Students Ambassadors, have provided networking opportunities. We have given more opportunity for PGT and UG students to interact through a School end of year party and alumni events and will continue to offer and develop these activities.	
22	Recommendation for the Faculty: The Panel commended the School's level of engagement with alumni; particularly the practice of using of these individuals as Teaching Fellows on non-credit bearing modules. The Panel recommended that this good practice should be considered within the Faculty and beyond, while noting that additional resource may be required to further develop this excellent initiative.	N/A			
23	Recommendation for the Faculty: The Panel commended the quality of the IT facilities provided by the School, and recommended that the Faculty should consider providing additional resources to the School, to enable them to expand these facilities further.	N/A			

	SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (Review Date: May 2019)				
	Recommendation	Priority	Planned action(s)	3 month update (Expected at EQSB:November 2019)	12 Month Update (Expected at EQSB: May 2020)
1	The Institution investigates virtual supervision by distance learning for PGR students in order to support students more efficiently during fieldwork and to open a new market for PGR students.	Essential			
2	The School utilises and improves awareness of the Staff Student Liaison Committee (SSLC), and its student representation infrastructure. The Panel recommended that the School liaises with the QMSU VP (Education) to effect this	Essential			
3	The School allocates additional time for staff to share good practice around teaching and learning	Advisable			
4	The School reviews module outcomes to ensure alignment with (a) the programme learning outcomes and (b) the appropriate academic level	Essential			
5	The Institution reviews how it supports the infrastructure needed for Schools to grow their provision.	Essential			
6	The School aligns itself with the Institutional data source.	Essential			
7	The Institution investigates holding its recruitment events for offer holders earlier in the academic year	Advisable			
8	The School widens its recruitment activities to include UG from other Schools across Queen Mary to SPIR PG programmes.	Advisable			
9	The School devotes additional resources to help with supporting and monitoring students	Advisable			
10	The School extends its induction activities beyond the first week and holds re-induction events to remind and refresh students with respect to information contained in the student handbook	Desirable			
11	The School reviews it exam and essay support practices for students. The Panel recommended that the School reviews how it uses formative assessment and activity to develop students' writing	Advisable			
12	The School reviews their use of QMPlus and fully standardises its organisation and presentation	Desirable			
13	The School develops its professional networks for PG students	Desirable			