



Senate

Paper Title	Education Quality & Standards Board, 16 May 2018: Executive Summary
Outcome requested	The Senate is asked to note the summary report.
Points for Senate members to note and further information	A high-level summary of the discussions and decisions of the Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB) meeting held on 16 May 2018. For fuller details on any of the points mentioned, including full papers and minutes, members are directed to the EQSB QMplus page: https://qmplus.qmul.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=6851
Questions for Senate to consider	Is the Senate satisfied with the decisions and workings of the EQSB?
Regulatory/statutory reference points	
Strategy and risk	
Reporting/consideration route for the paper	Senate only.
Author	Simon Hayter, Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance)
Sponsor	Professor Rebecca Lingwood, Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching and Learning)

Education Quality and Standards Board
Executive summary of the meeting held on 16 May 2018

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

1. The Board **noted** an update from the Vice-Principal (SETL) (subsequently circulated in large part as an all-staff email, and also included as part of the Senate agenda). Topics covered included: TEF, The QMUL Model, Student Survey Season, Partnerships with KTH Royal Institute of Technology and Commonwealth 100, an award of £50k from Santander to scale up inQUBEate, Degree apprenticeship and Queen Mary Digital programmes, QMSU Education Awards and elections, the Access and Participation Plan, 2019/2, and consultations on late work penalties and semester-based examinations.
2. The Board **reviewed** the SETLA Risk Register and change log, noting that there had been no recent changes to the risk levels. The recommendations from the recent KPMG review of Queen Mary's risk management processes would result in greater changes to the format and levels of risk for the next meeting.
3. The Board **considered** the report of the Ghost Writing Working Group, which had been led by Academic Development. The report made a number of recommendations for the avoidance, identification, and consequences of contract cheating. These fell into four categories: supporting students in developing positive academic habits; raising awareness of ghost writing; supporting and developing staff in identifying and dealing with assessment offences; and, deterring students from cheating through review of the curriculum to create more 'authentic' assessment opportunities. The Board agreed to reconstitute the Group in 2018/19 to work on those actions.
4. The Board **endorsed** a series of proposed changes for 2018/19 to the Academic Regulations, the Academic Regulations for Research Programmes, and the Assessment Handbook. These documents form part of the June 2018 Senate agenda. The Board recommended that the Senate should approve the amendments.
5. The Board **noted** brief verbal updates on the outcomes of the consultations on late work penalties and semester-based examinations. Early analysis indicated that option two (a slightly amended version of the current scheme) was favoured for late work penalties, and that a majority of respondents supported semester-based examinations (with a majority of those in support favouring a model with six weeks of exams split between January and May/June). The consultations had closed very shortly before the meeting, and fuller information would be presented to the June 2018 meeting of the Senate.
6. The Board **endorsed** plans to review the Annual Programme Review process. In future the process would be more desk-based, with standardised data sets drawn from an online dashboard at any point in the year. This would allow for better identification of issues and trends, and for isolation of individual groups within the datasets (e.g. looking at the results of students with particular protected characteristics, to determine whether Queen Mary was providing appropriate support). The Board was supportive of the increased flexibility and efficacy that the new system would bring.

7. The Board **approved** a new question for inclusion in all module evaluation questionnaires to assess whether developmental learning outcomes had been delivered successfully, and whether they had been helpful for students. The question related principally to QMUL Model modules, but was deemed relevant for all modules.
8. The Board **approved** credit and mark conversions for students studying overseas with Global Opportunities at the University of Iceland and at Waseda University. The Board **approved** revised mark conversions for SLLF students studying overseas as part of modern language degrees in Belgium, Spain, France and Germany.
9. The Board **approved** a change to the reassessment arrangements for CHE101 Foundations of Practical Chemistry that would result in failure for non-engagement, and require students who failed because of non-engagement to retake the module in attendance rather than only resitting the assessments. This related to an requirement from the Royal Society of Chemistry, stipulating that students needed to engage in a minimum number of laboratory hours to be eligible for accreditation
10. The Board **noted** the 2016/17 summary of issues raised in external examiner reports. There were no issues of institutional risk, but the following issues were identified as problematic:
 - a. Inadequate marking trails. This had been raised as a concern at a previous EQSB meeting, and the Deans for Taught Programmes had reinforced the issue with schools and institutes.
 - b. Ineffective scrutiny committees, resulting in externals having to act as proof-readers when approving examination papers.
 - c. Unsatisfactory response rates from exam boards to external examiner reports.
11. The Board noted a summary of the Annual Programme Review meetings held for H&SS schools in 2017/18. Common themes had included turnaround times for marking and feedback, embedding employability skills within the curriculum, response rates for PGT evaluations, and means to address unconscious bias.
12. The Board **approved** the following reports and updates from recent periodic reviews:
 - a. WHRI report.
 - b. BCI three-month update.
 - c. IHSE 12-month update.
 - d. EECS 12-month update.
13. The Board **noted** updates on the activities of Academic Development, Library Services, and Queen Mary Students' Union.
14. The Board **endorsed** a number of recommendations made by Library Services in response to an audit by the Copyright Licensing Authority. Queen Mary had received a satisfactory outcome in the audit. Library Services would introduce a central copy-on-demand service based in the Copy Shop, develop a QMplus training module on copyright compliance, and promote more widespread use of the TALIS Aspire online learning resources software.