1. Welcome and apologies

Part 1: Preliminary Items

Presented by Colin Bailey
Senate Meeting to be held at 15.00 hours on Thursday 19 October 2023 in Colette Bowe Room, Queens’ Building, Mile End Campus.

AGENDA

Part 1: Preliminary Items

1. Welcome and apologies
   N/A
   Prof. C Bailey

2. Minutes of the last meeting
   SE2023.01
   Prof. C Bailey

3. Chair’s actions
   SE2023.02
   Prof. C Bailey

4. Senate terms of reference and membership 2023-2024
   SE2023.03
   Prof. C Bailey

5. President and Principal’s report
   SE2023.04
   Prof. C Bailey

6. Vice-Principals’ reports
   SE2023.05
   Vice-Principals

7. Students’ Union President’s report
   SE2023.06
   President, Students’ Union

Part 2: Matters for Discussion

8. Freedom of Speech
   - Code of Practice on Free Speech
     SE2023.07
     J Pallant
   - Promoting Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech
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<table>
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<th></th>
<th></th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Taught Programmes Board*</td>
<td>SE2023.20</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board*</td>
<td>SE2023.21</td>
<td>Prof. A Livingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ethics of Research Committee*</td>
<td>SE2023.22</td>
<td>Prof. A Livingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Partnerships Board*</td>
<td>SE2023.23</td>
<td>Dr P Lloyd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 4: Other Matters</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Led by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Dates of future meetings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Prof. C Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 14 December 2023, 15:00-17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 14 March 2024, 15:00-17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Any other business</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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* will be taken without discussion unless a request is sent to the Chair or Secretary, at least two days before the meeting, to open the item for debate.

Jane Pallant  
Director of Governance and Legal Services  
October 2023
2. Minutes of the last meeting

Part 1: Preliminary Items
Presented by Colin Bailey
## Senate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paper Title</strong></th>
<th>Minutes of the last meeting of Senate held on 08 June 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>approve</strong> the minutes of the last meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points for Senate members to note and further information</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions for Senate to consider</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory/statutory reference points</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and risk</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</strong></td>
<td>Senate to approve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors</strong></td>
<td>Jane Pallant, Director of Governance and Legal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate

Minutes of 08 June 2023

Present:
Prof Colin Bailey (Chair)  Prof Amrita Ahluwalia  Prof Adrian Bevan
Prof Frances Bowen  Dr Lucy Carter  Prof Mark Caulfield
Prof Mary Collins  Dr Dianne Cooper  Dr Giulia De Falco
Dr Jayne Dennis  Dr Pedro Elston  Elizabeth Gillow
Prof Jonathan Griffiths  Prof Steffi Krause  Prof Andrew Livingston
Dr Philippa Lloyd  Prof Stephanie Marshall  Prof John Marshall
Prof Anthony Michael  Prof Wayne Morrison  Dr Ali Nankali
Prof Mike Noon  Prof Richard Pickersgill  Dr Simon Rawlinson
Charlie Sellar  Dr James Strong  Prof Jason Sturgess
Prof Elizabeth Tanner  Prof Wen Wang  Dr Yannick Wurm

In attendance:
Mary Childs  Haylee Fuller  Dr Kristian Hibberd
Prof Stefan Krummaker  Prof David Lee  Dr Maggie Leggett
Jonathan Morgan  Jane Pallant  Christopher Sleeman
Kaya Wiles (Secretary)

Apologies:
Prof Adrian Armstrong  Dr Erik Blair  Prof Rob Briner
Dr Giorgio Chianello  Prof Alex Clark  Prof Paul Coulthard
Dr Joseph Cronin  Prof Kavita Datta  Dr Debbie De Girolamo
Prof Panos Deloukas  Dr Paula Fonseca  Dr Abimbola Giwa
Prof Neve Gordon  Prof Richard Grose  Prof Henri Huijbers
Muneer Hussain  Prof Martin Knight  Prof Ioannis Kokkoris
Dr Theo Krouzis  Prof Nicholas Lemoine  Dr Michaela MacDonald
Prof Arunthathi Mahendran  Prof Seán McConville  Prof Scott McCracken
Dr Émilie Oléron Evans  Dr Michael Page  Dr Anthony Phillips
Prof Thomas Prellberg  Dr Amitha Ranauta  Prof Kathryn Richardson
Adi Sawalha  Prof Hazel Screen  Dr Prakash Shah
Saynab Sharif  Prof Daniel Todman  Prof Steve Uhlig
Prof Fiona Walter  Prof Anthony Warrens  Dr David Williams

Part 1: Preliminary items

Welcome and apologies

2022.118  The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and noted the apologies received.

Minutes of the last meeting on 16 March 2023 (SE2022.48)

2022.119  Senate confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2023.

Chair’s actions (SE2022.49)
Senate noted the approval of Dr Michael Page's appointment as a Senate-appointed Fitness to Practise Committee member by Chair's action.

President and Principal's report (SE2022.50)

Senate received the President and Principal's report. The following points were noted:

(i) The overall recruitment position was positive. There had been an increase in taught programmes applications of 8%, year on year. Overseas applications to taught programmes had increased by 16%, year on year. There had been a 16% increase in applications to postgraduate taught programmes.

(ii) Gilliam Keegan MP, Secretary of State for Education, had visited the University as part of the Education World Forum. The Education Secretary had been joined by Sir Steve Smith, the Prime Minister's International Education Champion, alongside education representatives from other countries.

(iii) The University had seven finalists in the National ‘targetjobs’ Undergraduate of the Year Awards. Queen Mary students had also won the Excellence Through Adversity Award and the First-Generation Award. Congratulations were expressed to all students.

Vice Principal's reports (SE2022.51a-f)

Senate received a report from the Vice-Principal (Health) (SE2022.51a). The following points were noted:

(i) The Faculty had generated £4.5m more funding than budgeted. This had been the result of higher research overheads, Office for Students (OfS) teaching income and other income.

(ii) Postgraduate taught student recruitment had progressed well with increases noted in year-on-year numbers across all provision.

(iii) A launch event had been held for the Faculty’s Lynton House floor space in Ilford, showcasing the new clinical teach skills hub to guests.

Senate received a report from the Vice-Principal (Humanities and Social Sciences) (SE2022.51b). The following points were noted:

(i) The Faculty was recruiting to three roles; Deputy Vice-Principal, Dean for Research and Deputy Dean for Research Impact.

(ii) Appointments had been made to two Head of School positions in the School of History and the School of Politics and International Relations.

Senate received a report from the Vice-Principal (Science and Engineering) (SE2022.51c). The following points were noted:
Recruitment numbers indicated that the Faculty’s academic quality and Research Excellence Framework (REF) results had been well received.

The Faculty would commence its third and final round of strategic hires shortly.

Senate received a report from the Vice-Principal (Education) (SE2022.51d). The following points were noted:

(i) A series of National Student Survey (NSS) workshops had taken place between April and June 2023. Heads of School, Institute Directors and Directors of Education had been invited to attend, along with Faculty Education teams, and staff from relevant Professional Services directorates.

(ii) The University achieved a response rate of 70.3% in the 2023 NSS. The results release date had not yet been published.

(iii) The OfS had published its guidance on the development of Access and Participation Plans (APPs). For most institutions, including Queen Mary, new APPs would need to be prepared and submitted for approval in 2024.

Senate received a report from the Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships) (SE2022.51e). The following points were noted:

(i) Reinstatement works had begun to restore the areas of the London City Institute of Technology (LCIoT) that had been damaged by flooding. The works were expected to be completed by mid-August 2023.

(ii) The Apprenticeships Learning Management System had been successfully commissioned pending contract signature by both parties.

(iii) The Centre for Public Engagement (CPE) funded 11 successful projects from their recent Participatory Research Funding scheme call; four from The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry (FMD), three from the Faculty of Science and Engineering (S&E) and four from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS). These three-month projects each sought to include non-academic partners in the research process.

Senate received a report from the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) (SE2022.51f). The following points were noted:

(i) Thanks were expressed to all those who supported the inaugural Research and Innovation Awards, which took place in May 2023. The Research and Innovation Awards would be held again in 2024.

(ii) A SharePoint site had been created for the Research and Innovation Board with the aim of promoting transparency and to facilitate contributions to meeting discussions with researchers
across the University. The site could be used to access the upcoming calendar of meetings and papers from previous meetings.

Students’ Union President’s report (SE2022.52)

Senate received the Students’ Union President’s report. The following points were noted:

(i) The QMSU Spring Elections had concluded, and 73 students had been elected to represent their peers during 2023-24. 151 students had submitted nominations, up from 105 in 2022. 4060 students had voted in the elections, up from 2459 in 2022. A range of promotional approaches, included targeted emails and on-campus poster campaigns, had been attributed as contributing to the increase in voter numbers. The newly elected officers would start their term on 01 August 2023.

(ii) The Education Awards ceremony had been attended by just under 100 members of staff and students from all faculties. The event had been a success and provided a good opportunity to recognise the outstanding contributions made to the student experience this academic year. Thanks were expressed to the Vice-Principal (Education) for their involvement.

Part 2: Matters for Discussion

Presentation from the Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships) Presentation

Senate received a presentation from the Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships) on public affairs and civic engagement, and working with employers. The following points were noted:

(i) A project team, reporting to the Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships) had been established to develop the University’s approach to public affairs. The project was in its fourth and final stage; consulting with further external organisations to identify best practice and making proposals to the Reputation Steering Group and Senior Executive Team (SET).

(ii) The Civic University Agreement (CUA) was launched in 2022. A mapping exercise had been undertaken to consider how impact and reach of Queen Mary could be enhanced, and the workstreams established.

(iii) The following was one example of work under the agreement. The Apprenticeship Levy was a monthly 0.5% tax that employers paid. If the levy was not used within 24 months, it would be reclaimed by the government. However, up to 25% of the levy funds of each paying organisation could be transferred to other small businesses. This would therefore be part of the University’s commitment to local communities and in its role as an anchor institution. SET approved the commitment of 10% of the funding to the levy transfer. This would be reviewed annually. The University would use criteria in line with Queen Mary’s values and
that encouraged applications from East London residents. The recipients would be able to use the money to support apprenticeships in any way they chose, including with Queen Mary.

(iv) The BSc Accountancy Flying Start programme, in partnership with PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), had shown a promising start, with a significant increase in applications for 2023-24; 368 applications up from 143 in 2022-23. There was a strong sense of community within the programme and a celebration had been held to mark the Year 1 achievements.

(v) The University ran six apprenticeship programmes, across four Schools, ranging from level 4 to level 7. Apprentice numbers had increased year-on-year since 2017-18. The level 7 Government Economic Service (GES) Senior Professional Economist programme had been particularly successful, accounting for 52% of apprentice numbers. The level 6 Digital and Technology Solutions programme, which taught 124 apprentices across multiple employers, had an average graduate salary of £75,000, 15 months after graduation.

(vi) The LCIoT had opened in September 2022. The high-quality educational and training facility had a focus on transport, technology, digital and engineering. The partnership between further and higher education was starting to allow the pursuit of non-traditional pathways in technical further and higher education.

(vii) Similar to those taking the University's traditional programmes, students taking a University degree apprenticeship programmes were very diverse and from a range of different backgrounds, with excellent job outcomes, having effectively had work experience over 4 years in the undergraduate course. These programmes were therefore providing an excellent route for successful social mobility.

(viii) A key project objective relating to degree apprenticeships was to implement an apprenticeship management system. The system would help the University to comply with Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and Ofsted requirements, manage the quality assurance of the apprenticeships and reduce the administrative burden.

(ix) The Degree Apprenticeships provision had also been assessed by Ofsted during a monitoring visit in February 2023. Ofsted found that reasonable progress had been made. The University would be looking to further develop its curriculum design and implementation. A full five-day inspection was due to take place within the next 18 months.
Senate received a presentation from the Director of External Relations, Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships), Vice-Principal (Health), Vice-Principal (Science and Engineering) and Head of the School of Economics and Finance on building academic reputation. The following points were noted:

(i) The University had a strategic objective to be ranked within the top 75 institutions in the Times Higher Education (THE) Academic Reputation Survey by 2030. The University also had ambitions to reach the Top 100 for global university in the THE or QS University Rankings. Achieving these positions in the rankings would significantly help Queen Mary’s visibility. This achievement would in turn contribute to the achievement of strategic objectives in other areas.

(ii) Two of the main components of the THE World University Rankings and the QS University Rankings were reputation and research. The THE World University Rankings used the Elsevier database to contact academics. QS maintained their own databases.

(iii) The number of research votes for the THE Academic Reputation Survey in 2022 had increased significantly from the previous year, but other universities had increased by more, so our rank went down to 194. If one vote had been achieved for each Queen Mary academic who had submitted to the Research Excellence Framework 2021 (REF21), the University would have been ranked within the Top 35.

(iv) World 100 Network research (2017) on behaviours of academic staff in relation to reputation surveys found that scepticism towards rankings meant a low response rate. Academics were also unlikely to change their top 5 choices each year. Personal connections were the single most significant influencing factor. Other contributing factors included research having been presented in key journals, partnerships and collaborations, attending events at the University, Nobel Prizes and research centres and areas of specialism.

(v) There were five key strands to the Queen Mary Reputation Strategy; improved governance, an agreed evaluation framework across target audiences, the delivery of a multi-year brand awareness campaign, improved research communications and improved internal capacity.

(vi) Directors of Reputation in FMD were working with colleagues in the Directorate of External Relations to improve the position for Life Sciences and Medicine, Medicine, and Dentistry. Considerations have been given to sending target newsletters and working with alumni where possible.

(vii) S&E had achieved strong REF21 results but work needed to be done to translate that into perceived quality. The longer-term strategy would be to build reputation by developing relationships. In the medium term, events such as the Night of Science and
Engineering allowed the Faculty to showcase their high-quality activities and deliver a public inaugural lecture. Two honorary awards were presented at the event and both recipients conveyed their passion for Queen Mary during their speeches. The Faculty was committed to delivering a second Night of Engineering event in 2024.

(viii) The School of Economics and Finance (SEF) was taking a bottom-up approach to building reputation and had achieved a top 100 position. Collaboration, hiring and retention, culture and resource were key factors. PhD students were also key, as was promoting the institution’s reputation alongside individual reputation. The School spoke of building the reputation from the individual, to School and then University level. There was also scope for newsletters tailored to academics, members of the community, alumni, and partners.

**Freedom of speech update**

(SE2022.53)

2022.131 Senate received an update on freedom of speech.

2022.132 Senate noted that the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill had received royal assent to form the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023. The legislation required all higher education institutions to have a Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech.

2022.133 Members noted that a task and finish group had been established in January 2022, at Senate’s request, to review Queen Mary’s Freedom of Speech Policy. The group had a particular focus on raising awareness and training to promote freedom of speech. The task and finish group had generated helpful discussion and it was agreed that the existing code would be rewritten to align as closely as possible to the legalisation and follow the structure that it had set out. The draft code would be shared with Senate in October 2023, before being presented to Council for approval.

2022.134 Senate noted that further consideration would need to be given to raising awareness and providing training on freedom of speech. The sector was beginning to respond to the new legislation and so more options for training and monitoring would become available in due course.

**Programme approval and review**

Oral report

2022.135 Senate received an update on programme approval and programme review.

2022.136 Senate noted that members with an interest in programme approval and review were invited to contribute to this work.

2022.137 Senate noted that colleagues had been reflecting on the approach to programme review. Considerations included whether there was value in the current programme approval process or if assurances could be gained through other existing processes and the discussions that take place during those to better embed the process in business-as-usual operations. It was hoped that the new process would be piloted during the next academic year.
Senate noted that there were known challenges around programme approval timeframes. These were being looked at alongside the programme review. Consideration would be given to resource requirements, how decisions were made and ways to enhance efficiency.

**Student casework policies**

(SE2022.54)

Senate considered the Academic Misconduct Policy.

Senate noted that a key revision to the Academic Misconduct Policy followed previous discussion at Senate around the threshold for referring a case to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office (ACCO). The amendment allowed Schools and Institutes to consider the seriousness of the misconduct, the level of study, and assessment weighting in the context of programme specifications. Previously, the decision regarding the threshold was made by considering assessment weighting alone. The amendment would create further consistency across Schools and Institutes.

Senate noted the penalties available to Schools and Institutes. These penalties had not been changed for the 2023-24 academic year. Members noted that there was not currently an option for a School or Institute to give the penalty of an uncapped resit.

Senate noted that the list of actions that constitute academic misconduct had also been amended to address the increasing availability of technology, such as generative artificial intelligence, that could undermine the integrity of an assessment. The list was not exhaustive.

Senate noted that declarations agreed to by students in advance of assessment submission might not include references to artificial intelligence. These would be reviewed at Faculty level.

Senate noted that the appeal stage had been incorporated directly into the Academic Misconduct Policy to better align with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) Good Practice Framework.

Senate noted that Appendix 5 had been added to provide the harmonised penalties applicable to Transnational Education (TNE) Programmes China Programmes. This had been previously included in the Academic Regulations.

Senate noted the potential benefits of a broader approach to academic misconduct which would have more of an emphasis on academic integrity.

Senate agreed that the penalties available to Schools and Institutes would be considered following the meeting. The policy would then be approved by Chair’s Action.

Senate agreed to discuss academic integrity further at the meeting of Senate in October 2023.

Senate approved the Academic Misconduct Policy, subject to the further consideration of the penalties available to Schools and Institutes.

Senate considered the Appeal Policy.
Senate noted that there were two minor amendments to the policy. References to Academic Misconduct and Student Discipline had been removed, in line with respective amendments to those policies. The timeframe students had to submit an appeal had also been amended. Previously, students were required to submit an appeal in 14 days, with the option to submit evidence up to seven days later. The revision policy allowed students to submit an appeal, with all evidence, within 21 days. It was noted that students also had the opportunity further in the process to provide comment on their case summary.

Senate approved the Appeal Policy.

Senate considered the Code of Student Discipline.

Senate noted the three amendments to the code. References to the “Academic Registrar” had been updated to read “Head of the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office”. Paragraph 57 had been amended to provide clarification on the scope and purpose of the informal action available to the Head of the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office. The appeal procedure had been incorporated into the Code of Student Discipline to better align with the OIA Good Practice Framework.

Senate approved the Code of Student Discipline.

Senate considered the Student Complaints Policy.

Senate noted the two amendments to the Student Complaints Policy. Reference to the post of Academic Registrar had been removed. The Formal Complaint Outcome and Review Stages had also been amended. Under the revised policy, the Formal Complaint outcome would outline the evidence relied upon and the reasons for a decision, rather than these being provided after submission of a Request for Review. Correspondingly, the opportunity for students to submit comments had moved from Paragraph 33 to 31.

Senate approved the Student Complaints Policy.

Academic Regulations 2023-24

Senate considered the Academic Regulations for 2023-24.

Senate noted the proposal to increase the minimum weighted mark required to progress onto a compulsory year abroad or to take an optional semester abroad from 60.0 to 65.0. The Global Opportunities team had led a consultation on the issue, before it was then considered by the Education, Quality and Standards Board (EQSB). Senate agreed that it would be useful to consider the impact of the amendment and further details on the consultation before accepting the change. The minimum mark would therefore remain at 60.0. It was noted that this was a minimum mark and so Schools and Institutes could use their discretion to operate to a higher mark.

Senate noted that the special regulations for programmes accredited by the Engineering Council (EngC) had previously been amended to include an outline of the circumstances where a student may receive a ‘compensated pass’. The amendment had been approved by Chair’s action in October 2022.
to ensure compliance with requirements made by EngC. Members discussed the use of ‘condoned failure’ in paragraph 6.45 of the Regulations, relating to EngC-accredited MSc masters awards, and noted that this may be queried by the accrediting body. To ensure compliance, it was suggested that ‘condoned failure’ be replaced with ‘compensated pass’. The issue would be considered further following the meeting, with any amendments to be approved by Chair’s action.

Senate noted that some Schools had seen an increase in the number of students self-certifying extenuating circumstances. The increase in extenuating circumstances had an impact on the student experience, including by causing delays to feedback. There were also concerns around academic integrity and the strategic use of extenuating circumstances. The Assessment Sub-Board of EQSB had established a work stream to consider extenuating circumstances.

Senate approved the Academic Regulations 2023-24, subject to the further consideration of the minimum weighted mark for compulsory years abroad and optional semesters abroad, and the use of the terminology ‘condoned failure’ in paragraph 6.45.

Academic Regulations and Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Programmes 2023-24

Senate considered the Academic Regulations and Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Programmes 2023-24.

Senate noted that the Research Degrees Programmes and Examination Board (RDPEB) had reviewed the guidance on research activity during a period of interruption by a student. The current provision noted that students could continue to work on their research during the period of interruption. RDPEB noted that this could imply an expectation for students to continue their research and impact their wellbeing. This was clarified in the Code of Practice to state that contact between a student and supervisor during a period of interruption should be pre-arranged, with no expectation for the student to undertake work. It was noted that some students would benefit from some engagement with their supervisors, depending on their individual circumstances.

Assessment Handbook 2023-24

Senate considered the Assessment Handbook 2023-24.

Senate noted that a new clause had been added to directly reference the design of online and computer-based examinations.

Senate noted that turnaround times for providing provisional marks to students had been added to the handbook. It was stated that feedback would normally be provided within 15 days for all types of assessment.

Senate noted that the Disability and Dyslexia Service (DDS) had provided updated wording around assessment arrangements for students with late-diagnosed specific learning disabilities to clarify the responsibilities of the student and the University.

**Admissions Policy 2024-25**

2022.171  Senate considered the Admissions Policy 2024-25.

2022.172  Senate noted that there had been minor amendments to the Admissions Policy for 2024-25. A footnote had been added to state that the University reserved the right not to accept bachelor's degrees obtained through a combination of study at different institutions, such as top-up programmes.

2022.173  Senate approved the Admissions Policy 2024-25.

### Part 3: Matters for Report

**Council report**

2022.174  Senate noted the minutes of the Council meeting held on 18 May 2023.

2022.175  Senate noted that the confirmed minutes of the Council meeting held on 23 March 2023 had been published on the Council webpage.

**Taught Programmes Board**

2022.176  Senate noted proposals relating to programme and module academic developments that have taken place between 23 February 2023 and 02 May 2023.

**Education Quality and Standards Board**

2022.177  Senate noted the executive summary of business considered by the Education Quality and Standards Board at the meeting on 29 March 2023.

**Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board**

2022.178  Senate noted the executive summary of business considered by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB) from March 2023 to May 2023.

**Ethics of Research Committee**

2022.179  Senate noted the executive summary of business of the Ethics of Research Committee meeting held on 30 March 2023 and actions taken since.

2022.180  Senate noted that the business of the meeting included consideration of a high-risk application.

**Partnerships Board**

2022.181  Senate noted the executive summary of business considered by the Partnerships Board 04 February 2023 to 09 May 2023.

### Part 4: Other matters

**Dates of future meetings**
Senate noted the upcoming Senate meetings for 2022–23:
• Thursday 19th October 2023
• Thursday 14th December 2023
• Thursday 14th March 2024
• Thursday 13th June 2024
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# Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Chair’s actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> the detail of Chair’s actions taken since the last meeting of Senate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points for Senate members to note and further information</th>
<th>Four Chair’s actions were taken since the last Senate meeting held on 08 June 2023:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Amendments to the Academic Regulations 2023-24:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Phrasing of the award rules linked to EngC accreditation requirements replacing ‘condoned’ with ‘compensated pass’,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Reverting the progression threshold for programmes with compulsory years abroad to 60.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The addition of a penalty to the Academic Misconduct Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The appointment of Mr Michael Griffiths CBE DL as a Senate-appointed member of the Professional Capability Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The appointment of three new Complaints Assessors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full details of the Chair’s action are provided for members’ information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Senate to consider</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/statutory reference points</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and risk</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Jane Pallant, Director of Governance and Legal Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary
There were two changes, outlined below, considered by Chair’s action:

(1) phrasing of the award rules linked to EngC accreditation requirements replacing ‘condoned’ with ‘compensated pass’, and
(2) reverting the progression threshold for programmes with compulsory years abroad to 60.0.

Background

EngC award rules

1. Regulation 6.45 was amended to remove the word ‘condoned’ – it was described as a compensated pass that is awarded where a student fails a module, so this sits in a neutral middle-ground between “condoned failure” and “compensation” while still meeting the EngC requirements. The previous wording was not a change for 2023-24 and had been signed off mid-year in 2022-23 by SEMS and EECS before going to EQSB and Senate (and the EngC) – no issues were reported, but the use of ‘compensated pass’ would help to avoid the potential for a PSRB query.

6.45 A compensated pass may be granted in up to 15 credits of failed modules of an EngC accredited MSc masters award where all of the following conditions are met:
   i. the module mark for each failed module is 40.0 or higher; and,
   ii. the credit-weighted average mark across all modules, including the failed module(s), is 50.0 or higher; and,
   iii. a failed module is not designated as ‘core’ (must be passed outright) in the programme regulations.

Year abroad progression

2. The text on the previous rules on progression for students on programmes with a compulsory year abroad (i.e. a fixed hurdle of 60.0+, making this is a request to withdraw a proposed change rather than a new or amended proposal) has been reverted. There is some background to the original request to raise it to 65.0:

   a. Global Opportunities had received feedback both from QM’s international partners and from QM student support contacts that students were struggling while overseas, particularly those at the lower end of evidenced achievement. Some of the partner institutions had been critical on this front, eg the University of Michigan, which stated its desire for us “to be more selective on students’ academic backgrounds to ensure their success here.”. This is also evidenced in student attainment – eg, of seven students who went to Miami in 2021-22 only two passed (and the pass threshold is lower than it would be had the students spent the year at QM – students only need to pass three quarters of the modules they
take while overseas and only need to achieve a minimum pass mark equivalent to a UK 40.0 in those passed modules).

i. Global Opportunities had consulted and received positive feedback and agreement for the change from those schools who send students overseas, and made the proposal to EQSB on the basis of that review. It sounded from the Senate feedback as if perhaps the consultation had not extended widely 'within' the schools, though, which should be a learning point for future consultations. The paper that Global Opportunities presented to the EQSB is attached.

b. There was a substantial working group a few years ago that looked specifically at procedures for years abroad. It made a very clear final decision that the same rules needed to be applied across all schools, including the same progression threshold for years abroad. We had a situation previously where there was considerable divergence between schools, and this had led to difficulties in clearly communicating policies to students and some (perhaps understandable) accusations of unfairness, given places are limited and a better performing student in one school might find themselves without a place while a poorer performing student in a cognate department was able to go overseas. It’s a particular issue for students on joint honours programmes, who will see two different systems in use.

c. Year abroad places are heavily oversubscribed and we do not have enough partners/places to grant to all students who wish to take up those places. We therefore do need a selection mechanism and QM has been unequivocal in the past that the selection should be made on academic merit. There is a separate and outstanding question as to whether it is right for us to advertise and admit students onto programmes with a compulsory year abroad when we do not have enough spaces to accommodate those placements, and that may be a conversation we need to revive – the alternative would be to admit everyone onto the standard three year versions and to only allow those who meet the selection criteria to transfer across to the ‘with year abroad’ version.

d. After proposing the increase to 65.0, Global Opportunities did (shortly before Senate met) query whether now was the best time to implement the change after all – they had seen particular high failure rates in the course of 2022-23 (after making the original proposal to raise the threshold) and attributed that at least in part to cohorts affected by the pandemic during their A-levels. At the time it was agreed that it would be better to make the change and then suspend regulations if needed, as that at least gave us the option of having the higher threshold and we felt that the most severely affected cohorts would have passed through the system by the time the change came into effect (which would be for the 2025-26 academic year, when 2023-24 entrants reached their third year of study). Reverting to 60.0 would negate the need for that change and we could re-evaluate in a year or two, perhaps with more detailed benchmarking and consultation (though still noting the comments from the partner HEIs and the poor success rate of some students on overseas placements.
On the basis of the above the changed wording has been deleted so that the threshold returns to 60.0, if that is acceptable to the Senate. It is felt that additional discussions would be required if we were to look at making it variable by school, but of course if that is Senate’s preference we can look into this.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper title</th>
<th>Updates to Student Exchange Programme Terms and Conditions</th>
</tr>
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</table>
| Outcome requested | EQSB is asked to approve the changes proposed by the Global Opportunities team in consultation with Queen Mary schools:  
  - Allowing pass/fail modules for 25% of modules while abroad, effective for mobility periods taking place during 2023/24 and onwards  
  - Raising the minimum overall weighted average for exchange participation from 60% to 65% across developmental years prior to the exchange, effective from 2023/24 and applicable later entry to Queen Mary |
| Points to note and further information | These changes are being proposed to enable a higher percentage of students participating on the Student Exchange Programme to have successful academic outcomes and prevent reputational damage to Queen Mary among our demanding portfolio of exchange partners, ensuring our students thrive overseas and as the academically strongest representatives travelling on behalf of Queen Mary. |
| Questions to consider |  |
| Regulatory/statutory reference points | Terms and Conditions Student Exchange Programme [PDF 373KB] |
| Strategy and risk | Increase the calibre of Queen Mary's outgoing student cohort, offer participating students greater flexibility to attain greater student satisfaction, and prevent reputational damage through students performing poorly while participating in the exchange. Not supporting to approve these changes presents two risks: 1) Queen Mary may lose high-calibre and highly valued exchange partners in the coming years, and 2) Queen Mary students nominated to participate in exchanges at these partners abroad could be rejected by the partner post-offer. |
| Reporting/consideration route | Queen Mary schools have been consulted, see appendix 1 |
| Authors | Ceri Bevan, Head of Global Opportunities  
  Colleen Jaycox, Global Programmes Coordinator |
Introduction

The Global Opportunities team promote and manage exchange programmes made possible through bilateral exchange agreements. These are reciprocal arrangements typically renewed every five years with universities around the world, providing Queen Mary undergraduate students with the opportunity to study abroad for a semester or an academic year as part of their degree.

Terms and Conditions - Queen Mary Student Exchange Programme

Students participating in exchange programmes are made a Conditional Offer to participate in an exchange programme for a semester or a year, a student agrees to all general conditions as well as the full Terms and Conditions of Queen Mary’s Student Exchange Programme.

Conditional Offer

When a student accepts their Conditional Offer of exchange from Queen Mary, to meet the conditions of that offer and to be approved by Queen Mary as unconditionally eligible to complete the exchange as forecasted, there are certain academic requirements that the student must fulfil:

- Pass all modules from all developmental years prior to the period abroad
- Achieve a minimum weighted average mark of 60.0 across all developmental years combined (letter grade B.)

This is to ensure that students are academically equipped with the right level to excel during their period abroad and to have successful exchange outcomes.

Summary of Proposed Changes

Allowing pass/fail modules of a certain % to be allowed as pass/fail

To grant students greater academic freedom and access to opportunities at our exchange partners (such as internships, seminars and modules that do not deliver a letter/numerical grade), it is proposed that exchange students be permitted to take a maximum 25% percentage of their credit load with the exchange partner as pass/fail. This option would be beneficial to students by offering them greater flexibility with what they can study/learn while abroad, presenting them with an inclusive approach shown particularly for students whose learning styles may compel them to flourish in alternative environments beyond the traditional classroom setting, and helping to mitigate instances where availability of classes is restricted. Students must receive permission from their Queen Mary academic School/Department Coordinator before enrolling in a pass/fail module(s).

Raising the average from 60% to 65% across developmental years prior to the exchange, for 23/24 entry

It is essential for Queen Mary students to be well prepared academically for their exchange abroad. When permitted to study abroad on exchange via one of Queen Mary exchange spaces granted by our partners abroad, students are enrolling in academically rigorous environments where the course of study is often more challenging than what they are used to at Queen Mary. For example, increased time in class and a higher number of assessments required earlier in the academic calendar.
It is recommended that the minimum weighted average for participation on the Student Exchange Programme be increased from 60% to 65% across all developmental years prior to the exchange, effective from 2023/24 and applicable later entry to Queen Mary. This change will:

- Ensure only academically strong students participate in the exchange programme, decreasing the likelihood of students performing poorly, failing modules, and impacting their Queen Mary degree
- Increase the calibre of Queen Mary students as representatives of our university abroad
- Reduce the risk of reputational damage for Queen Mary through sending students who perform poorly, reducing the need for staff intervention and resources from the partner institution
- Increasing the threshold would be a sensible way to address the issue that participation in exchange programmes is increasing and as an institution Queen Mary may in future years not have enough spaces with exchange partners for all students wishing to go abroad. This is a significant risk to Queen Mary.

**Evidence supporting the proposed change:**

- **2021/22 exchange student participation to the University of Miami:** At this institution whose academic rigour is low-moderate when compared to Queen Mary, of the seven students who completed exchanges abroad there last year, only two students passed all modules. The five other students failed one to three modules.
- **2022/23 exchange student participation to the University of Michigan:** At this domestically top-ranked institution. The partner has communicated to Global Opportunities their desire “to be more selective on students' academic backgrounds to ensure their success here.”

These examples illustrate that some Queen Mary students with a 60.0 average do not have a background sufficiently strong to succeed at not only our most academically demanding partners yet also the low-moderately rigorous ones. Furthermore, these instances have raised concern that students meeting our current conditions to participate risk being rejected post-application by the host institution to which we nominate them, as our partners now intend to be more discerning when analysing student transcripts.

**Appendix 1**

**Summary of consultation with Queen Mary Schools**

13 Schools were consulted via an online survey circulated in September 2022. 11 Schools responded regarding the proposed changes:

- 10 out of 11 Schools support the proposal to permit students to study a percentage of their modules as pass/fail. 25% was the most common response as to the percentage
- 9 out of 11 Schools support the proposal to increase the weighted average from 60% to 65% across all developmental years prior to the exchange, effective from 2023/24 and applicable later entry to Queen Mary.
Senate Chair’s action: Academic Misconduct Policy

Summary
An additional penalty has been added to the Academic Misconduct Policy, as discussed during Senate, for Chairs Action.

James Strong, Senior Lecturer in British Politics and Foreign Policy and elected member of Senate, (who raised the point) has confirmed he is satisfied with this addition.

The text added to the penalty list is:

i. requirement that the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred be resubmitted. This will not count as an additional attempt at the module, and the resulting mark will not be capped.

Background
At the Senate meeting on 08 June 2023, members requested that an additional penalty be added to those available to Schools and Institutes when considering cases of academic misconduct.

The draft policy, including the new addition to paragraph 20 (page 5), is provided below.
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Academic Misconduct Policy

Scope

2. Academic misconduct is cheating (or attempted cheating) that occurs in relation to any assessment, which could include drafts submitted in preparation for the submission of any assessment. Such behaviour runs contrary to Queen Mary’s stated core values, with particular reference to its commitment to act with integrity and the highest ethical standards.

3. Allegations of any of the following will be dealt with under the Academic Misconduct Policy:
   i. breach of any section of the Academic Regulations relating to the conduct of assessment.
   ii. misconduct relating to an invigilated examination or in-class test:
      a. unauthorised access to an examination paper or venue before an examination.
      b. forgery of an examination timetable produced by Queen Mary.
      c. removal of a question paper, answer script, or other examination stationery from an examination venue.
      d. causing a disturbance during an examination, either physically, verbally, or through an electronic device.
      e. refusal to cooperate with an invigilator, or to follow an invigilator’s instructions.
      f. possession of unauthorised material while under examination conditions, or leaving unauthorised material in an examination venue (including cloakrooms and toilets).
      g. access, possession, or use of unauthorised material on a computer, mobile telephone, or other electronic device during an examination.
      h. communication with another candidate while under examination conditions.
      i. copying, or attempting to copy, the work of another candidate.
      j. having writing on the body in an examination venue.
   iii. plagiarism (including self-plagiarism).
   iv. fraudulent reporting of source material.
   v. fraudulent reporting of experimental results, research, or other investigative work.
   vi. collusion.
   vii. use, or attempted use, of a ghost-writing service or third-party for any part of assessment.
   viii. impersonation of another student in an examination or assessment, or the employment of an impersonator in an examination or assessment.
   ix. Unauthorised or unacknowledged text manipulation which undermines the integrity of an assessment (including the use of paraphrasing software, generative artificial intelligence or machine translation such that the work submitted cannot be considered wholly the student’s own).
   x. This list is non-exhaustive, and any other activity which undermines the integrity of an assessment and/or attempts to gain undue advantage in an assessment may also be considered academic misconduct.

4. The Academic Misconduct Policy applies to all students, irrespective of cohort. It is normal practice that penalties for second or subsequent instances of academic misconduct are escalated.

5. There is no statute of limitations on application of the Academic Misconduct Policy. The Policy may be applied retrospectively if a graduate is alleged to have committed academic misconduct while studying at Queen Mary. Under certain circumstances this may result in the revocation or reclassification of an award.

Terminology

6. In the Academic Misconduct Policy:
   i. ‘Head of School’ (HoS) refers to the relevant Head of School or Director of Institute.
ii. ‘Academic Misconduct Officer’ (AMO) refers to the person nominated by a Head of School or a Director of Institute to oversee issues of academic misconduct in their school or institute. The Academic Misconduct Officer or equivalent is responsible for all aspects of the academic misconduct process within a school or institute, which includes but is not limited to all aspects of school/institute level investigations and all school/institute level penalty decisions. The Academic Misconduct Officer is also responsible for deciding if allegations can be classified as technical offences, as well as the decision to refer allegations to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.

iii. ‘Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel’ refers also to Deputy Chairs of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

iv. ‘Technical offence’ refers to any allegation of misconduct where the HoS/AMO determines that the student attempted to acknowledge their sources fully and/or comply with the regulations for assessment but a minor oversight or error has given cause for concern. In other words, a technical offence is one where the HoS/AMO is satisfied that the threshold for a formal allegation of academic misconduct has not been met. The discretion to determine that an allegation should be treated as a technical offence rests entirely with the HoS/AMO, and can be applied to any allegation, irrespective of the weighting of the assessment and the student’s record.

7. Queen Mary defines ‘plagiarism’ as presenting someone else’s work as one’s own, irrespective of intention. Close paraphrasing; copying from the work of another person, including another student; using the ideas of another person without proper acknowledgement; and repeating work that you have previously submitted – at Queen Mary or at another institution – without properly referencing yourself (known as ‘self-plagiarism’) also constitute plagiarism.

8. Queen Mary defines ‘collusion’ as any illegitimate cooperation between students in the preparation or production of submitted work, irrespective of intention. Unless such joint work is explicitly permitted by the relevant assessment guidance, students are obliged to ensure that any work submitted for individual assessment is entirely their own. Legitimate academic cooperation between students, such as study groups, is not considered to be collusion.

Allegations of academic misconduct

9. Where a member of staff suspects that academic misconduct may have been committed they will report this to the HoS/AMO; this applies to any assessment other than invigilated examinations. In the case of invigilated examinations, reports are made directly to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office by the relevant examination staff.

10. If upon receiving a report of academic misconduct not involving a postgraduate research student the HoS/AMO is satisfied that a technical offence has occurred (as per paragraph 18) then appropriate action will be taken within the school or institute. A technical offence can be applied to any assessment, irrespective of the weighting or the student’s previous academic misconduct record.

11. If it has been decided that the allegation should not be treated as a technical offence, and if the element of assessment in which the academic misconduct is alleged to have occurred counts for 31 per cent or more of the module mark and/or the student has committed academic misconduct previously, the HoS/AMO will determine whether the case should be referred to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office, or resolved by the School or Institute. A case will normally be referred to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office when:

i. the student has a prior offence of academic misconduct on their record,

ii. the nature of the allegation suggests a deliberate act (for example, ghost writing, impersonation, fraudulent/falsified elements),

iii. the assessment makes a substantial contribution to the student’s progression and/or award (taking into account the level of study, assessment weighting and/or programme specifications).
iv. the appropriate penalty, in accordance with university guidance, exceeds the scope of the school or institute (as per paragraph 19).

- It is important to note that the preliminary investigation into the matter will take place with the school or institute, which will provide all of the evidence collected to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.

11. Any allegation of academic misconduct against a postgraduate research student must be referred to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.

12. The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office will review the veracity of any third-party reports it receives from other students or from outside Queen Mary that address matters of academic misconduct. The process that will be followed upon receipt of such reports of academic misconduct is set out in Appendix 3.

13. In all cases the investigating officer will notify the student of any allegation to be taken forward and provide copies of all evidence submitted in support of the allegation. The student will be invited to admit or deny the allegation, and to submit evidence and make representations in response to the allegation.

14. A student who fails to respond to this notification within seven calendar days of the allegation or to make alternative arrangements will be considered not to have denied the academic misconduct. Evidence and representations made beyond this point by the student will not be considered without good reason for the late submission.

15. The investigating officer will also gather other evidence as part of the investigation. This may include analysis of documentation, interviewing the student, and other relevant enquiries. A school may test on subject knowledge by an oral assessment; this will be conducted by two members of academic staff. The process to be followed in the conduct of oral examinations is set out in Appendix 4.

16. If the investigating officer finds that there is no case to answer, they will notify the student that the matter is closed. Where the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office is the investigating body it will also report this to the Chair of the relevant Subject Examination Board.

17. If the investigating officer finds that there is a case to answer then the next steps will vary depending on whether the case was investigated by the school/institute or by the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.

Investigations by a school or institute

18. If the HoS/AMO determines that the student attempted to acknowledge their sources fully and/or comply with the regulations for assessment but a minor oversight or error has given cause for concern this will be deemed a technical offence. The HoS/AMO may decide either that no further action will be taken or require submission of a corrected version of the assessment. A technical offence can be applied to any assessment, irrespective of both the weighting and the student’s record, i.e. a technical offence can be considered for second or subsequent allegations of academic misconduct.

19. If the HoS/AMO is satisfied that misconduct has been committed they will impose one of the following penalties, considering all evidence and any mitigating factors:

i. a formal reprimand.

ii. requirement that the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred be resubmitted. This will not count as an additional attempt at the module, and the resulting mark will not be capped.
failure (a mark of zero) in the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred, with a
resubmission of the element permitted with the same attempt at the module. This will not
count as an additional attempt, but the mark for the resubmitted element will be capped to the
minimum pass mark.

iii. failure with a mark of zero for the relevant element of assessment, with no right to
resubmit.

20.21 The HoS/AMO will notify the student of the outcome of the case.

21.22 Investigations by the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office

21.22 If the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office finds evidence of potential academic misconduct, it
will notify the student to that effect.

22.23 If a student admits or does not deny an allegation of academic misconduct, the case will be
considered by a Chair alone rather than the full Panel. Furthermore, such cases may also be considered
by any of the Acting Chairs appointed by the Principal for the 2022 calendar year only. If a student
denies the allegation, their case may be considered by a Chair alone, but not an Acting Chair, by
agreement with the student. Any Chair may choose to refer a case to a full Panel at any time.

23.24 Any allegation of academic misconduct made against a postgraduate research student will be
referred to a full Panel, irrespective of the student’s response to the allegation. In cases where the
subject matter requires expert opinion, the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office may consult
outside bodies or persons where appropriate.

24.25 Academic Misconduct Panel

The Academic Misconduct Panel is responsible for determining whether academic misconduct has
been committed, and for determining penalties. The Panel comprises:

i. a Chair, or Deputy Chair,
ii. a member of academic staff from a department cognate to that of the student (normally from
   the same Faculty).
iii. a further member of academic staff, not necessarily from a cognate department.
iv. a student member, normally the President of the Queen Mary Students’ Union (or nominee).

25.26 The Chair and Deputy Chair(s) will be appointed by the Senate to hold office for terms of three
years. If, for any reason, the Chair or Deputy Chair is unable to act, the Principal will appoint an Acting
Chair. For the 2022 calendar year only, the Principal has approved the consideration of Acting Chairs to
support the timely consideration of cases.

26.27 The other academic members of the Panel will be drawn from the membership of the Senate and
from other academic staff appointed as members of the Panel by the Senate for terms of three years.

27.28 The quorum for a meeting of the Panel is 75 per cent (three members).

28.29 The Academic Misconduct Panel (or Chair, where acting alone) will consider the allegation and the
evidence, determine – on balance of probabilities – whether misconduct has occurred, and determine
an outcome. The full procedures for a Panel meeting are outlined in Appendix 2.

1 In some circumstances this may result in failure of the module as a whole, with no right of resit. The
HoS/AMO will consider whether this is a proportionate penalty, where that is the case.
29.30. The student may be assisted or represented by any one person. Both the student and the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office may submit written evidence and call witnesses. If the Panel determines that academic misconduct has been committed, the student has the right to address the Panel in mitigation.

30.31. The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office will nominate a member of staff as Secretary to the Panel. The Secretary is responsible for advising the Panel on the regulations.

31.32. If a student has been given at least five working days’ notice of a meeting of the Panel and fails to attend without providing a reasonable explanation in advance, the hearing will proceed as planned in the student’s absence. If the student cannot attend for good reason the Panel will be rearranged.

32.33. If a Panel is divided on a decision to be taken, the Chair will have a second and casting vote to determine the outcome.

Penalties

33.34. If it is determined that academic misconduct has been committed, the Chair or the Panel will impose one or more of the following penalties:

i. a formal reprimand.
ii. capping to the minimum pass mark for the assessment in which misconduct occurred.
   This will not count as an additional attempt at the module, and the resulting mark will not be capped.
iii. failure (a mark of zero) in the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred, with a resubmission of the element permitted with the same attempt at the module. This will not count as an additional attempt, but the mark for the resubmitted element will be capped to the minimum pass mark.
iv. capping to the minimum pass mark for the module in which misconduct occurred.

The following penalties can only be applied after a full meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel:

vi. For postgraduate research students only: a requirement that the student rectify any material that is deemed to have breached the Academic Misconduct Policy within a specified timeframe, which is to be determined in consultation with the student’s supervisor/s and the relevant Faculty Deputy Dean for Research.

vii. a recommendation to the Principal that the student be suspended from the programme for a period of up to one academic year; where it is deemed appropriate, the Chair of the Panel may also recommend that the student receive marks of zero in all modules taken during the academic year in which the misconduct occurred.

viii. a recommendation to the Principal that the student be expelled from Queen Mary; where it is deemed appropriate, the Chair of the Panel may also recommend that the student receive marks of zero in all modules taken during the academic year in which the misconduct occurred.

34.35. For the purposes of the Academic Misconduct Policy, each Section of each Part of the MBBS programme and of Parts 3-5 of the BDS programme will count as a module.

35.36. Where a penalty involves failure in a module but a resit or retake is permitted the reattempt will be at the next normally available opportunity.
Where a penalty involves the reworking or resubmission of an element of assessment, this will take place within the current academic year. If the student does not resubmit then a mark of zero will be given for the element of assessment.

Where a penalty involves failure in one or more modules and resits are permitted, a school/institute may choose to retain any coursework marks achieved in the academic year of the academic misconduct, except in elements where misconduct occurred. Schools/institutes may require a student to resubmit some or all coursework if this is deemed academically appropriate; this may also depend on whether the reassessment is formative rather than summative, or synoptic rather than standard.

Appeal process

A student may appeal a decision arising from the Academic Misconduct Policy using the process set out in the Queen Mary Appeal Policy. This includes the right to appeal any penalty imposed. The appeal will be considered by an Appeal Chair.

An Academic Misconduct Appeal must be submitted on the proper form and must include explicit reasons for the appeal. The appeal must be received by the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office within 14 calendar days of the date of the Academic Misconduct outcome letter. The Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office has discretion to allow and consider later requests where a student demonstrates good reason for the delay.

New evidence or issues will not be considered unless the student can demonstrate good reason why that information was not previously made available.

The appeal process will involve a review of the existing casefile by the Appeal Chair to determine whether:

i. the procedures were followed appropriately, and/or,

ii. the outcome was reasonable in light of the available evidence.

If it is determined that the case was not handled in accordance with the procedures and/or that the outcome was not reasonable in light of the available evidence, the Appeal Chair may take corrective action where appropriate, refer the case back to the original decision-making body for reconsideration, or refer the case back to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office for reconsideration under the Academic Misconduct Policy.

The student will be informed of the outcome of an appeal in a Completion of Procedures letter. This is the final stage in Queen Mary’s internal Academic Misconduct procedures.

An Academic Misconduct Appeal will normally be concluded within 28 calendar days of receipt. The student will normally be notified if consideration of their appeal is likely to take longer than this.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (the OIA) is an independent body set up to review student complaints about higher education in England and Wales.

A student not satisfied with the outcome of Queen Mary’s internal procedures may submit a complaint to the OIA. The OIA will not normally consider a submission until a student has completed all of Queen Mary’s internal procedures and is in possession of a Completion of Procedures letter.
48. The OIA will consider whether Queen Mary followed its policy correctly and whether the outcome was reasonable in light of the facts of the case.

49. Information on submitting a complaint to the OIA will be included in the Completion of Procedures letter issued to the student. Information is also available on the OIA website.

50. A student who has exhausted all stages of Queen Mary’s Appeal Policy will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter, and may be eligible to request a review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). The Appeal Policy and the Completion of Procedures letter contain additional details on the OIA.

**Reporting**

46.50. Academic misconduct penalties will be reported to the Professional Capability Committee and, where it is a stipulated requirement, to other professional bodies that accredit awards.

46.51. All allegations of academic misconduct dealt with by a HoS/AMO must be reported to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.

46.52. The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office will present an annual report to the Senate on all cases of academic misconduct, however resolved.

This version of the Academic Misconduct Policy was approved by Senate on 16 June 2022
Appendix 1: Academic misconduct procedure

Potential academic misconduct identified.

Assessment counts for 31% or more of the module mark, or would be the second or subsequent instance of misconduct.

School/institute decides to either:

Report it to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office for investigation.

Notify student, with evidence, and ask student to accept or deny the allegation. Conduct investigation.

Student admits, does not deny or does not reply to allegation, or asks for consideration by Academic Misconduct Panel Chair/Deputy

Chair/Deputy considers case, determines whether misconduct has occurred and applies any penalty.

Student informed of outcome in writing. Student record amended to reflect any penalty.

Assessment counts for 30% or less of the module mark and would be the first instance of misconduct.

Investigate it within the school/institute.

Notify student, with evidence, and ask student to accept or deny the allegation. Conduct investigation.

HoS/AMO considers case, determines whether misconduct has occurred and applies any penalty.

Student denies allegation.

Case considered by the Panel, which will determine whether misconduct has occurred and apply any penalty.
Appendix 2: Academic Misconduct Panel Procedure

Scope

1. These are the procedures for a full meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

Procedure

2. At the start of the meeting, the Chair will:
   i. introduce the student (and/or their representative) and the members of the Panel.
   ii. indicate the Queen Mary representative, who will present the facts in the possession of Queen Mary.
   iii. check that the student (and/or their representative) has copies of all the documentation supplied to the Panel.
   iv. inform the student (and/or their representative) and the Panel of their right to examine any documents, reports or written statements used in the case by any of the parties, and their right to call witnesses, who may be examined by any of the parties.

3. The Chair will read the allegation and ask whether the student admits to the allegation or not.

4. If the student admits to the allegation, the Panel will proceed to consider its findings. The student (and/or their representative) will be informed that they will be able to address the Panel after it has considered its findings and before it considers its decision. The Queen Mary representative, the student, and (where relevant) the student’s representative must leave the room while the Panel considers its findings. Continue to paragraph 8 of this document.

   OR

   If the student denies the allegation then the Queen Mary representative will be asked to present the facts in the possession of Queen Mary and to call any witnesses, who may be examined by any party.

5. The student will be asked to give their evidence. If they call any witnesses they may be examined by any party.

6. After both the Queen Mary representative and the student have given evidence, each party may address the Panel. The Queen Mary representative will address the Panel first, followed by the student.

7. The Queen Mary representative, the student, and (where relevant) the student’s representative must leave the room while the Panel decides whether academic misconduct has been committed. The Secretary may also be asked to leave the room, at the discretion of the Chair. The Panel must reach its decision without adjournment if possible, and must give reasons for its decision. No penalty is issued at this stage.

8. Once the Panel has decided whether academic misconduct was committed, the Queen Mary representative and the student (and/or their representative) will be recalled for the decision.

9. If the Panel finds that no academic misconduct was committed, the Chair will inform the student and all parties may leave.

10. If the Panel finds that academic misconduct was committed the following procedures will follow:
   i. if the student admitted academic misconduct, the Chair will invite them to explain the circumstances of their actions.
   ii. the Chair will invite the Queen Mary representative to address the Panel on the penalty to be applied.
   iii. the Chair will next invite the student to address the Panel on the penalty to be applied.
   iv. witnesses cannot be called at this stage, but written statements may be submitted to the Panel with a copy given to all parties.
11. The Chair will ask the Queen Mary representative and the student (and/or their representative) to leave the room while the Panel determines the penalty. The Secretary will provide the Panel with the information required under section 12 below.

12. When determining the penalty, the Panel will consider all relevant information, including:
   i. the relation of the module(s) in question to the structure of the programme for which the student is registered (in cases where the penalty is applied to the module)
   ii. the effect that failing the module would have on the student (if applicable)
   iii. the arrangements for resitting the module (if applicable)

13. The Chair will recall the Queen Mary representative and the student (and/or their representative).

14. The Chair of the Panel will announce the penalty decided on by the Panel and the reasons for the penalty. The penalty will be read verbatim, as it appears in the Academic Misconduct Policy.

15. The student will be informed of their right to appeal against the penalty in accordance with the Appeal Policy.

16. The meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel will be closed.
Appendix 3: Third-party reports

Third-party reports of academic misconduct

1. The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office will review the veracity of any third-party report of academic misconduct it receives from other students or from outside Queen Mary. Any such report will be acknowledged by the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office. The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office will request evidence of the report of academic misconduct if evidence has not been provided.

2. In order to protect the confidentiality of its students, any third party reporting an allegation of academic misconduct will receive no other acknowledgement of any action or otherwise taken by Queen Mary.

Appendix 4: Oral examinations

Oral examination process

1. A school/institute may test the subject knowledge of a student suspected of academic misconduct by oral examination if it is deemed appropriate by the HoS/AMO.

2. An oral examination will be conducted in accordance with the following process:
   a. The oral examination must be conducted by two members of academic staff; a third person may be present to take notes. Where possible, the academic member of staff who first raised the allegation or the module organiser will be one of the two academic staff members.
   b. The student suspected of academic misconduct must be given at least three working days’ notice of the meeting.
   c. The notification of the meeting must include the following information:
      i. The time/day/date of the meeting.
      ii. The location of the meeting (in-person or remote).
      iii. Copies of all evidence to be considered in the meeting.
      iv. A statement on the reasons for the suspicion of academic misconduct.
      v. A statement that the student will be expected to defend their work and that they should prepare appropriately.
      vi. A statement informing the student that they may be accompanied by one person of their choosing, making clear to the student that this person is not there to represent or defend the student since the purpose of the oral examination is to test the student’s knowledge.
   d. The third person present at the oral examination will take notes.
   e. At the conclusion of the oral examination, the two members of academic staff will summarise their academic opinion of the student’s responses, including a statement on whether or not they believe the suspicion should be forwarded to either the school/institute’s HoS/AMO or the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office for further investigation. Both the notes and the statements by the two academic staff members will be sent to the relevant HoS/AMO.
   f. If the conclusion of the oral examination is that the matter should be referred for further investigation, the school/institute must advise the student as soon as possible that the matter will be taken forward by the appropriate process.
   g. If the conclusion of the oral examination is that the suspicion of academic misconduct is unfounded, the school/institute must advise the student as soon as possible that the matter has been resolved and that the assessment in question will be marked in the usual way.

Appendix 5: Transnational Education Programmes
Transnational Education Programmes

1. The "harmonised penalties" outlined below apply to academic misconduct found to occur in the course of collaborative programmes between Queen Mary and:
   i. Nanchang University
   ii. Queen Mary School Hainan
   iii. Northwestern Polytechnical University
   iv. Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications

2. For the avoidance of doubt, the "harmonised penalties" replace those outlined in Paragraph 33 for students on these programmes.

3. Harmonised Penalties:
   i. A formal warning
   ii. A requirement that the student resubmit the relevant piece(s) of assessment by a specified deadline with no cap on the mark that may be obtained.
   iii. A requirement that the student resubmit the relevant piece(s) of assessment by a specified deadline with the resubmission mark capped at the minimum pass mark.
   iv. A mark of 0 for the relevant piece(s) of assessment, but if the module is failed the student may retake at the next opportunity.
   v. A mark of 0 in the module of which the assessment forms a part, with the module mark capped at any retake at the minimum pass mark.
   vi. The overall classification of Honours to be reduced by one grade with an explanation to be provided as to why the calculated mark does not match the Honours awarded.
   vii. Recommendation to the Steering Committee that the student be expelled from the two universities. The Steering Committee decision must be ratified by the Principal/President of both universities before the student can be expelled.

4. QM penalties where the mark is capped mean that for the UK transcript and Honours calculation the mark is limited to 40% on the UK scale (60% on the CN scale) but the mark recorded by BUPT will be the uncapped mark as BUPT does not use capping of marks.

5. Where the penalty involves failure in the module the student may retake but, unless specified in the harmonised penalties, must miss the next opportunity, if the next opportunity is held in less than six months, and except for students spending the final year in London where examinations are held annually.

6. Penalty vii. will only be applied for exam offences where the QMUL standard penalty of failure of all modules would mean dismissal by BUPT as the students cannot fail more than 30 credits under BUPT regulations.
Senate Chair’s action: Appointment of a new Professional Capability Committee member

Summary
This was a request for the approval of the appointment of a new member of the Professional Capability Committee by Chair’s Action.

Background
The Professional Capability and Fitness to Practise Regulations state that one member of the Professional Capability Committee hearing a case needs to be a “member of academic staff who is a registered doctor or dentist drawn from a pool appointed by Senate depending on whether the student being considered is from a medical or dental programme. The pool may include clinicians appointed on Honorary Contracts.”. This pool of Committee members currently consists of five members of staff, with one currently on maternity leave.

It was requested that Mr Michael Griffiths CBE DL, Blizard Institute, be approved as a Senate-appointed member to the Professional Capability Committee.

This time-sensitive request was put through as a Chair’s action with the hope that Michael could act as a committee member for an upcoming Professional Capability Committee hearing. Two of the five members are GDC registered so cannot hear the upcoming case.

Michael is a Consultant Trauma and Vascular Surgeon at the Royal London Hospital (Barts Health NHS Trust) and an Honorary Senior Clinical Lecturer at the Blizard Institute. Michael is a Director of Medical Education for postgraduate clinicians at the Royal London Hospital.

Approved by Chair’s action – 10 July 2023
Senate Chair’s action: Appointment of Complaints Assessor

Summary
This was a request for the approval of new Complaints Assessors by Chair’s Action.

Background
Student complaints present a notable risk to the University; failure to handle complaints in a robust, transparent and timely way can have significant negative impacts on Queen Mary’s standing and reputation, and an effective mechanism for dealing with complaints is a required by the relevant regulatory bodies.

To that end, and in light of increasing numbers of complaint cases, the appointment of additional Complaints Assessors was proposed by Chair’s Action to expediently address cases. Appointment was proposed for:

- Jane Pallant, Director of Governance & Legal Services
- Danny Hassel, Policy & Governance Lead
- Haylee Fuller, Head of Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office

The nominees are senior staff members within the Directorate of Governance & Legal Services at Queen Mary, and have substantial experience working with student casework and complaints in higher education. They hold an authoritative understanding of the University’s regulatory requirements and legal obligations and are experienced in investigating and considering complaints.

Approved by Chair’s action – 23 August 2023
4. Senate terms of reference and membership 2023-2024

Part 1: Preliminary Items

Presented by Colin Bailey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Senate terms of reference and membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome requested</td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> the terms of reference and <strong>approve</strong> the membership for 2023-24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points for Senate members to note and further information</td>
<td>Members are asked to note the minor revisions to terminology in the terms of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for Senate to consider</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/statutory reference points</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and risk</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</td>
<td>Senate to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Jane Pallant, Director of Governance and Legal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ordinance A15: The Senate

Constitution of Senate

1. The Senate is established by the Charter, subject to the overall superintendence of the Council, to exercise general responsibility for the academic activity of Queen Mary. In addition to exercising jurisdiction over the following issues, it may offer advice to the Council and to the Principal on all academic matters.

Terms of reference

Academic Standards

[a] To establish the requirements for degrees and other awards made under the Charter and to put in place procedures and boards for the consideration of such awards.

[b] To approve regulations relating to the admission, assessment and operation of all programmes, modules and awards.

[c] To approve procedures for approval and amendment of programmes and modules leading to awards of the CollegeQMUL and the University.

[d] To approve procedures for the withdrawal of programmes and modules.

[e] To consider and approve or advise on as applicable strategies and policies designed to ensure the academic quality of programmes, including the teaching, learning and assessment strategy.

[f] To receive reports on procedures that relate to academic standards, academic quality and the quality of the student experience and recommend appropriate action in the light of these reports.

[g] To approve provisions for the operation and award of prizes as applicable.

Academic Freedom

[h] To approve policies to support and foster academic freedom in relation to the academic activity of Queen Mary and to report to Council on matters of concern in relation to the provision of academic freedom.

Research

[i] To consider and approve or advise on as applicable the research strategy and policies for research.

[j] To approve regulations relating to the admission, supervision, assessment and operation of postgraduate research programmes in addition to those provided for under Academic Standards above.
[k] To approve in place structures and procedures for the consideration of research ethics.

**Academic Organisation**

[l] To advise the President and Principal and the Council on matters related to the academic organisation of Queen Mary.

[m] To advise the Council on the conferral of Honorary Fellows of the CollegeQMUL and award of Honorary Degrees of the University, upon the recommendation of the appropriate committee.

**Other**

[n] To advise on any other matter referred to it by the Council or other relevant matters that have a bearing on the academic policy of the CollegeQMUL.

**Membership**

[a] The President and Principal as Chair ex-officio

[b] The Vice-Principals ex-officio

[c] The President of the Students’ Union ex-officio

[d] The Students’ Union Vice Presidents for Humanities & Social Sciences, Science & Engineering and Barts and The London ex-officio

[e] Heads of School/Institute (School of Medicine and Dentistry) ex-officio

[f] Faculty Deans of Research and Education ex-officio

[g] Elected members of academic staff so that there is an overall elected majority (including the elected student members). The numbers of elected members of academic staff per faculty may vary to provide for uneven numbers of Heads of School or Heads/Directors of Institute so that there is in total an even number from each Faculty over all membership categories. In the first instance this will be: 9 from HSS; 12 from SMD and 13 from S&E.

**Elected members of Senate**

2. The call for nominations and elections shall be conducted by the Academic Secretary. The elections shall be conducted by a ballot using a single transferable vote system.

3. All academic staff in the relevant constituencies shall be entitled to stand and to vote. Academic staff are defined in Ordinance B1. In any category, where more than one person stands for election, the Secretary to Council conducts a postal or electronic ballot.
4. Elections are normally held during the second semester prior to the academic year in which an elected member’s period of office shall be due to end.

5. Where a casual vacancy arises because an elected member ceases to be a member before his/her term of office expires, the member replacing him/her shall commence a new term of office of four years and be eligible for re-appointment in the same way as other members.

6. A member who does not attend a meeting for twelve consecutive calendar months shall be deemed to have resigned his/her membership.

Attendance at Senate meetings

7. Individuals in attendance at meetings of Senate, in addition to the Secretary to Senate, do so at the invitation of the Chair.

Boards and Committees of Senate

8. Senate may establish such Boards and Committees as it considers appropriate for the discharge of its responsibilities.

Ordinary meetings of Senate

9. The Senate shall meet at least four times per year with meetings scheduled in advance. Scheduled meetings shall also be known as ordinary meetings.

10. The schedule of ordinary meetings shall normally be published by 30 June in the academic year prior to the year in which the meetings are to be held.

11. The quorum for Senate shall be one third of the membership.

12. If a meeting of Senate is inquorate does not meet quorum, the Chairman shall determine decide whether; a) the meeting shall be postponed and rearranged, or b) whether that the meeting shall proceed. In the instance of b)–with all decisions made will be considered preliminary, until the agreement has been confirmed by of the required number of members has been confirmed to effect the decisions as formal for the record.

Extraordinary meetings of Senate

13. An extraordinary meeting of Senate may be called by the Chairman at any time and will be held within a maximum of 21 days.

14. An extraordinary meeting of Senate may be called by the secretary to Senate at the written request of no fewer than one third of the members. Extraordinary meetings shall be held within a maximum of 21 days from the date of the requests to the secretary.
15. The business of an extraordinary meeting of Senate shall be only that business for which the meeting was called. An extraordinary meeting may be held electronically, by circulation or in person.

Circulation of agendas and papers

16. The secretary to Senate normally despatches the agenda and papers to all members for a meeting at least seven days prior to the date of the meeting.

17. Any member of Senate may propose an item for consideration to the agenda by submitting it to the secretary by the relevant published deadline.

18. Any papers not sent with the original circulation shall be circulated by the secretary at least three days prior to the meeting. Only in exceptional circumstances, and with the agreement of the Chairman, shall papers be circulated in a shorter timeframe or tabled at the meeting.

19. The agenda for a meeting of Senate may include items marked with an asterisk, which will signify an expectation that these items will pass without discussion. Any member may before the start of a meeting request that the asterisk be removed, to permit discussion of the items.

20. In exceptional circumstances, supplementary agenda items may be taken with the approval of the Chairman.

21. Agenda and papers for, and minutes of, any meeting or items relating to reserved business shall be recorded separately and circulated only to those members entitled to receive them.

Conduct of meetings of Senate

22. Any proposal or recommendation which appears on the agenda or in a report submitted to the meeting shall be put to the meeting for resolution. Any amendments to the proposal shall be considered in turn before the overall proposal. If an amendment is carried, the proposal shall be amended accordingly and the amended version considered for approval.

23. It shall be within the discretion of the Chairman to set a limit to the length of time to be spent on debate, provided that the mover of any proposal, motion, amendment or item of business has the right of final reply before it is put.

24. Voting at meetings shall be normally by show of hands of those present, not including the Chairman. The decision shall be taken in accordance with the majority votes. When equal numbers of votes are cast, the Chairman shall have the casting vote.
Acts during vacancies

25. No act or resolution of the Council or any committee or board constituted by it or one of its committees or boards can become invalid by reason only of any vacancy in the body doing or passing it or by reason of any want of qualification by or invalidity in the election or appointment of any de facto member of the body whether present or absent, or by reason of the accidental omission to give any member notice of the meeting or the non-receipt by any member of that notice.

Minutes

26. The secretary to Senate shall be responsible for producing minutes of the meeting and for maintaining the master copies of all minutes and papers.

27. Minutes shall be unconfirmed until approved at the next meeting. After the Chairman has agreed the unconfirmed minutes they shall be circulated to members. Any amendments to the unconfirmed minutes agreed at the meeting shall be incorporated into a final version which becomes the confirmed minutes and the formal record of the discussion and decisions.
SENATE MEMBERSHIP 2023-24

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

a) Chair
President & Principal
Professor Colin Bailey

b) The Vice-Principal
Vice-Principal (Health)
Professor Mark Caulfield
Vice-Principal and Executive Dean (Humanities & Social Science)
Professor Frances Bowen
Vice-Principal and Executive Dean (Science & Engineering)
Professor Wen Wang
Vice-Principal (Education)
Professor Stephanie Marshall
Vice-Principal (International)
Vacant
Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)
Dr Philippa Lloyd
Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)
Professor Andrew Livingston
Vice-Principal (People, Culture and Inclusion)
Vacant

c) The President of the Students’ Union
Serena-Amani Al Jabbar

d) The Students’ Union Vice-Presidents
Vice-President Humanities and Social Sciences
Jovani Palnoni
Vice-President Barts and The London
Amaan Abbas
Vice-President Science and Engineering
Aisha Qadi

e) Heads/Deans of Schools & Institutes

Humanities and Social Sciences
Business Management
Professor Mike Noon
Centre for Commercial Law Studies
Professor Ioannis Kokkoris
Economics and Finance
Professor Jason Sturgess
English and Drama
Professor Scott McCracken
Geography
Professor Kavita Datta
History
Professor Emma Griffin
Languages, Linguistics & Film
Professor Kathryn Datta
Law
Professor Jonathan Griffiths
Politics and International Relations
Professor Martin Coward

Medicine and Dentistry
Barts Cancer Institute
Professor Nicholas Lemoine
Blizard Institute
Professor Mary Collins
Institute of Dentistry
Professor Christopher Tredwin
Institute of Health Sciences Education
Professor Arunthathi Mahendran
William Harvey Research Institute
Professor Panos Deloukas
Wolfson Institute of Population Health
Professor Fiona Walter

Science and Engineering

f) Faculty Deans of Research and Taught Programmes

**Humanities and Social Sciences**
- Dean for Education: Elizabeth Gillow
- Dean for Research: Professor Adrian Armstrong

**Medicine and Dentistry**
- Dean for Education: Professor Anthony Warrens
- Dean for Research: Professor Amrita Ahluwalia

**Science and Engineering**
- Dean for Education: Professor Christopher Bray
- Dean for Research: Professor Martin Knight


g) Elected members of academic staff

The numbers of elected members of academic staff per faculty may vary to provide for uneven numbers of Heads of Schools/Institutes so that there is in total an even number from each Faculty over all membership categories.

1) **Constituency One: Nine elected members of the academic staff from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**
   - Professor Rob Briner [Business and Management] [2026]
   - Professor Liam Campling [Business and Management] [2027]
   - Dr Joseph Cronin [History] [2024]
   - Professor Neve Gordon [Law] [2025]
   - Professor Wayne Joseph Morrison [Law] [2025]
   - Professor Rachael Mulheron KC (Hon) [Law] [2027]
   - Dr Émilie Oléron Evans [Languages, Linguistics and Film] [2026]
   - Dr Sharri Plonski [Politics and International Relations] [2027]
   - Dr James Strong [Politics and International Relations] [2025]

2) **Constituency Two: Twelve elected members of the academic staff of the School of Medicine and Dentistry**
   - Dr Georgia Black [Wolfson Institute of Population Health] [2027]
   - Dr Erik Blair [Institute of Health Sciences Education] [2026]
   - Dr Lucy Carter [Institute of Health Sciences Education] [2026]
   - Dr Livia A Carvalho [William Harvey Research Institute] [2027]
   - Dr Dianne Cooper [William Harvey Research Institute] [2024]
   - Dr Pedro Elston [Institute of Health Sciences Education] [2026]
   - Dr Abimbola Giwa [Institute of Dentistry] [2025]
   - Professor Richard Grose [Barts Cancer Institute] [2025]
   - Professor John Marshall [Barts Cancer Institute] [2026]
   - Dr Ali Nankali [Institute of Dentistry] [2024]
   - Dr Michael Page [Institute of Health Sciences Education] [2024]
   - Dr Simon Rawlinson [Institute of Dentistry] [2025]

3) **Constituency Three: Thirteen members of the academic staff from the Faculty of Science and Engineering**
Dr Oscar Bandtlow [Mathematical Sciences] [2027]
Dr Giorgio Chianello [Physical and Chemical Sciences] [2025]
Dr Giulia De Falco [Biological and Behavioural Sciences] [2025]
Dr Jayne Dennis [Biological and Behavioural Sciences] [2026]
Dr Lei Fang [Mathematical Sciences] [2027]
Dr Paula Fonseca [Electronic Engineering and Computer Science] [2024]
Professor Steffi Krause [Engineering and Materials Science] [2024]
Dr Theo Kreouzis [Physical and Chemical Sciences] [2024]
Dr Michaela MacDonald [Electronic Engineering and Computer Science] [2026]
Dr Anthony Phillips [Physical and Chemical Sciences] [2026]
Professor Thomas Prellberg [Mathematical Sciences] [2026]
Professor Elizabeth Tanner [Engineering and Materials Science] [2026]
Dr Yannick Wurm [Biological and Behavioural Sciences] [2026]

ACADEMIC SECRETARIAT
Chief Governance Officer and University Secretary          Jonathan Morgan
Director of Governance and Legal Services               Jane Pallant

IN ATTENDANCE
Deputy Vice-Principal for Impact, Civic, Culture and  Professor Alison Blunt
   Community
Deputy Vice-Principal for Strategic Research             Professor Yang Hao
Deputy Vice-Principal Education                         Professor Stefan Krummaker
Deputy Vice-Principal for Impact Enterprise and         Professor David Lee
   Commercial Innovation
Deputy Vice-Principal for Education                     Professor Anthony Michael
Dean for Postgraduate Research, Blizard Institute        Professor Tim Warner
Executive officer (Academic Secretariat)                Kaya Wiles

Membership count: 71
Quorum: 24

Revised 21.09.2023
5. President and Principal’s report
Part 1: Preliminary Items
Presented by Colin Bailey
President and Principal’s report

**Outcome requested**

Senate is asked to note and discuss the attached report.

**Points for Senate members to note and further information**

The President and Principal provides a written report to each Senate meeting. This provides an opportunity to highlight key issues and developments to Senate members, for information and discussion at the meeting as appropriate.

The report covers the following:
- Student Recruitment
- Horizon Europe
- European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grants
- 2028 Research Excellence Framework (REF)
- Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF)
- Industrial Action
- National Student Survey (NSS)
- Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)
- University of London Gold Medal Viva for Dentistry
- National Teaching Fellowship
- University Rankings
- Graduation Ceremonies
- Hainan Partnership
- Times Higher Education (THE) Awards
- Senior Appointments (new Heads of School)

**Questions for Senate to consider**

N/A

**Regulatory/statutory reference points**

N/A

**Strategy and risk**

Relates to all aspects of Queen Mary strategy and all sections of the Risk Register.

**Reporting/consideration route for the paper**

For Senate only.

**Authors**

Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal

**Sponsor**

Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal
The academic year has got off to a great start. Our campuses look fantastic, and the atmosphere everywhere is electric as students connect and re-connect with friends new and old, and with our staff. All the same, we are down on our recruitment targets, which does set a financial challenge for the year ahead, and discussions are in hand to look at how we deal with this.

We had our first Open Day of the academic year on Saturday 7 October which saw a 50% increase in the number of potential students registered compared with this point last year and a doubling in the number of international students registered to join us either on campus or online. Hopefully this puts us on a good track for future recruitment.

1.0 Student Recruitment

Unfortunately, we will not meet our targets this year and are anticipating a financial income shortfall of between £20m to £25m. Although we had more student applications compared to last year, the overseas students did not convert into students accepting our offer and a number of Schools within HSS did not meet their UK student undergraduate target. We are currently looking at cost savings in the Schools and Faculties where there is a shortfall in student numbers. This will result in us ‘flexing’ the University to focus our resource where it is required.

The largest financial shortfall has been due to us not hitting our overseas student numbers particularly for some PGT programmes. This has been driven by a drop in students from China. A greater number of students from China have been attracted to Australia, with the Australian government offering very attractive post study work visas and top Australian universities providing attractive scholarship packages. We also failed to hit our UG overseas target numbers due to the recent change in the global market.

We are considering mitigations for international student recruitment for the next recruitment cycle, including possible increased commission for agents, increasing the number of Chinese universities from which we accept PGT students, and slightly increasing and better marketing our scholarship offer. Longer term, we are looking at other options with our foundation partner, Kaplan, and are also looking at our portfolio in relation to attractiveness to the overseas market.

In terms of UK PGT students, we will not hit our ambitious target, although we should exceed the number of students we recruited last year. Across the sector many institutions are finding growing their home PGT recruitment enrolments difficult in the context of a relatively buoyant job market and high living costs.

In relation to UK undergraduates some subject areas are continuing to exceed target, but other areas, particularly in the humanities, have significantly missed their recruitment targets. Overall, we will need to look at our cost base and flex the University to align with the student market and our intake.

At University level, the latest position for enrolments is shown in the table overleaf.
We have had a very successful Open Day in October, with increased interest from home and overseas students. Hopefully this puts us on a good track for future recruitment. We are also looking at the feasibility of January starts for 2025.

2.0 Horizon Europe

On the 7th September the government confirmed the UK’s association to Horizon Europe and Copernicus programmes through a new bespoke agreement with the EU. This news has come as an enormous relief and much-needed boost, both for the higher education sector and the UK as a whole.

Due to the support we put in place during this period of uncertainty, Queen Mary has done very well on European Research Council (ERC) awards with our success rate having more than doubled compared to previous schemes where the UK was a member. However, our submission to collaborative grants has halved. It is clear that the impact of the uncertainty of the UK status, and delays to association to Horizon Europe, have had an impact on our participation in collaborate grants.

To date we have attracted 44 Horizon Europe awards totalling 32.55m euros, which is funded through UKRI Horizon Europe Guarantee funding. We also provided an underwrite from the University to provide confidence for staff in the UK government funding guarantee.

3.0 European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grants

Two academics from Queen Mary have been awarded recent European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grants for their groundbreaking, ambitious research. Just 32 grants were awarded in the UK during this most recent round.

Dr Wei Tan, a Senior Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering at the School of Engineering and Materials Sciences, has been awarded a grant for his project “Life-like Resilient Materials for Mitigating Liquid-Solid Impact Damage (LSIMPACT)”. The project aims to address the longstanding puzzle of liquid-solid impact, which involves the collision between a high-velocity liquid and a solid, leading to substantial material degradation.

Dr Edward Gillen of the School of Physical and Chemical Sciences has also won a grant with his project “Age-Enabled Exoplanet Science: Understanding the evolution and diversity of planetary systems (AENEAS)”. AENEAS will fund a large team to work with Dr Gillen to conduct ground-breaking research into understanding how planetary systems evolve into the diverse and potentially habitable population we observe.

Wei and Edward’s successes underline the importance of Queen Mary colleagues continuing to apply to European funding calls as we have encouraged staff to do even during a period of uncertainty. Congratulations to them both.

4.0 2028 Research Excellence Framework (REF)
Research England during the summer published their initial decisions for the design of the 2028 Research Excellence Framework, with a consultation.

A key proposal is to increase the weightings to the for the People, Culture and Environment element (up to 50% cumulatively), with a decrease to the weighting for research quality. Whilst we support efforts to improve research culture in the sector, our view is that a framework that assesses research excellence fundamentally must focus on the quality of research outputs (a weighting of at least 60%) – this is also the area where Queen Mary has previously performed most strongly. I am working with some other University leaders to advocate on this point.

5.0 Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF)

Results of the 2023 KEF were published on 27 September, and we continue to be a strong performer across a range of different areas. For the second year running, Queen Mary was placed in the top category – Very High Engagement – for ‘Research partnerships’, ‘Public and Community Engagement’ and ‘IP and Commercialisation’. We also ranked in the second highest category for ‘Working with the Public and Third Sector’. Further information and case studies pertaining to each category measured are available on our website.

6.0 Industrial Action

The marking and assessment boycott has now concluded, and we have asked staff to prioritise outstanding marking before undertaking any other duties associated with their employment, to allow the 140 students in the School of English and Drama students to have their final results confirmed and progress to graduation.

I would like to thank staff who worked tirelessly over the summer to mark additional work to allow almost all students to graduate on time or to progress to their next level of study, and to professional services teams for convening additional exam boards to allow this.

All Faculties and Schools/Institutes confirmed that all education was delivered to our students during the last academic year, which allows our students to compete within the competitive employment market and maintains the value of Queen Mary degree. I would like to thank staff again for ensuring that all education was delivered to our students.

There was UCU industrial action during Welcome Week and the first week of teaching. Usual mitigations to allow students to report missed teaching, and for missed teaching/education to be rearranged and made-up, are in place in-line with our agreed policy.

Our publicly accessible set of FAQs was updated through the course of the dispute. UCU is currently balloting its members on further industrial action, and we await the outcome of that ballot.

7.0 National Student Survey (NSS)

The 2023 National Student Survey has several significant methodological changes, including removal of the overall satisfaction question (formerly used as a Queen Mary KPI), which means comparisons cannot be made with previous years.

At an aggregate level, the average ‘positivity score’ at Queen Mary for the 2023 NSS questions used in the TEF was 76.4%, which will form our revised Student Satisfaction KPI. The benchmark was 79.3% showing a difference from benchmark for Queen Mary of -2.9%. When considering absolute values Queen Mary is placed 116th in the sector.
The distance from benchmark scores for each subject area is shown below. It should be noted that ‘benchmark’ is an average and we need to be above this value.

8.0 Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

The outcomes of the 2023 Teaching Excellence Framework for all providers were published on 28th September. The TEF panel considered the overall rating at Queen Mary to be Silver, with the student experience aspect rated as Bronze and the student outcomes aspect rated as Silver. We will now turn our attention to preparing for the next TEF with a focus on improving our outcome and particularly the student experience element.

The Russell Group TEF results are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>Student Experience (SE) Rating</th>
<th>Student Outcomes (SO) Rating</th>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London School of Economics and Political Science</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary University of London</td>
<td>Bronze (HQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>Bronze (HQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bristol</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Durham</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>Bronze (HQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Liverpool</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Newcastle upon Tyne</td>
<td>Bronze (HQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nottingham, The</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Warwick</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of York</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
<td>Silver (VHQ)</td>
<td>Gold (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.0 University of London Gold Medal Viva for Dentistry

The prestigious University of London Gold Medal MBBS competition has been running since 1903. Each year, London-based medical schools are invited to nominate their top-performing students in their final examinations to take part.

In Dentistry, Suraj Shah won the Gold Medal Viva, Demi Bains was the winner of the annual Betuel prize in Dentistry, and Yogesh Patel was awarded the proxime accessit to the University of London Gold Medal for Dentistry. Congratulations to them all, which I know is keenly contested between Queen Mary and King’s in particular. Well done to everyone.

10. National Teaching Fellowship

Professor Arunthathi Mahendran, Professor of Education and Director of the Institute of Health Sciences Education (IHSE) at Queen Mary University of London, has been awarded the National Teaching Fellowship from Advance HE. The National Teaching Fellowship (NTF) awards celebrate and recognise academics who have made an outstanding impact on student outcomes, student experience and the teaching profession.

There are only 55 new National Teaching Fellows awarded each year across the UK sector. Queen Mary has a strong record of its educators being awarded NTFs with 16 Fellows appointed since 2000.

Professor Mahendran delivered her inaugural lecture on 14 September.

11.0 University Rankings

This summer has been a very busy period for university rankings, both domestic and international.

Times Good University Guide

The Times Good University Guide saw us fall 10 places to 46th. We performed well on social inclusion and good honours. The Guide did not use the latest NSS results, instead using the results from 2022. We continue to perform badly on the NSS (particularly in the areas of ‘teaching quality’ and ‘assessment and feedback’), with a ranking of 117th for this measure. In the Times Good University Guide, we were awarded runner-up University of the Year for Social Inclusion.

Guardian University Guide
The Guardian University Guide 2024 saw us fall 19 places to 73rd. The Guardian league table is heavily weighted towards student experience measures (with no metrics for research quality) and again used the 2022 NSS data.

Daily Mail University Rankings
The new Daily Mail University Rankings positioned Queen Mary at 17th in the UK. The Daily Mail rankings methodology uses a much broader basket of metrics. We were short-listed for ‘University of the Year’ by the Daily Mail.

Times Higher Education World University Rankings
In the Times Higher Education World University Rankings, we have been ranked 135th, down from 124th. There has been another change in methodology in these international rankings and it is worth reflecting on the data and rankings for each component, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>% contribution to rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score (out of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Doctorate bachelor ratio</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate staff ratio</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching reputation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student staff ratio</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional income</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Environment</td>
<td>Research productivity</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research reputation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research income</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Quality</td>
<td>Citation impact</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research strength</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research excellence</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research influence</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industry income</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Outlook</td>
<td>International staff</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International co-authorship</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International students</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studying abroad</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above we can see that we are ranked 14th in the world for ‘research quality’ with a mark of (97.9/100), and 7th in the world for ‘international outlook’, with a mark of (98.1/100). Both these measures are based on metrics. However, we perform badly for ‘research reputation’, with a score of (20.7/100) and ‘teaching reputation’, with a score of (18.7/100). Both these measures are based on the number of votes from academic peers across the globe and represents their perception of the research and teaching quality at Queen Mary.

12.0 Graduation Ceremonies
We were pleased to graduate around 3700 students across two weeks of ceremonies in July, alongside honorary degrees and fellowships for Professor Dame Susan (Sue) Hill, Luke Savage, Alex Scott MBE (shown below), David Willis and Dr Lorna Ewert.
Graduation Ceremonies in January 2024 will return to Tobacco Dock, as previously held in 2022, as the growth in PGT student numbers leaves us with insufficient capacity between the Christmas break and January in-person examinations to accommodate ceremonies on our campuses. April and July ceremonies are currently planned to remain on our campuses.

13.0 Hainan Partnership

Further developing our 20-year partnership with the Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications (BUPT), we held the official launch of our new transnational education programme in Hainan. So far 240 students are enrolled in numerous subjects – including Maths, Digital Technologies, Computer Science and Data Science.

Teaching takes place in Hainan entirely in English and is split 50/50 between both universities, with Queen Mary sending out staff to deliver face-to-face lectures. Students will graduate with a double award – one from each institution.

14.0 THE Awards

We are delighted to have two members of staff shortlisted in the 2023 Times Higher Education (THE) Awards. Kate Thornton, Technical Resource Manager for the Faculty of Science and Engineering, is on the Outstanding Technician of the Year shortlist for her exceptional practical skills, commitment and vision that have enabled the highest quality teaching, research and knowledge transfer.

Professor Julia Hörnle, Chair of Internet Law at the Centre for Commercial Law Studies, has been shortlisted for the Outstanding Research Supervisor of the Year award. Professor Hörnle is renowned for creating supportive, stimulating and inspirational research environment for doctoral students, which have helped to nurture and develop the careers of many PhD students.

We have our fingers crossed for the awards ceremony on the 7th December.

15.0 Senior Appointments (new Heads of School)

We have made several new appointments over the summer:

- Professor Christopher Tredwin as Dean for Dentistry, an alumnus of one of our founding institutions and former Head of the Dental School at the University of Plymouth.
- Professor Nitzan Rosenfeld as Director of the Barts Cancer Institute, from Cambridge University and a co-founder of the successfully commercialised Inivata.
- Professor Emma Griffin is the new Head of the School of History, also an alumna of Queen Mary and is currently President of the Royal Historical Society.
- Professor Martin Coward is the new Head of the School of Politics and International Relations, previously at the University of Manchester.
- Professor Michael Harker will start as Head of the School of Law on 1st November 2023, having previously been Head of School at the University of East Anglia.
There have been several changes to Faculty leadership teams over the course of the summer and I congratulate all those starting in new roles. Our Queen Mary Academy is rolling out a new set of Educational Leadership Development programmes, starting with Programme Directors and Directors of Education.

Colin Bailey

30 September 2023
6. Vice-Principals’ reports
Part 1: Preliminary Items
## Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Vice-Principal’s reports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome requested</td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> the Vice-Principal’s reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points for Senate members to note and further information</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for Senate to consider</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/statutory reference points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and risk</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Authors              | Professor Sir Mark Caulfield, Vice-Principal (Health)  
Professor Frances Bowen, Vice-Principal (Humanities & Social Sciences)  
Professor Wen Wang, Vice Principal (Science & Engineering)  
Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)  
Dr Philippa Lloyd, Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)  
Professor Andrew Livingston (Research and Innovation) |
Faculty Budget

The faculty generated £5.6m in quarter 4 2022-23. Full year cash generation was £42.0m, £2.8m higher than budgeted predominantly due to OFS teaching funding, research overheads & pay savings which is being partially offset by lower tuition fee income.

Key factors to note.
- Tuition fees were £73.5m year in 2022-23, £1.6m lower than budgeted, due mainly to lower PGT recruitment than planned.
- Research overheads year 2022-23 were £9.9m, £1.6m higher than budgeted.
- FMD pay 2022-23 was £66.9m, £0.6m lower than budget. The small underspend to date is due mainly to posts being appointed later in 2023 than originally planned.
- FMD non-pay costs full year costs 2022-23 were £10m, in line with budget.

Education update

Visit by Department of Education.

The Principal, VP Health and the FMD IHSE Team hosted a visited by the Department to share our approach to high enrolling years and progression and showcase the Centre of the Cell.

NHS Workforce Changes:

We are in advanced planning for increased medical and dental student places. Work is being done on placements across east London and Essex. We have received a letter outlining forward process for new medical student places and expect similar for dentistry. We are in advanced planning for this.

Student Recruitment Summary

The enrolment estimates for total UG and PGT students is for circa 5,172 students at 2023 enrolment close, circa 60 students lower than targeted (5,232 students). This is based on the remaining potential to enrol students converting in October 2023.

Based on this, it is expected that tuition fee income will be circa £70m, similar to target. The lower student number variance is expected to be offset by slightly higher overseas student recruitment and a higher percentage of full-time students than planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrolment Estimate</th>
<th>Enrolment target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Enrolment Estimate</th>
<th>Enrolment target</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25,048</td>
<td>24,786</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,736</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UG Total</strong></td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37,784</td>
<td>36,936</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>(333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DL Total</strong></td>
<td>739</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>6,778</td>
<td>(188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PGT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>6,307</td>
<td>7,021</td>
<td>(714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,168</td>
<td>12,981</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PGT Total</strong></td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>19,475</td>
<td>20,002</td>
<td>(527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TNE</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>6,042</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,172</td>
<td>5,232</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>69,924</td>
<td>69,759</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UG Enrolment summary.
Undergraduate student recruitment for 2023-24 cycle has now closed, with enrolment opening on 18th September. Total new UG enrolment numbers currently standing at 687 students, exceeding the target of 665 students.

PGT Enrolment summary.
As of 3rd October 2023, 1,351 new students have been fully enrolled. This is expected to increase further by 31st October enrolment closure as there are a further 185 potential-to-enrol students. Coordinated conversion activities are continuing throughout this period.

The enrolment deadline for all FMD PGT programmes has been extended to 31st October which should allow maximum time to convert students, and programmes will provide additional support where needed to ensure their experience is not impacted.

An exercise is currently underway to rapidly facilitate a January 2024 entry point for PGT programmes able to accommodate this with no detriment to student experience, to further underpin the delivery of the 23/24 faculty cash generation target.

Digital Education Update
- The first and new DL MA/PGCert Medical Education has been successfully launched, as part of the Digital Academy agenda. Exceeded the target of 15, currently 28 students are in the first module, learning online. We foresee potential for growth next year.

DES created several showcase videos:
- Showcase of Lynton House teaching space - used at the meeting with Department of Education, along with the Principal, on 31st Aug. Video also being used to promote activities taking place on the Ilford site.
- Student support signposting video in collaboration with Amaan Abbas (BLSA president) and Dr Ava Kanyeredzi (Senior Lecturer in Mental Health, Digital Education, Wolfson Institute) – designed to signpost university wide student support services for ALL FMD students. Made easy to be linked in each QMPlus site for FMD programmes
- Cadmus pilot – All 7 selected FMD module teams for the Student Assessment and Feedback Pilot have been supported to redesign their digital assessment with an evaluation framework being created for the pilot.
- The Thematic Peer Group: Digital Assessment and Feedback for the whole of University community, along with the DES (Prof. Chie Adachi, Dr Jo Elliott), QM Academy (Prof. Janet De Wilde, Dr Emily Salines, Shoshi Ish-Horowicz), HSS (Prof. Rachel Male, Deputy Dean for Education) and S&E (Dr Shabnam Beheshiti, Director of Education, Math) – monthly meetings to work on ‘wicked problems’ in digital assessment and feedback. A few projects are being formed to progress. Currently 37 members across the University. Held on 15th Aug; 17th Sept.

NSS
The NSS 2023 results are currently being reviewed in detail with respective Institutes, and via the faculty executive board, and updated action plans are being developed. Despite good performances in Pharmacology the new scoring means performance in MBBS is at best static and Dentistry is low in rankings. The relative ranking positions across the 7 key themes require continued major work and significant improvement in several areas.

Table 5: NSS FMD Subject Rankings by Key Theme
Industrial Action/Missed Teaching Reporting

The faculty is continuously monitoring the potential impact of strikes of university and NHS Staff on education, with daily reporting (including any impact from ASOS). No impact recorded as of 26-9-2023.

Research Update

FMD has launched major initiatives focusing on research culture and environment. New research governance processes were introduced as of 1st September 2023, in line with the current research requirements which will enable the faculty to maximise chances of success, with focus on major overhead-bearing grants proposals (over £1M).

FMD have also launched the Research Integrity training for all its research staff and students provided by Epigeum for all research active staff and PGR students. Compliance will be monitored at an institute level and reported back to the FMD Executive Board routinely. FMD are currently awaiting final approval from ITS before launching LabArchives an electronic laboratory notebook for all staff and PGR students that will provide a platform for all research work to be recorded and stored securely and help with better compliance of the University Research Integrity Policies.

Compared to 2021/2022 FMD have been very successful in 2022/2023 in terms of new research awards and number of bids submitted.

**Overall Summary of FMD proposals/awards 2022/2023** *(data from Worktribe including partner costs)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bids Submitted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Bids</td>
<td>Bids Value (£)</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>£366M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/23</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>£444.3M</td>
<td>+£78.3M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Awards</td>
<td>Awards Value (£)</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>£112M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/23</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>£142.9M</td>
<td>+£30.9M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major research proposals in progress:

2. **Health and Social Care Delivery Research (HSDR)** – Richard hooper, £1.5M, NIHR Stage II call.
3. EU – Horizon Europe – Steffen Petersen, £1.46M, Cardiovascular Analytics on distributed Repositories of Data and AI supported Decision making.

4. MRC Clinician Scientist Fellowship – Paul Vulliamy, £1.34M, The role of platelets in post-injury organ dysfunction and thrombosis. **Shortlist decision January 2024.**

5. CRUK early detection and diagnosis Programme Grant – Samantha Quaife, £1.18M, **deadline September 2023.**

6. EU – Horizon Europe Starting ERC Grant - Paul Vulliamy, £1.17M. **Deadline: 24th October 2023.**

7. NIHR Research Professorships – Pre-call. Research Managers working with internal shortlisted candidates to develop applications for the 2023/24 call.


9. Wellcome Discovery Awards – Internal call for EoIs to be submitted by 29th September 2023. **Deadline for submission of proposal: 21st November 2023.**

Major Research Proposals submitted:

1. NIHR Health Tech Assessment (HTA) Programme – Xavier Griffin, £2.1M. TOPical Glycopeptides vs Usual antibiotics in Neck of femur 2. **Awaiting outcome.**

2. BHF Centre of Excellence in Cardiovascular Inflammation – Lead Panos Deloukas + CoIs, £5M, **Shortlist to be announced December 2023.**

3. UKRI Mental Health Hub – £3.5M including partner costs. Call led by Jennifer Lau from WIPH. EoI submitted on 9th May. **Outcome to be announced in November 2023.**

4. FLF Round 8 – Two FMD applications have been submitted. Tanya Soliman (BCI); Garth Funston (WIPH). **Shortlist to be announced in February 2024.**


6. Rosetrees Trust – Bid up to £300K. DM process was passed to FMD RSB which received 4 EoIs. RSB shortlisted 1 due to cap imposed by Rosetrees. Andy Prendergast/Conrad Bessant - REVAMP-AI – Researching the Vaginal Microenvironment in Preterm Birth using Artificial Intelligence. **Outcome in September/October 2023.**

7. Neurosciences and mental health research: responsive mode research grant - James Timmons, £1.2M, **Outcome in October 2023.**

8. MRC Applied Global Health Research – Rohini Mathur, £1.94M, **Outline proposal deadline 1st August 2023. Outcome in November 2023.**

9. MRC Clinician Scientist Fellowship – Paul Vulliamy, £1.36M. **Submission deadline 6th September 2023.**

10. MRC Career Development Award – Eleri Jones, £1.4M. **Submission: 13th September 2023.**

**New Awards in August 2023 - present:**

The faculty has had another successful start to the new academic year in August 2023 with 30 new awards from various funding bodies including the MRC, Wellcome Trust, CRUK and BHF. Indicative subset of awards (>£200K) from August 2023 are shown below.
NIHR Capital Award at Barts Health-QMUL of £4.885 million (two scanners and a mass spectrometer).

Summary of research awards by value August 2023 - present (incl. partner costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead PIs</th>
<th>Funders</th>
<th>Price to Funder (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stamatina Iliodromiti, Andrew Prendergast, Melanie Smuk</td>
<td>Wellcome Trust</td>
<td>£1,773,784.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian Smedley, Steffen Petersen, Panagiotis Deloukas, Aaron Lee</td>
<td>EU - Horizon Europe</td>
<td>£1,596,678.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Griffin</td>
<td>Barts Charity</td>
<td>£1,102,098.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Sanders, Jessica Okosun, Steffen Petersen, Dylan Morrissey</td>
<td>Barts Charity</td>
<td>£1,054,585.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Chan, Zudin Puthucheary, Andrew Prendergast, Josmond Dalli, Jonathan Grigg, Melanie Smuk, Priyanthi Dias</td>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>£954,974.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Finch</td>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>£837,808.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Rouault-Pierre, Ana Del Rio Machin</td>
<td>CR-UK</td>
<td>£502,776.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall, Jane Sosabowski, Julie Foster</td>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>£475,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Carless</td>
<td>Alzheimer's Society</td>
<td>£422,745.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Grigg</td>
<td>OM Pharma SA</td>
<td>£319,755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Timmons, Peter Mccormick, Gregory Slabaugh</td>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>£310,383.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Yagoob</td>
<td>WHRL</td>
<td>£285,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph Thiemermann</td>
<td>WHRL</td>
<td>£285,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>Barts Charity</td>
<td>£243,083.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Gerlinger</td>
<td>F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd</td>
<td>£240,427.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christos Bourantas</td>
<td>BHF</td>
<td>£237,741.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William Harvey Research Institute £4,017,544.05 £578,659.84 £4,596,203.89
Blizard Institute £3,911,935.45 £574,263.14 £4,486,198.59
Barts Cancer Institute £2,258,658.71 £137,469.01 £2,396,127.72
Wolfson Institute of Population Health £775,575.27 £72,447.85 £848,023.12
FMD Total £10,963,713.48 £1,362,839.84 £12,326,553.32

Capital Projects Update:
The Garrod building, refurbishment is delayed by a few weeks but is going to offer a fabulous new staff-student hub for teaching and the Barts and the London Student Association. It will also house the Institute for Health Sciences Education upon programme completion, We have rescheduled Sept/Oct face to face teaching.

Charterhouse Square Campus update
The Medical College of Saint Bartholomew’s Hospital Trust, the charitable trust holding the freehold of this campus have communicated their intention to grant QMUL a long lease for the CHSQ, pending contractual negotiations.

11-13 Charterhouse Buildings, funds of £3.4m have been allocated to transform this new office space to New Ways of Working and release John Vane space for new laboratories.

Events Update:
Open House- Pathology Museum 16th September 2023
As part of St Bartholomew’s Fair and Open House, we opened the Pathology Museum on 16th September 2023 with 326 public bookings. The event was supported by: MBBS students, 4
ambassadors and Steve Moore. Positive feedback was received with offers put forward for volunteers e.g., researcher to help with the collection’s catalogue and art illustrator.

Upcoming Events

William Harvey Day 19th October 2023 – Barts 900th
Our flagship conference is returning for the first time since 2019 to showcase the cutting edge research currently ongoing at the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. Featuring talks from researchers at all stages of their career, working across disciplines and in a variety of fields WHD23 is sure to demonstrate the breadth and depth of our activity in FMD. As part of Barts900 celebrations the event will be co-organised with the Barts Hospital and the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries who will contribute speakers, posters and join us at networking opportunities. The day will conclude with the traditional St. Luke’s Tide Service in St Bartholomew the Great.

Queen Mary organises Barts back to Rome – Barts 900 International Symposium 28th October 2023
A partner event to celebrate 900 years of Barts Hospital, organised with Campus Bio-Medico, University of Rome will take place in the stunning Basilica San Bartolomeo in Rome on 28th October 2023. A range of talks delivered by QM Staff covering both historical and medical topics this event will spotlight the international connection and shared heritage of both institutions.

Equality diversity and inclusion update:
FMD has received feedback from the AdvanceHE panel communication asking for further detail to secure a “gold” award.
Writing has begun on the Institute of Dentistry Athena Swan Silver renewal, which is due for submission on 31 May 2024.
• The next FMD EDI Seminar is being held on 31 October. The speaker is to be Professor Maria Fitzgerald, Professor of Developmental Neurobiology at University UCL, elected a Fellow of the Academy of Medical Sciences in 2000 and a Fellow of the Royal Society in 2016, and currently on the EDI committee at the Royal Society.
• Following on from the staff survey 2023, FMD specific resources have been developed to increase awareness of the available bullying and harassment reporting channels.
• This August the Blizard Institute acted as host for the In2scienceUK 2023 programme, which aims to connect disadvantaged Year 12 students to STEM professionals from different fields.
Faculty Leadership Team

We are pleased to confirm that we have successfully recruited to four roles within the HSS Faculty Leadership Team:

- Professor Dan Todman (History) has been appointed as our new HSS Deputy Vice-Principal and began his role on the 1st September 2023, having previously successfully led the School of History as Head of School for the last four years.
- Professor Galin Tihanov (Comparative Literature, SLLF) will take up the position of HSS Dean for Research in January 2024, when Professor Adrian Armstrong’s (Modern Languages and Cultures, SLLF) term comes to an end.
- Professor Kate Spencer (Geography) has commenced her role as the new HSS Deputy Dean for Research Impact, taking over from Professor Martin Welton who is now Head of the Department of Drama (SED).
- Professor Michael Harker recently joined Queen Mary, and will serve as our new Head of the Department of Law from the 1st November 2023. Michael will be joining us from the University of East Anglia (UEA) where he held the role of Head of the UEA Law School and previously served as the School’s Director of Research.

Research Updates

HSS’s research grant award success continues, and we are making excellent progress towards our income target of £10m in 2027/28. In 2022/23, our research income (spend on grants) totaled £7.2m. The faculty has a very promising research grant pipeline. Awards for 2022/23 totaled £12.1m - our highest ever – compared to £4.7m last year and a historic average of £9.4m. We were also pleased to see our pivot to larger bids (£500k) continuing, with 15% of the bids making up 65% of the total value of new awards.

Several awards were made in the region of £1m each, including:

- Eyal Poleg (History) *Hidden in Plain Sight: Historical and Scientific Analysis of Premodern Sacred Books*, AHRC, £1m (£600k to HSS), an innovative interdisciplinary collaboration with FMD colleagues aligned with new AHRC investment in heritage science
- Heather Ford (Geography) *Pliocene Lessons for the Indian Ocean Dipole*, NERC-NSF Pushing the Frontiers grant, nearly £1m in total, £430k to HSS
- Devyani Sharma (SLLF), *Generations of London English: Language and Social Change in Real Time*, ESRC, £1m+, £945 to HSS, which used innovative interdisciplinary
methodology (linguistics and social psychology) to track changes to London speech brought about by social change and migration

- Camilla Kong (Law / IHSS Fellow), **Reproductive Borders and Bordering Reproduction: Access to Care for Women from Ethnic Minority and Migrant Groups**, AHRC, nearly £1m, £350k to HSS, drawing on philosophy, bioethics, law, sociology and arts-based engagement

**Education Updates**

**Student Recruitment**

As noted elsewhere in papers for this senate, HSS experienced a challenging admissions round for September 2023 entry. The faculty overall will not meet admissions targets, though in most schools we will be educating more students than we did last year due to large cohorts recruited in the past two years. We are working through how to improve admissions for next year and revisiting our targets over the next five years as part of the planning process.

The three main focus areas in HSS are: significant under-recruitment in some schools for home UG (SLLF, SED, Geography, History); the sustainability of international student recruitment in our three main PGT international recruiting schools (SEF, CCLS/law, SBM); and weak late-stage international UG conversion across all subject areas, which is a challenge shared with other faculties. A Task and Finish Group has already reported and made recommendations to address home UG recruitment in the four focus schools. We are convening groups to consider both UG and PGT international recruitment, in collaboration with marketing and recruitment colleagues.

**Student Experience: National Student Survey Results**

Senate members will have already seen the quantitative NSS results compared with benchmark by subject that were released in August 2023. Unfortunately, it is difficult to compare results with previous years due to methodology changes. However, it is clear that there are many areas across HSS that did not score well on the survey. We are in the process of undertaking a full set of review meetings with all schools to understand this further, and have asked all schools to update their NSS action plans by October 16th.

We were pleased to note some significant improvements in rank scores in some areas, particularly Drama (SED) coming top in the country (out of 71 institutions) for organisation and management, 6th for academic support, and improving 40 rank places for ‘teaching on my course’ from 56th to 16th; Human Geography achieving an impressive 11th in the country (out of 43) for teaching on my course, up from 42nd out of 43 for last year, with dramatic
improvements in rank score across just about all themes; Marketing (SBM) leaping into the top 20 for learning opportunities (from 76 of 91 last year), with strong rank gains in all themes, including student voice (up 49 places from 80th to 31st); positions in the top 3 in the country for three themes in English language (1st in organisation and management, 2nd for teaching on my course, and 3rd for learning opportunities), with improvements across many subject areas within SLLF. We will focus on what we can learn from these pockets of change to influence action plans across the faculty.

The HSS Education Dean Team also conducted Structural Topic Modelling (STM) analysis on the qualitative free-text comments written by students in their NSS responses. STM uses an algorithm to generate topics based on word frequencies, and then estimates the probability that each school responses falls within each topic.

**Figure 1: Negative comments; topic frequency by school**

![Probability of topics per school](image)

*Notes: Uni Life = general comments on university life; IA = industrial action; A&F = assessment and feedback; St. Supp. = student support; C19 = Covid 19 pandemic*

Figure 1 shows how negative free-text comments varied across schools. Industrial action issues were more prevalent in those schools that were most strongly affected by it (i.e. SED, SPIR, History). SEF, on the other hand, had the lowest probability of students commenting negatively about industrial action, but the highest for university life.
Figure 2: Positive comments; topic frequency by school

Notes: Uni Life = general comments on university life; Module Org. = module organisation; Intell. = intellectual challenge; St. Supp. = Student support

Figure 2 shows that Teaching was particularly praised in humanities subjects (SLLF, SED, History), and that student support was commented positively in some schools with large cohorts (SPIR; SBM). SED and Geography were praised for the organisation and communication within modules, whereas students in Law and SEF appreciated intellectual challenge in their programmes.

Student Experience: Industrial Action and Marking and Assessment Boycott

Some areas within HSS were affected by ongoing industrial action and, in particular, a marking and assessment boycott throughout summer 2023. Around 140 students in the School of English and Drama were unable to graduate in July because of having insufficient marked work. This marking has now been completed, and the students will be cleared to graduate at the next available opportunity. In addition, several hundred first and second year students in SED, SPIR and History experienced delays in receiving their marks to progress from one developmental year to the next. Much of this marking was completed before the end of the boycott, and all continuing students are now cleared to enter their next year of study.
The Faculty is particularly grateful to colleagues in professional services who have helped to manage this challenging assessment period, particularly in HSS school offices, Registry Services, DGLS, Communications, and the Advice and Counselling Service who have all played a vital role in supporting our students and staff this summer.

**HSS Community, Alumni and Partnerships**

Three HSS Alumni were recognised in the King’s first Birthday Honours List:

- Jonathan Cox (MA Community Organising, 2011) Deputy Director, Citizens UK. Awarded an OBE for services to Community Organising and Refugee Settlement
- Peter O’Hara (BSc Economics, 1980) – Chief Executive, OLM Systems. Awarded an MBE for services to social care
- Bilal Bin Saqib (BSc Business Management, 2011) – Co-Founder One Million Meals. Awarded an MBE for services to the NHS and to the community in Stanmore and the London Borough of Harrow

VP-HSS led two Queen Mary delegations including colleagues from within HSS and across the university, to deepen research and education partnerships:

- Research Symposium and Project Workshops with FGV and Fiocruv in Jio de Janerio, Brazil, 11-14 September, including researchers from all three faculties developing projects in grand challenge areas. The visit also included celebrating People’s Palace Projects (PPP) Brazil’s 20th anniversary in Casa Rio
- Joint *Transnational Migration Workshop* between Queen Mary and Cornell University, held at QM Malta campus, 9-11 October 2023. Focus on interdisciplinary research collaborations and fundable project proposals in areas of migration studies crossing all three QM faculties.
Since my last report to the Senate, there have been a number of changes in the S&E Faculty Executive. Professor Chris Bray has been appointed our new Dean for Education and Professor Alex Clark has been appointed our new Dean for International. Rachel Appleton, who has recently returned to Queen Mary, has been appointed as our new Deputy Dean for Education (Programs and Portfolio).

I am pleased to report that we have enjoyed an incredibly successful year of academic promotion within the Faculty with eleven promotions to professorial level within the Faculty. These promotions reflect that breadth and excellence of the contributions of our staff and we are delighted to have been able to recognise their contributions at this time.

We are also delighted to announce that our Faculty Technical Resources Manager, Kate Thornton, has been shortlisted in the Times Higher Education Awards under the Outstanding Technician of the Year 2023 category – for her dedication and hard work with the QM community of technicians both at Faculty and institutional levels. Category winners will be announced in early December at a ceremony in Liverpool.
Research

It has been a busy and productive summer period for the Faculty of Science & Engineering in terms of research. Since the start of June, we have won over £15 million in new awards and our total research funding for the year 2022-23 reached a record high of £43.8M, up 27% from last year and 67% from the previous year.

Several significant grants have been awarded including EPSRC funding (£896k) to investigate scalable perovskite device manufacturing techniques; research into insect sentience funded through US charity the Good Venture Foundation (£764k); a joint Wellcome Trust bid (£1.82M) with our FMD colleagues; and a BBSRC standard grant (£688k) looking at chromosome stability. We are also especially pleased to report two significant and prestigious ERC Starting grant awards made to Dr. Edward Gillen in SPCS (£1.19M) and Dr. Wei Tan in SEMS (£1.17M) in the areas of exoplanet evolution and resilient materials respectively. These contribute towards a total of over £3.2M in European funding which the faculty has won since June, clearly demonstrating our strong, continuing links with EU counterparts, despite prior Brexit instability. We look forward to leveraging and growing these relationships further, following the welcome news of the UK’s association to the EU’s €95.5bn Horizon Europe research and innovation programme. Indeed, this has already been evidenced this September when the faculty submitted 36 applications to the EU Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action Postdoctoral Fellowships call.

More broadly, we have seen a good funder spread with engagement across a wide spectrum of organisations including key partners in UKRI, the National Academies, industry partners such as Yamaha and Ocado, UK Government departments DSTL and DEFRA, charities such as Rosetrees and various international partners.

Already in the first 2 months of this financial year researchers within the Faculty have submitted over £120M of grant applications, up more than 50% on this time last year reflecting our ambitious growth strategy. In terms of Early Career Researchers, the Faculty has seen a hive of activity this September, with an unprecedented number of bid submissions to fellowship schemes. Over 47 applications have been submitted, including 17 to the Royal Society, 10 to EPSRC’s New Investigator Awards, 6 to the Ernest Rutherford Fellowships with STFC, as well as several prestigious Future Leaders Fellows and Royal Academy of Engineering schemes.

We have recently recruited 27 ambitious, excellent researchers as part of our strategic hiring of new lecturers to boost our world-leading research power. For 2024/25, the Faculty is allocating a total of 22 QMUL funded PhD studentships and 6 EPSRC DTP studentships to support these talented newly recruited research stars.

S&E colleagues have continued to publish their research in leading journals, whilst simultaneously working with our faculty communications team to share our expertise with wider press and social media audiences. Over the past few months, we have seen a significant number of articles in Nature. To highlight some key examples, Prof John Iwan Jones from our School of Biological and Behavioural Sciences (SBBS), co-authored an article about the decelerating recovery of European freshwater biodiversity whilst his colleague, Dr Lee M. Henry, put forward a paper on the evolution of symbioses and how this has influenced insect diversification. Dr Tao Liu and Dr Xuekun Lu, from our School of Engineering and Materials Science (SEMS), have published on increasing damage tolerance in 3D orthogonal woven composites and multiscale dynamics of charging and plating in graphite electrodes respectively. In the School of Physical and Chemical Sciences (SPCS), Dr Gavin A.L. Coleman and Prof Richard P. Nelson co-authored a paper on the discovery of only the second confirmed multiplanetary circumbinary system to date, along with international collaborators in Australia, Belgium, France, Portugal, Switzerland and the USA.

In terms of broader reputation building, our research continues to receive considerable press interest.
Notable stories in the past few months have included EECS Prof Xiaodong Chen’s BEIS grant (£960k) which was included as part of the UK Government’s announcement of its’ plans for space-based solar power as well as reported in The Guardian. We have also seen the identification of a new species of dinosaur and the development of lithium plating for electric vehicle batteries leading to faster charging times.

In addition to our grants and publications, S&E have also enjoyed several successes in other activities including conferences and awards. In June, SPCS held the 2023 NOvA Collaboration Meeting – one of the largest International Neutrino Detection Projects. The following month, Prof Jan Mol organised a Future Leaders Network for Quantum Energy Conversion 2023, bringing together important and emerging leaders in this critical new field. July also saw Prof. Alex Fink (SMS) hosting the conference “Queer and Trans Mathematicians in Combinatorics” in support of our School and Faculty EDI goals. Our work on the Night of Science and Engineering showcase preparations also continues apace, with excellent, high-level speakers, including Dr Karen Salt (UKRI Lead for EDI), having been secured to introduce our event.

**Education**

**Graduation**

In July we celebrated the success of our graduating students in eight ceremonies over three days. As always, we were pleased so many of our academic colleagues took part in the ceremonies. We know how much this means to our students and the celebratory atmosphere was a welcome end to a very successful academic year in the faculty.
UG and PGT recruitment

Summary of 2022-23 actual student intake vs estimated numbers for 2023-24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>Y-o-Y change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UGH</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGO</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%OS</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>Y-o-Y change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGTH</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGTO</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%OS</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %PGT     | 29%     | 35%     |

Aligned with Strategy 2030, we made steady progress in changing our size and shape, reducing our reliance on Home UG and growing numbers in PGT, both Home and OS. Over one-third of our new intake this year are PGT. There has been a small shift in the balance between Home and OS in the direction of more OS.

Of note has been the launch of a new MSc Psychology (Conversion) program by the Psychology Department within SBBS. This is designed for students who have undertaken a degree in another subject and are interested in getting a qualification in psychology. This new program was recently accredited by the British Psychological Society (BPS). This accreditation, a key driver for recruitment, enables our conversion program graduates to gain Chartered Psychologist status and enter the professional workforce.

A series of new PGT programs will launch in September 2024 including MSc Engineering Management (SEMS), MSc Actuarial Science and Data Analytics (SMS), MSc Applied Statistics (SMS), MSc Risk Analytics (SMS), MSc Artificial Intelligence for Drug Design (SPCS), MSc Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Science (SPCS) and MSc Biotechnology and Synthetic Biology (SBBS).

Welcome week

Our schools have worked hard to ensure our new students have had an excellent start to their studies with us – both here at Queen Mary and on our TNE programmes. We give our thanks to colleagues across the University who have supported the creation of such a welcome atmosphere on campus.
Satisfaction with Student Experience

Due to changes to the NSS methodology this year we cannot compare absolute scores from NSS 2023 with any of those from previous years. However new data for this year allows us to see the difference from NSS benchmark by comparing the responses of our students to those of a similar demographic.

Our Schools have been putting significant effort into developing and implementing their NSS Action Plans. Across the Faculty it was pleasing to see there were a significant number of high positivity scores and encouraging subject-level rankings. In line with Queen Mary's university-level results, these results show that, though remains much hard work ahead, we are making significant progress in many areas.

We received positivity scores greater than 85% in the theme area 'Teaching on my Course' by students in Biosciences, Chemistry, Materials & Technology, and Physics & Astronomy, whereas 'Learning Resources' were rated particularly positively by students in Maths and Bioscience.

There were several notable achievements in the rankings and benchmarking sections. For 'Student Voice', Chemistry is now ranked 7th in the country, with a positivity score of 88.9%, this was 15.7% above their NSS benchmark. Psychology ranked 13th for 'Organisation and Management' with a score that put them 8.7% above their NSS benchmark. Across S&E there were 14 theme areas where we were rated >2.5% above the NSS benchmark, these included the ‘Student Voice’ in Physics & Astronomy and ‘Academic Support’ in Biomedical Sciences.

Overall, the results show that we still have work to do to improve our students' experience and Education reviews and more specific NSS data meetings are currently ongoing with all Schools in advance of the planning round.

Part of the long-term strategy to improve our UG student satisfaction is a move away from module-centred assessment. This has tended to lead to a high assessment load for students, which we know is unpopular, and is resource intensive. We are moving towards programme-level assessment; this will be happening in SEMS and SPCS for the first time in the coming year, with other Schools bringing ambitious plans forward in the coming months.

At the PGT level, PTES methodology remained unchanged between 2022 and 2023 allowing for direct comparison of results. Against a 1% improvement in overall satisfaction across QMUL, Computing improved 13% (71 -> 84%) and ranked in the top quartile, Engineering improved 9% (70% -> 79%), whilst Biosciences and Maths improved 4% and 2% respectively.
**International**

As part of our expanding co-operation with the Beijing University of Post and Telecommunication, this academic year we started the BSc Digital Media Technology (DMT) with a cohort of 90 students in Hainan; next year we plan to start a new BSc in Biomedical Engineering. In 22/23 we started the BSc in Information and Computational Science (ICS), and 90 students are continuing on this degree for their second year.

The Hainan campus is managed by the Hainan bureau, and 5 educational initiatives operate on the Hainan campus including QMUL's. The infrastructure and facilities are being developed very quickly, and soon the work for a brand new building to be used exclusively by QMUL will begin.

**EDI**

SEMS submitted their application for a Bronze level Athena SWAN renewal on 25th September and we are now awaiting a decision and feedback; this is expected within 12 weeks from the date of submission.

The Faculty is planning our annual Night of Science and Engineering event in 2024 to showcase our outstanding research and education to industry and other stakeholders. This will build upon our successful inaugural event in February and the theme will focus on our commitment to Opening the Doors of Opportunity. To highlight alignment with Queen Mary’s EDI values and to tie in with the International Day of Women and Girls in Science, we are planning an all female panel of inspiring scientists, engineers and policy makers.
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Vice-Principal (Education) Update – September 2023

Education Leadership

1. A series of NSS workshops have taken place between April-June 2023. The 3 workshops covered the different areas of Student Experience as captured within the NSS. The first session (17th April 2023) covered ‘Academic Support’ and ‘Student Voice’ and was delivered by Chris Shelley and QMSU. The second session (18th May 2023) covered ‘Teaching’ and ‘Assessment and Feedback’ and was delivered by the Queen Mary Academy. The third session (01st June 2023) covered ‘Learning Resources’ and was delivered by colleagues in the Library Team and TELT. The notes from the workshop with actionable insights, along with the slides have been circulated amongst attendees and the Directors of Education.

2. The Directors of Education and Programme Directors Fora have resumed from last month, with updates from the Vice-Principal (Education) and the Queen Mary Academy, and a discussion of the School/Institute-level priorities for the 2023/24 academic year.

3. Senate is asked to note that Professor Anthony Michael has completed his term as Dean for Education in the Faculty of Science and Engineering. Colleagues are asked to note the recent appointment of Dr Chris Bray as Dean for Education in the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

4. Professor Arunthathi (Arundi) Mahendran, Professor of Education and Director of the Institute of Health Sciences Education has been awarded a National Teaching Fellowship from Advance HE. The awards celebrate and recognise academics who have made an outstanding impact on student outcomes, student experience and the teaching profession.

5. The Drapers’ Annual Lecture has been rescheduled for the 22nd of November. We expect to start with approximately at 5 pm. Mary Curnock Cook will be delivering the annual Drapers’ Lecture titled: Social mobility, skills, and employability – myths, magic and momentum.

6. Professor Janet De Wilde was invited to present on an Evasys Lunch & Learn webinar, in partnership with HEPI. The webinar topic was How to Evidence Educational Gains and the recording can be found here.

7. Professor Janet De Wilde has recently been appointed as the chair of a new European University Association (EUA) Transnational Education Thematic Peer Group. More details on the appointment can be read here.

8. Professor Stephanie Marshall was invited to speak at a Cadmus AI webinar on The Future of Learning and Assessment with the Emergence of AI. Professor Marshall spoke about the intersection between AI and assessment, when to incorporate it, and how to ensure students’ preparedness on the appropriate use of AI. The webinar was held on 26th June and the recording can be found here.

9. Professor Stephanie Marshall presented at the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER) 2023 conference on Friday 22nd of August. Her presentation is titled Transforming Quality Enhancement of Teaching and Learning and covers the ‘massification’ of Higher Education, key pivot points (with a focus on England) and the continuation of the transformation agenda. The presentation is based on a recent publication of hers in Research Handbook on the Transformation of Higher Education.
Teaching, learning and assessment

10. We are continuing to assess the impact of the Marking and Assessment Boycott on our students, particularly finalists. We are experiencing some disruption to graduation for some students in the English department. The school has already written to affected students apologising and offering ongoing support. Colleagues are working hard to mitigate the impact of this as much as possible. More detail on the industrial action and a repository of communication can be found here.

National Student Survey

11. A full analysis of the NSS 2023 results has now been presented to SET and Faculty Leadership teams. Action plans are being updated accordingly within Faculties and Schools/Institutes. The full statement can be read on connected here.

12. Colleagues are reminded of a few notable changes to the NSS 2023. The overall satisfaction question has been removed for institutions in England and new four-response direct questions replace the previous agree/disagree five-point scales. These changes make it harder to do year-on-year comparisons, even though the five broad NSS themes remain the same. The University-level results show there is room for cautious optimism, although clearly there is much more that needs to be done to realise our TEF 2027 ambitions. Comparing to benchmark, we have slightly narrowed the gap at the overall university level but are still below where we need to be. Overall, the metrics suggest a ‘bronze’ award equivalent on just the NSS 2023 results.

13. The NSS Taskforce met to discuss the NSS results in more detail on the 30th of August. In addition, a series of meetings led by the VP (Education) are taking place with Heads of Schools and Institutes and their education team to discuss their NSS action plans. So far, 11 meetings have taken place, 2 are scheduled and 3 are still TBD. At the end of the visits, we will be providing a faculty summary to identify themes and synergies in the action plans.

14. On the aggregated TEF measure (5 themes from NSS 2023), Queen Mary’s ranking improved from 119th to 116th in the sector. Queen Mary is placed 20th out of 22 Russell Group Universities with results and 27th out of 32 London Universities.

15. In preparation for the TEF 2027 submission, the NSS Task Force continues to receive quarterly updates on the NSS School Action Plans via the Faculties. Part of this exercise includes seeking evaluation and impact data for completed actions from schools. The Deputy VP Education (Programmes & Standards) is also reworking the previous set of NSS targets in context of the change in methodology to help schools project the change in student opinion needed to realise our ambitions for a TEF Gold in 2027.

Student Surveys

16. We now have the 2022/23 Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) sector data for comparison. Overall satisfaction for Queen Mary was 79% in 2022/23. This is 4% below the sector score of 83%, which is the same distance as 2021/22. The 5-year trend shows we are heading in a positive direction, and we have narrowed the gap on the sector. However, all areas of the PTES were still below the sector benchmark. Dissertation was the only area that did not have a negative significant difference from the sector. Visualisations for these can be found in the Appendix, along with a CAH2 Subject-level breakdown.
17. A more detailed report is currently being produced and will be shared as soon as possible. This will cover the institutional and sector data in more detail, as well as Faculty and School/Institute level data. There will be PTES Power BI dashboards being developed, which will make the data much more accessible. It will also make it much easier to analyse the data at a more granular level (e.g., programme level). These are expected to be completed by the end of the first semester 2023/24. For any additional queries about the PTES, colleagues may contact Johnny Dixon (johnny.dixon@qmul.ac.uk).

Queen Mary Academy

18. Senate is asked to note and congratulate the following projects awarded funding in the first year of the new Award of President and Principal’s Fund for Educational Excellence:

- **AI for student learning and research** - Dr Dominic Hurst, Dr Cassandra Lewis (Institute of Dentistry); Paula Funnell, James Soderman, Chenee Psaros, Sharlin Ahmed, Rosella D’Alesio (Library); Nick Fisher, Dr Pedro Elston, Rofique Ali (Institute of Health Sciences Education); Dawn Buzzard, Catherine McLean (TELT) and student collaborators
- **Co-creating AI best practices in higher education (HE): Building AI skills enhancement resources through interdisciplinary Student-Staff Best Practice Sharing Sessions** - Dr Xue Zhou, Dr Joanne Zhang, Dr Lilian Schofield (School of Business and Management); Dr Lesley Howell (School of Physical and Chemical Sciences); Dr Aisha Abuelmaatti (School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science)
- **East London Atlas Project** - Dr Elsa Noterman, Dr Alex Henshaw, Dr Andrew Russell, Dr Philippa Williams (School of Geography)
- **Empowering Skill-Based Education through Virtual Reality** - Dr Lesley Howell (School of Physical and Chemical Sciences); Professor Chie Adachi (Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry); Dr Pedro Elston (Institute of Health Sciences Education)
- **ePortfolio Based Learning for Personal and Professional Development, using the Graduate Attributes Framework** - Dr Timothy Fulton and Dr Sally Faulkner (School of Biological and Behavioural Sciences)
- **‘GenAiring’ Critical Clinical Thinking: A new approach to learning using large language models** - Dr Stuart Miller, Ian Griffiths, Dr Simon Lack, Dr Manuela Angioi, Prof Dylan Morrissey (William Harvey Research Institute), Dr Esther Murray (Institute of Health Sciences Education)
- **Get spotted! a podcast series and a masterclass on communicative practices that make you stand out at university and in your dream job!** - Dr Weronika Fernando and Dr Saima Sherazi (School of Languages Linguistics and Film)
- **How might we create spaces that support human flourishing, enabling students and staff to thrive and innovate?** - Dr Louise Younie, Dr Rofique Ali, Dr Nandini Hayes, Vanessa Thompson (Institute of Health Sciences Education); Professor Chie Adachi (Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry); Dr Nicholas Hostettler (School of Politics and International Relations); Marianne Melsen (QMSU)
- **QMCUR (Queen Mary Centre for Undergraduate Research)** - Dr Giuseppe Viola, Dr Maria Romero Gonzalez, Professor Henri Huijberts, Professor Julia Shelton (School of Engineering and Materials Science)
In addition, the Drapers’ Fund for Innovation in Learning and Teaching for 2023/24 was awarded to:

- **Innovative and diverse creation of teaching materials in Economics, Finance and Business Management: new approaches in the classroom with co-creating Research-Led, Learning by Doing, Peer-Led Team Learning and Teaching with Historical Perspectives** - Dr Daniela Tavasci, Dr Eileen Tipoe, Dr Luigi Ventimiglia (School of Economics and Finance); Dr Xue Zhou and Dr Lilian Schofield (School of Business and Management)

A member of the Queen Mary Academy team will be assigned to support each of the projects.

19. We have now completed Unit 2 of the Educational Leadership Programme. This took place at the Institute of Technology and was co-delivered by our external providers Edison Red. Participants explored a range of leadership skills and practically applied this in the room. On day 2 we were joined by Professor Stefan Krummaker sharing strategic insights and where our focus here at The University needs to be. Participants have now begun their strategic projects, working towards our KPIs and Strategy 2030. Our Heads of School programme launched on 2 October and received very good feedback. We looked at participants leadership journeys so far, where they would like to grow and the leadership challenges currently facing the higher education sector. We have now scoped out our Module Leaders programme and will be sharing more details on this shortly.

20. Dr Sally Faulkner from the School of Biological and Behavioural Sciences has taken up a new Queen Mary Academy Fellowship. Her project will investigate the implementation of Team Based Learning in programmes and measuring its impact in terms of grade outcomes, self-efficacy and confidence development.

21. Dr Xue Zhou from the School of Business and Management will continue as a Queen Mary Academy Fellow. Her new project will focus on developing students’ fundamental knowledge of AI and practical training on AI usage in learning.

22. Dr Luigi Ventimiglia from the School of Economics and Finance will continue as a Queen Mary Academy Fellow. His new project will focus on the creation of a tool to analyse awarding gaps which will support the evaluation of an assessment strategy and its impact on the awarding gap.

23. Dr Lilian Schofield from the School of Business and Management has taken up a new Queen Mary Academy fellowship. Her project will focus on learning by doing across disciplines and Faculties.

24. Dr Anne Ropiquet from the School of Biological and Behavioural Sciences has taken up a new Queen Mary Academy Fellowship. Her project will explore opportunities and challenges for integrating interdisciplinary approaches into our programmes.

25. Professor Graham Easton from the Institute of Health Sciences Education has taken up a new Queen Mary Academy Fellowship. His project will support the co-creation of the medical
undergraduate curriculum, working with students and patients, and will develop training and resources for wider use in co-creation projects across Queen Mary University of London.

26. Workshops for PGR students who teach ran throughout September. Our ‘Teach Your First Session’ (TYFS) workshops cover the basics of lesson planning, active learning, educator roles and inclusive classroom practice. Three Faculty-wide sessions were held, alongside bespoke workshops for Schools and Institutes. Overall, 124 GTAs from across the three Faculties attended our workshops. Follow up sessions are being planned.

27. We welcomed 118 new participants who joined our Taught Programmes (CILT and PGCAP) in September. Applications are now open for the January start.

28. The Student Enhanced Engagement and Development Award, which supports co-creation and recognition at Queen Mary, is going from strength to strength, with 99 students having received an award since the start of the scheme in 2021. Three award panels will take place during 2023/24, providing opportunities to reward and celebrate co-creation projects.

29. We continue to develop and offer workshops and other CPD opportunities supporting education practice with a strong focus on the ACE approach and the Queen Mary 2030 strategy.

Office for Students and Regulatory Matters

30. The government has responded to a higher education reform consultation by outlining their vision for the sector and complement the wider skills revolution to grow the economy. They are based on the recommendations by the Independent Panel Report to the Review of Post-18 Education and Funding. Their priority is to ensure that higher education provides value for money, supports economic growth, and leads to employment opportunities for students. Overall, our initial assessment of these reforms concludes that there are no significant risks or impact on Queen Mary. Key takeaways include:
   a. More investment in Level 4 and 5 courses to support providers in deliver Higher Technical Qualifications with no change to fee limits currently.
   b. Student number controls will be imposed on provisions in breach of B3 conditions – enforced using the OfS’s existing powers.
   c. Minimum eligibility requirements will not be taken forward.
   d. Classroom-based foundation year course fees (price group D) will be cut to £5,760 from 2025/26. For other foundation courses, the maximum fee will remain £9,250 – expected annual fee loss ~£56K. This impact is limited to HSS.

31. The TEF 2023 ratings have now been published on the OfS website. The OfS are now publishing separate ratings for Student Experience and Outcomes along with an overall rating. Queen Mary has received Bronze for Student Experience, Silver for Student Outcomes and an overall rating of Silver. Colleagues can read the message to all staff and students from the VP Education and the QMSU President on Connected, which also has links to our institutional and student submissions for TEF 2023.

32. The VP (Education) is commencing meetings with Heads of Schools and Institutes to discuss the TEF 2023 and NSS 2023 results in more detail, along with our approach to driving up both NSS scores and focusing on improvements to succeed in TEF 2027 to avoid potential financial
penalties from the OfS. In preparation of this exercise, detailed reports of the NSS and TEF results have been shared with faculties and schools.
Appendix

PTES 2023 Sector Data

Queen Mary scored below the sector on 40 out of 43 questions. All areas of the PTES were below the sector benchmark. Dissertation was the only area that didn’t have a negative significant difference from the sector.

Overall Satisfaction

Overall satisfaction for Queen Mary was 79% in 2022/23. This is 4% below the sector score of 83%, which is the same distance as 2021/22. The 5-year trend shows we are heading in a positive direction and we have narrowed the gap on the sector.

CAH2 Subject Level
The visual below shows how our subjects compared to the rest of the sector. It’s important to note that SBM and CLLS had very low response rates (7% and 8% respectively) and it is possible this has impacted our scores in these subjects and doesn’t reflect the true student experience. This highlights the importance of us needing to significantly improve our response rates, particularly in these two schools, as well as SEF – these three schools make up over half of our PTES population.

Further Updates

A more detailed report is currently being produced and will be shared as soon as possible. This will cover the institutional and sector data in more detail, as well as Faculty and School/Institute level data.

There will be PTES Power BI dashboards being developed, which will make the data much more accessible. It will also make it much easier to analyse the data at a more granular level (e.g. programme level). These are expected to be completed by the end of the first semester 2023/24.
Senate update: VP, Policy and Strategic Partnerships: June – October 2023

London City Institute of Technology (IoT)

Works on the IoT capital project have now come to a conclusion, and the full 8 floors of the facility are now open to students and staff with 74 new starts on our Technology Degree Apprenticeships this September. Exploratory conversations with employers such as Ocado, QinetiQ and Unilever are underway for a series of Engineering Degree Apprenticeships (Advanced Robotics Engineer, Systems Engineer & Postgraduate Engineer with Management) for September 2024 entry. We plan to host an internal open day for staff shortly and are working with private office in the Department for Education to secure the Secretary of State for Education to launch LCiOT officially, probably now in 2024.

Degree apprenticeships

ESFA Audit

- The mock ESFA audit has been conducted by KPMG in which they reviewed and scrutinised our internal management control systems and our regulatory checks and balances on the apprentices files. They also used the ESFA Provider Data Self-Awareness Toolkit (PDSAT) to test the integrity of the data, which is also used internally by us to help to identify and mitigate potential problems.
- We will shortly receive their report with the key findings and recommendations to help us achieve greater compliance going forward and improve our data practices so that we mitigate the risk of financial claw back.

Apprenticeship management system – SMART assessor - implementation plan

- We are currently in the development and testing phase of implementation. Staff training has taken place and new processes and systems are being developed and agreed.

Apprenticeship recruitment

- There are approx. 199 new apprentices joining the university this September at Masters and undergraduate degree level. The onboarding and induction activities are taking place, and all apprentices should be fully inducted by mid-October 23.

Civic Impact

- Sarah Gifford (currently Community Engagement Manager, Centre for Public Engagement) will start as Civic Engagement Lead on 6 November. We are delighted to appoint somebody to this role on a permanent basis who brings with them such a deep knowledge of both Queen Mary and our local communities.
- Queen Mary is a leading and founding partner of the Civic Universities Network, which is led by Sheffield Hallam University. We are hosting a dinner for the network on 10 October and hosting a range of local civic partners there.
- We are also hosting an OECD/EECOLE visit to review civic university work in London as part of the National Civic Impact Accelerator Programme on 19 October, with UCL, University of East London, London Metropolitan University, Goldsmiths and University of Northumbria in London participating. QM is a partner
on the NCIA and the Centre for Public Engagement is leading on a strand of work on equitable partnerships, building on pilot workshops held at QM last year.

- Key priorities for the coming academic year include launching a Civic Champions network, developing and delivering a comms and engagement plan internally and externally, availability of space on campus, and finalizing a monitoring and evaluation framework.
- QM’s strategic civic partners are: London Borough of Tower Hamlets; GLA; Barts Health NHS Trust Tower Hamlets Council for Voluntary Service; London Citizens; Ocean Estate Regeneration Trust; Women's Inclusive Team; East London Business Association; Drapers' Multi-Academy Trust; University Schools Trust; Newham FE College. All partners are represented on QM’s Civic Advisory Board, which is co-chaired by Alison Blunt, Deputy Vice Principal for Impact (Culture, Civic & Community) and Aelswith Frayne, Head of Employment and Skills, LB Tower Hamlets.
- From 2023/24, QM's Civic Delivery Group will include all priority theme leads and a representative from the East London Research Network. It will be chaired by the Civic Engagement Lead (Sarah Gifford from early November). Working groups consisting of academic and professional services colleagues will focus on key areas and report to the Civic Delivery Group.
- The next meeting of the East London Research Network will be in November and will focus on research with schools and young people in East London (see e-bulletin for further information and email civic@qmul.ac.uk to join the network).
- As part of the NIHR funded Tower Hamlets Health Determinants Research Collaborative, QM has appointed Briana Applewhite as Health Inequalities Research and Partnerships Manager, based in the Centre for Public Engagement. Briana will work with colleagues at QM, her counterparts at UEL and London Metropolitan University, and with LB Tower Hamlets, Tower Hamlets Council for Voluntary Service, and local residents to develop co-created research and funding opportunities.

**Arts & Culture**

In October, Arts and Culture will be relaunching as the Centre for Creative Collaboration. This reflects the interdisciplinary nature of our mission, to work with colleagues across all faculties to support QM research impact through creative collaborations with the cultural sector. New website pages will be launched to share this news and promote engagement opportunities over the coming year.

- In July, Arts and Culture convened a workshop of major funding bodies for the cultural and creative sectors. The topic was data collection and evaluation, and how greater collaboration between government, universities and funding bodies can create innovate solutions to better support cultural organisations to access data and report on their impact. Attendees included the DCMS data analytics team, Arts Council England, Greater London Authority, Tower Hamlets Council, Esmee Fairbairn and many more. Feedback on the session was positive with many keen to see the network continue. 'I found the creative thinking we were asked to undertake very valuable in terms of my own thinking about approaches to evaluation and how we might develop our own practice as well as supporting other organisations in their evaluation/measurement of impact'. 'It was amazing to see how embedded universities like QMUL are with their local cultural sectors”.
- Following on from a session with the Cultural Advocacy Fellows on AI in the summer, QM is now collaborating with the Turing Institute and the Institute for the Future of Work to put together a proposal on AI impact assessments for the creative industries. Cultural Fellows from Musician's Union, Society of Authors and BECTU technician's unions are all joining the bid which will be submitted to the AHRC in October.
• Arts and Culture have received three years of funding from Research England to develop new toolkits for training young people as peer researchers, to support QM academics and foster a culture of high-quality research with young people. The first year will convene a network of interdisciplinary expertise from across all QM faculties and partners in the local cultural sector.

• The Assistant Producers scheme will be recruiting across October and November, engaging 15 students and recent graduates in a knowledge exchange programme to build skills as creative producers and then support QM research projects and local cultural organisations to deliver and evaluate workshops and events.

Public Engagement

We have secured funding from Research England for 3 years to recruit a Participatory Research Manager to the CPE, who will administer our Participatory Research funding scheme which provides grants of up to £10,000 to Queen Mary staff to undertake Participatory Research projects. We are also currently collaborating with the Young Foundation to develop a bespoke Participatory Research training offer for Queen Mary staff and students, which will launch in 2024.

Briana Applewhite joined the CPE in July as Health Inequalities Research and Partnerships Manager, working on the HDRC (Health Determinants Research Collaboration) project, in partnership with Tower Hamlets Council, London Metropolitan University, and the University of East London.

Sustainability

The new Head of Sustainability and Interim Director of Sustainability in place and have been reviewing existing activity and progress against the 2020-23 Environmental Sustainability Action Plan to inform the development of interim 23/24 action plan and longer-term sustainability strategy, targets and action plan.

The team are working with colleagues around the university develop and take forward initiatives that support the delivery of our sustainability objectives across research, education, operations and external partnerships.

Please do contact the team with any thoughts or questions or ways in which you would like to be involved or to involve your students directly in projects: sustainability@qmul.ac.uk

• Staff and student engagement opportunities to note include:

  • **Sustainability Week 2023** will be week of 13th November.
    • There will a timetable of events hosted by those from teams around QM but also a few centrally organised key events (including Research Highways and QM Academy events) to bring the QM staff and student community together and give people the chance to be informed and engage with sustainability across research, education and operations, and to feed into the development of the sustainability strategy and action plan.

  • Queen Mary Climate Action Week (formerly Green week) will be in February 2024.

  • **New- Sustainability in the Curriculum Network**: community of practice run by QM Academy - first meeting 3 Oct and event 15 Nov. Contact sustainability@qmul.ac.uk or QM Academy to join network.

  • **Student projects on campus**: the Sustainability team are developing opportunities for students to learn and engage with sustainability in action on campus or with local partners. Contact team if interested.
• **Sustainability in Labs network** and LEAF programme: over 15 lab teams currently involved in the LEAF (Laboratory Efficiency Assessment Framework) programme which supports lab to reduce the environmental impact of the research. Contact Sustainability team or Kate Thornton to get involved.

• **Highlights of progress against operational sustainability targets:**
  • Good progress against the 30% carbon reduction target. Queen Mary has a 30% carbon reduction target from 2018/19 to be achieved by 2024/25. Data from energy use in buildings and vehicles- (Scope 1 and 2 carbon) shows that there has been a 30% reduction by FY 2022/23 and that the target is on track to be achieved.
  Further work is required to calculate the university's wider carbon emissions (scope 3) in line with sector reporting requirements for instance those related to business travel, and supply chain. A rolling programme of investment in energy and carbon reduction initiatives across our estate which include LED lighting, building management system upgrades, heat recovery from IT equipment, insulation, boiler upgrades and this alongside grid electricity continuing to decarbonise has helped us to meet our carbon reduction target.
  • Waste targets: Recycling rates have decreased, and a thorough review of waste management is underway to identify actions to reduce waste and increase recycling.

• **Student experience:**
  • The SU and Sustainability team continue to work together with students to deliver an engaging sustainability programme to help students learn, engage and take action. The Big Green Survey and Welcome Week engagement continues to show that this is important to students. A programme of volunteering opportunities, educational opportunities, and engagement opportunities will be offered.
  The first events of this year have been well attended- the Reuse fair and the Canal Clean up.
  • QM submitted a response to the [UKRI draft Concordat for Environmental Sustainability of Research Practice](#) and will be considering how this will need to be taken forward within Queen Mary.
  • Queen Mary is an active member of the Tower Hamlets Climate Partnership which has been reformed to enable Tower Hamlets and those based in the area to support the low carbon transition. There will be opportunities for those with specific research or education interests to be involved in the group.
I would like to begin with a date for Senate’s diaries: our second Research and Innovation Awards will take place on the afternoon of Thursday 2 May 2024. We are aiming to identify a larger venue so we can invite all our nominees and their nominators to join us, and I am looking forward to another memorable celebration. Work is underway to consider how we can improve the nominations process, and further information on this and the awards for 2024 will be announced in due course. I very much hope that Senate will hold the date in their diaries and be able to join us in May.

Future Research Assessment Process response and REF preparations

Queen Mary has submitted its response to the Future Research Assessment Process (FRAP), which is the consultation on the shape of the next REF. I would like to thank everyone who fed into our response, we have been grateful for your considered and careful comments and have included as many as possible within the final submission. The new REF proposes a number of changes, under two main headings: firstly, it aims to shift the level of assessment from the individual to the institution, secondly, it includes a measure of research culture, which Research England view as essential to research excellence. You can read more about the initial decisions and the shape of the consultation here.

Queen Mary welcomes many of the proposed changes to the REF: the enhanced focus on research culture aligns strongly with our institutional value of inclusion, and the new attention to engagement – the process by which we create impact – enables us to showcase our strengths in areas such as public engagement and innovation and our role as a civic university.

However, we are concerned that some of the elements of the submission may have unintended consequences, and we have focussed our FRAP response on these. We are aware that our views are shared by many Russell Group institutions, and are also reflected in their response.

1. We believe the primary purpose of the REF should be to provide evidence of the benefits of public investment to inform allocation of funds. The key way we do this is through measuring research excellence. The element of the submission which does this is the Contribution to Knowledge (formerly Outputs). Given this is the primary purpose of the exercise, we argue strongly that the weighting attached to Contribution to Knowledge should be no less than 60% - anything lower risks diluting the purpose of the exercise.

2. We suggest that the weighting given to the re-shaped People, Culture and Environment element is too high (currently 25%). The precise details of this element are still unknown, and are unlikely to be clear until 2025. Given this, we suggest a weighting of 15% for PCE in recognition this is the newer aspect of the assessment where confidence in the robustness of the approach still needs to build.

3. We highlight the risk of unintended consequences for Early Career Researchers or those who are still establishing programmes of research created by the removal of the criteria for all researchers to submit one output. This could create a perverse incentive to concentrate resources on more established researchers, with important implications for equity and inclusion. We propose that the requirement that all researchers submit one output is reintroduced.
4. We welcome the focus on reducing bureaucracy. However, we highlight that some of the measures proposed for this may not have this effect in practice. One key example here is the use of HESA data to replace the staff list. We are aware of concerns with the HESA Data Futures Project, including the unreliability of the current error reports. We are also aware that the use of HESA will require the addition of more granular UOA level data, with a higher degree of accuracy. While we recognise our responsibility to ensure that our data is accurate and fit for purpose, we believe this potentially creates a significant but hidden administrative burden.

A full copy of our FRAP submission is available from my team on request.

Impact

Over the summer, we have undertaken redesign of the Queen Mary Impact Fund (QMIF), with the aim of achieving four key objectives:

1) Ensure we are funding projects which are most likely to achieve impact of a scale and significance sufficient to be part of a REF return (whether in 2028 or in future REFs).
2) Improve understanding and transparency of QMIF, promoting researcher engagement and trust.
3) Increase the value of making an application to both successful and non-successful applicants, by making better use of internal and external expertise through the process.
4) Clarify post award processes and responsibilities – enabling projects to start more quickly and efficiently once funded.

We have used service design principles to underpin this work. In service design, the needs of the service users are placed at the heart of the work. In this case, our primary users are researchers themselves, although we also considered the needs of impact supporting professional service teams (QMI, BD, CPE…) and of our expert external reviewers.

The redesigned service will offer three levels of award:

1) Exploratory Impact Awards (£5,000 to £10,000): Ideal for testing ideas, planning impact journeys, generating early-stage impacts, and supporting small-scale projects. These awards may lead to larger initiatives.
2) Impact Project Awards (£10,000 to £20,000): Geared toward building on exploratory awards or equivalent-stage projects, these awards focus on specific deliverables to support innovative ideas.
3) Impact Accelerator Awards (£20,000 to £50,000 per project, £100,000 exceptional cases): Targeted at projects with clear opportunities for commercial or societal impact. These awards foster relationships with partners and investors to advance research.

Exploratory Impact Awards are open throughout the year (apart from December). Applications will be assessed as they are received, with the aim of providing rapid feedback and funding to enable researchers to take advantage of emerging opportunities.

Both Impact Project Awards and Impact Accelerator Awards are allocated termly. These awards are assessed by external expert reviewers as well as by an internal panel, and so we need additional time to conduct this process. Deadlines for upcoming calls are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autumn call</th>
<th>Spring call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications close</td>
<td>20 November 2023</td>
<td>11 March 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further information about the calls and the process are available here. Prospective applicants are invited to contact the Impact Team to discuss their application before completing the application form.

Over the past year, the volume and quality of applications to QMIF have grown considerably, with the result that the fund now receives many more applications than it can support. However, the Impact Team is keen to hear from all researchers who have a potential QMIF project, in order that we can provide support to help them submit the strongest possible application to the fund. The team will be working closely with School/Institute Impact Leads over the next year, to support identification of high potential projects in order that we can provide proactive support to the researchers to facilitate their applications to the fund. The Team can also provide advice on external funding that may be suitable for each project, including supporting with applications for these funds.

**Research Culture**

I am delighted to welcome our new Research Culture Team to Queen Mary. As of September, the team of 3 FTE is now fully established, based in the Research Services Directorate but providing support across the university. They are keen to meet with as many researchers as possible and would welcome invitations to attend Departmental or School/Institute meetings. Please contact Mark Whelan, Research Culture Manager, if this is of interest.

Research and Innovation Board will consider a first draft of our Research Culture Strategy in November, and I look forward to sharing a fuller update in my next report. However, in its October meeting, the Board approved the creation of a new Research and Innovation Culture Funding Stream, which will be launched across the university this term.

The scheme will be open to all researchers and research supporting staff, and will allocate £250,000 of funds against two streams:

1) “Grass roots” grants of up to £10,000 are available for projects with potential to create particular benefit in their immediate area – this could be as small a unit as a Centre or a professional services or technical team.

2) Project grants of up to £50,000 are available for larger pieces of work which will add benefit across a number of teams.

Queen Mary uses the Royal Society definition of research culture, which is also widely used by other universities: “Research culture encompasses the behaviours, values, expectations, attitudes and norms of our research communities. It influences researchers’ career paths and determines the way that research is conducted and communicated.”

Given the breadth of this definition, a wide range of projects and activities are potentially in scope for this call, including work to promote EDI, to support career transitions at different stages, to promote collaboration and interdisciplinarity, to support our technicians or to foster team science. I am particularly keen that we use this funding to address areas where we have existing challenges and opportunities to improve our research culture. Mark would welcome informal conversations with potential applicants and is happy to provide early feedback on whether ideas are suitable for the scheme.
Each project will be required to demonstrate how it will build evidence capture and evaluation into its design and will be required to spend its funding by 31 July 2024. Further details of the scheme will be announced in the next few weeks and I would be grateful if Senate could share this opportunity with their Schools/Institutes.

**Business Development**

Business Development continued to support a variety of funding applications including UKRI and IUK funded grants. Working closely with researchers and company partners, the team established some highly innovative research collaborations, and contract research with both large and small businesses alike such as Dr. Wolf Group, Volition, Unilever, Enhance3D, TC Biopharma and Roche.

Of the 58 project enquiries and projects initiated since August with a potential value up to £12.5M, 6 projects have already been signed off with a value of £276,606 in the past 2 months with Thames Water, Table Top R&D Limited, QinetiQ, DSTL and Social Mobility Commission.

KTPs, IUK grants, and industry funded studentships provided excellent knowledge exchange opportunities connecting our researchers with businesses to solve some real-world challenges. 5 IUK bids were successfully supported for S&E with Extend Robotics, Arda Biomaterials, Ranplan (IUK-Singapore), Authentise + Epoc Wires (IUK-Eureka Stars) in August and September.

The team is managing 13 live KTPs (10 for S&E and 3 for FMD) and 3 KTP applications are currently being supported for submission in Nov/Dec.

Ongoing relationship building efforts include attending the BioJapan conference, hosting industry connect days, and meeting with industry partners on campus. The FMD team has coordinated with London & Partners (formerly MedCity) to attend the BioJapan conference in Tokyo and Yokohama, Japan in October 9th-13th. QMUL joins Kings College London, UCL, and Imperial College London, as well as 15 companies and Cancer Research Horizons, to represent Greater London. We currently have 14 partnership meetings scheduled and have additional meetings and pitching sessions to be held with multiple companies from the Ibaraki prefecture.

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Business Development team are working closely with WHRI to organise an Industry Connect Day, focused on Cardiovascular and Metabolism – another focused research theme for FMD (and one being spotlighted at BioJapan). The event is scheduled for the 22nd November 2023 and includes contributions from the research managers of the Blizard Institute and Wolfson Institute, as well as the commercial and partnership leads for FMD. Event planning is progressing well.

In addition to our industry-wide event planned for November, the FMD BD team also arranged an introductory meeting between Bristol Myers Squibb (BMS) and Queen Mary Innovation (QMI) and DERI. The FMD BD team have been developing the relationship between Queen Mary and BMS by working closely with the academic partnerships lead at BMS. The in-person event was attended by the BMS academic partnerships lead and director of early assets (Europe), responsible for bringing new technologies into the BMS pipeline. The meeting gave BMS the opportunity to outline their strategic priorities and for QMI to showcase the promising technologies being develop at QM, as well as DERI to discuss collaborative research opportunities and studentships. We are hopeful that this is the beginning of a strong partnership between the two organisations.

**Joint Research Management Office**
Senate may already be aware of the introduction of The Funding System (TFS) introduced by UKRI to replace J-eS. The aim for TFS was to provide enhanced customer experience. Unfortunately, the system has been affected by several operational issues which have impacted on our ability to submit applications. These issues have affected most UK universities. We have been working with UKRI to raise the issues and understand there will be a full review into the problems with the aim to have the system fully operational as soon as possible. In the meantime, researchers submitting grant applications are advised to do so in advance of the deadline, and to contact Jan Clarke should they have any problems with the system. I would like to pass on my thanks to Jan and her team for all their help supporting our researchers to overcome these challenges, which I know have placed a significant degree of additional administrative burden on the process.

We have been notified that we will be the subject of a Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) inspection for our clinical studies. Dates of the inspection have been announced, and it will take place from 13 – 17 November 2023. The JRMO is currently preparing support plans for the clinical trials team, and beginning preparations with the individuals who will be interviewed by the inspectors. We do not yet know which trials will be inspected and will communicate further once we have this information.

**Doctoral College**

The Doctoral College is continuing its work to develop a comprehensive overview of PGR data within the institution. The current data report was presented to Research Innovation Board in July and suggested Queen Mary undertake a comprehensive review of PGR degree types and fees, in order that we can develop a more considered approach to cost recovery and to enable us to consider the attractiveness of our fee packages in an internationally competitive market. The Fees and Degrees working group with report to Research Innovation Board in February. The working group will analyse the types of PGR degree offered at QMUL as well as the fees charged. The working group will make recommendations for degree types for consideration.

Work is ongoing and close to being completed (January 2024) on the PGR payments project that will support uplift of PGR financial data and support monthly payments to PGR students in receipt of stipends that are administrated through Queen Mary. This will enable us to pay our students more regularly, and is an important part of helping us to provide our PGR students with a first-class experience at Queen Mary.

The Doctoral College has taken on responsibility for PGR training and development and is working on a comprehensive review and audit of training for PGRs. The new PGR training programme will focus on delivering support across the institution to deliver excellent student training and student experience, including how we support future career success whether in universities or in other roles.

Finally, the Doctoral College will be starting a broader programme of work to support diversity and widening participation in PGR at Queen Mary. This builds on the excellent STRIDE internship programme, which was featured by UKRI as part of their ‘Jobs that Change the World’ campaign earlier this year. New activities include providing comprehensive wrap around support for PGR applications and a campaign demystifying PGR and the pathways to research careers. Work is also being done on admissions data to support KPIs around widening participation in PGR.

**Queen Mary Innovation Ltd**

The past academic year has seen a significant expansion in QMI, to enable the team to provide enhanced coverage to all faculties. This will enable us to respond to increased demand from the
Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, and to provide dedicated support to Humanities and Social Sciences for the first time. We have also boosted our communications capacity, particularly with a view to enhancing our engagement with prospective partners and funders for this work.

Other focuses for the QMI team over the past year include:

- Extending the investor network for spinouts, developing fundraising strategies to increase access to capital (in collaboration with other universities and regional partners)
- Contributing to planning for improved entrepreneurship across the University
- Engaging with Barts Life Sciences and others in supporting the Innovation District Development
- Increasing the use of impact funds to accelerate development of promising projects and contributing to revision of impact fund processes.

I am pleased to report that this work is already showing impact. Over 23/23, we recorded 93 new IP disclosures, accompanied by £1.9m new IP Income generated and 24 new IP agreements. Our research lead to the creation of four new spinouts, taking our total portfolio to 24 companies with turnover of over £60million.

Over the next year, QMI will focus on broadening and accelerating the pipeline of licensing and spinout projects. The team will continue work to engage all faculties to stimulate demand and increase project disclosures and will develop training programmes for academics and researchers to increase entrepreneurial skills and awareness of QMI services. They will also focus on external engagement, with key priorities around improving the way we communicate the Queen Mary Innovation story externally and better marketing for technologies and opportunities. Finally, they will focus on raising more funds to progress projects to commercial outcome, including using external accelerators for promising businesses and developing plans to enhance our Queen Mary accelerator funding.
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President’s Report

Key Updates

Autumn Elections
The Students’ Union Autumn Elections are now open, and students are able to submit a short online nomination form to put themselves forward to become an elected student rep for this academic year. While the 6 full-time officer roles and most of the 70+ part-time officer roles were up for election in March, students can still put themselves forward for 11 part-time officer roles, 2 student trustee roles, more than 400 course rep roles and more than 20 PGR subject rep roles.

To encourage students to become representatives, the roles were promoted during the Welcome Fairs with more than 1000 interested students speaking to the Students’ Union team. Colleagues from the faculty education teams in Humanities and Social Sciences, Science and Engineering, the Doctoral College and various schools have also contributed to the promotion of the elections, and we are grateful for their support.

Nominations are open until early October, after which students can submit their votes for their preferred candidates. The successful candidates will receive training tailored to their role, and they will hold office for the 2023/24 academic year.

Rep Handover & Training
Following the Spring Elections in March, our six new full-time officers started their term in office on 1 August. In July and August, the new officers attended a comprehensive training programme covering a wide range of topics such as communication, the higher education landscape, teamworking and representation.

Our new part-time officers also took office on 1 August, and their training is currently ongoing. The training for part-time officers aims to equip them with essential skills for their role, as well as transferable skills such as leadership and inclusivity.

In addition to the training, part-time officers are also having individual meetings with their staff supports to identify their priorities for the year and plan how they will achieve their goals. The officers bring different ideas based on their roles and experiences, with ideas covering topics such as employability, inclusivity, community building, organising social activities and raising awareness about mental health support services.

Performance Sport
Our Talented Athlete Programme, supported by the University, was last year accredited by the ground-breaking dual career scheme. QMUL is leading the way with supporting talented athletes in education in England, having been accredited by an innovative Talented Athlete Scholarship Scheme (TASS) initiative. The Sport England-backed programme supports young sportspeople on the talent pathway, giving them the opportunity to gain qualifications alongside their sporting pursuits, follow other interests, as well as further their personal development. By formally recognising an institution’s commitment to supporting student-athletes, the TASS Dual Career Accreditation Scheme aims to allow athletes to reach their potential in education alongside achieving success in their sport. The programme has received 26 applications, and interviews will be taking place over the next few weeks. By mid-October we will be welcoming successful new student-athletes onto the programme.

We have grown our focus team programme this year and are pleased to be supporting five clubs. QMBL Vipers are returning to the programme and will be joined by QMBL Women’s Fencing, BL Netball, BL Women’s Hockey and QMBL Water Polo. The focus team programme has been created to support teams who have clear performance ambitions within their competitions. Focus teams and their players will benefit from a support network to help them achieve their performance goals including; Access to performance development workshops, opportunity for Strength & Conditioning support, additional staff support on BUCS entries, admin, and travel arrangements, extra publicity around the team e.g. social media and dedicated webpage.

Sport Partnerships
We are pleased to announce that we have continued to develop our cross departmental partnerships with the university and will be working with the Advice & Counselling Service to support two wellbeing programmes and initiatives. We will be supporting a pilot exercise referral scheme for ten students in semester one, and
will also be supporting a black female therapy group initiative. Both programmes will aim to collate data, information and relationships between physical activity and wellbeing. In addition to this, we have worked with the HR and benefits team to enable staff the opportunity to apply for a loan to be used against a 12-month membership at Qmotion sport and fitness centre. We hope that in making this membership more affordable and accessible to our staff, we will be able to encourage more staff to take part in physical activity on campus.

QM Skills Award

We have recently hired a new Student Engagement Coordinator within the student engagement team who will help oversee the SU skills award. There are currently 17 skill sessions planned over the first semester, with a couple more still to be confirmed. Currently we have 89 students signed up for at least one skill session, but this number is expected to grow throughout semester one.

Introduction for University Staff

This year we are introducing an introduction to the Student’s Union for permanent QMUL staff to attend if they wish. This one-hour session will cover an overview of QMSU, our strategic plan, our people, how we help our students during their time at university and signposting resources as well as a chance to ask questions. This is intended to complement their overall induction and increase knowledge and understanding about the Students’ Union. QMUL staff will be able to register to attend via the new CPD Training platform, and we will offer monthly sessions online with the option for an in-person session once a semester alongside a tour of some of our spaces.

Welcome Week

Welcome Fair

The Welcome Fair events at Mile End were a great success with over 10,000 excited attendees attending across the three days of Fairs. There was a great atmosphere across the Great Hall, Students’ Union Hub, Sports Hall and outdoor areas, and the whole event went very smoothly. The event featured 250 stalls from our Student Groups, performance and demonstration areas, sporting activities, university services, an inflatable fun zone and several external organisations and charities. We were also pleased to welcome members of the University SET team who toured the event on day two. There will now be a review to ensure the ongoing success of the event. The event in its current format is certainly at full capacity in terms of both attendee numbers and the number of student groups and organisations who can be accommodated across the existing indoor and outdoor spaces on campus, however we need to ensure the current atmosphere and experience of the event is maintained.

At Whitechapel, the event took place inside the BLSA Building. There were some challenges with crowd numbers due to the popularity of the event, poor weather meaning outdoor activity had to be curtailed and the Garrod Building not being open (a space traditionally also used for the event alongside the BLSA Building). Despite this, feedback from attendees and student groups was positive and there was great engagement throughout the day. Thank you to the Estates team who helped our team navigate the various challenges.

Welcome Crew & Help Squad

Over 120 students volunteered their time over Arrivals Weekend and Welcome Week to help welcome new students across our London campuses. In their standout ‘Here to Help’ red and black hoodies, these volunteers were a key friendly face to help new students feel welcome while they also assisted with move-in to accommodation, moved luggage, signposted to opportunities and supported students in navigating our campuses. The volunteers’ generosity and dedication to ensuring that new students had a memorable first week has been remarkable and we cannot thank them enough for their time, commitment and positive energy! We look forward to expressing our appreciation at the upcoming Thank You Party.

Welcome Events

The Students’ Union delivered a packed programme of events for Welcome Week, that continue at the time of writing into week one. Over 9000 tickets have been sold for these events so far and many were completely sold out. Hundreds more students participated in free / non-ticketed events.

Events took place across the three London campuses and other off-campus locations and have included speed meeting events, craft & planting sessions, comedy nights, sports activities, club nights on and off-campus and trips & tours to locations such as Thorpe Park and Cambridge and walking tours. Our events team also delivered two Boat Ball events down the Thames which were sold out. Dedicated events were also
run for our commuting, postgraduate and international students – helping these students meet other students from within their community, with at least 350 students attending each of these.

Our Freshers’ events programme was complemented by our Try Something New programme that featured welcome events, meet & greets and taster sessions from our student-led groups such as Clubs and Societies, alongside alcohol-free activity and events delivered by our events team. This programme continues throughout semester one.

Reuse Fair
The Reuse Fair was a great success this year. Having trialed a new way of facilitating the event, it was much calmer and smoother. This year we included ticketed timeslots, a token system for individuals to trade for items and dedicated student staff helping with the running of the event. We diverted 1.4 tons of items from landfill and had 427 happy students attend! We are very grateful for the University Sustainability team giving us the budget to have student staff available on the day to ensure the event ran smoothly and we are excited to work with them on ways to keep expanding the Reuse Fair, especially after a large increase in donated items this year compared to last year. Our team will be looking at running a clothes swap event following plenty of clothing donations during reuse collections.

Welcome Communications
The Communications and Marketing team introduced the Students’ Union to new students through our Welcome communications campaign. Launching on A-Level Results Day and running through to the end of September the campaign was fully segmented for the first time. All UK home students received a welcome pack in the post, and for the first time this included all postgraduate taught and postgraduate masters students. This was supplemented by a series of email communications split by undergraduate/postgraduate taught/postgraduate research, campus location, home/international and associates. The segmentation resulted in our highest-ever open rate, averaging at over 85% and click-through rates higher than 40%. There was also a strong social media campaign fronted by our student reps and Executive Officers and dedicated online webpages, seeing 18% more page hits than last year, beating our previous highest page views during the welcome period.

Welcome Week & supporting the university
The Students’ Union worked in partnership with the university to deliver a successful Welcome Week programme. As well as the activity listed above, this included co-delivering several events such as the Wellbeing Fair and directly supporting other activity such as the Library Square Information Fair and chillout zone.

Due to the challenging weather conditions during Welcome Week we supported university activity that had been due to take place outside. For example, the University Wellbeing Fair was re-located from Graduate Square to the Students’ Union Hub on the morning of the event, disrupting our own set-up of the Welcome Fair but ensuring the best experience for students. The International Student Welcome and other school welcome events were also moved from outdoors to the Students’ Union Hub with little notice on the day, but we were happy to help where we could and all went well.

Our Venues & Events team also worked with several schools to host social activity and welcome events across our spaces including offering food & drink, games and craft sessions and icebreaker activities. We also worked with the Residential Life team to deliver a series of online speed meeting events for all halls prior to Welcome Week. Over 500 students participated in these online activities prior to their arrival at university, helping them to meet their new flatmates and make connections prior to their arrival.

Student Voice & Education
Russell Group Students Union
In August, Serena-Amani Al Jabbar, President, and Aisha Qadi, Vice-President, Science and Engineering, attended the Russell Group Students’ Union first residential of the year in Cardiff. During the event the group discussed the pressing issues students have and continue to face nationally and how to proceed and find solutions. Two of the main topics discussed were the rising cost of living and industrial action. Both attended a follow up September forum in which the group considered what actions were needed by the RGSU and how to lobby to better the student experience nationally.
Postgraduate Representation
Matthew Beach, Vice-President Communities, continues the work of his predecessor, increasing representational infrastructure for postgraduate students (both taught and research). He is working closely with PGR students and reps to continue lobbying the university in areas of struggle during the ongoing cost of living crisis, in particular those students on international scholarships whose stipends do not meet the UK Research and Innovation minimum funding amount.

Matt has also started scoping for a potential overhaul of the SYMPA listservs used across the university by Schools/Institutes to reach their postgraduates, which many postgraduate student representatives use (where possible) to ask for feedback from their constituents. He has also begun facilitating scoping meetings with university representatives and working with the Students’ Union Comms team to find ways of increasing his role’s visibility for postgraduates.

Institute of Technology (IoT) and Degree Apprentices
Aisha was invited to the IoT where she presented to students about the Students’ Union and how they can get involved. Aisha spoke with students about the representative structure and student voice, gathering feedback on how to improve these areas for this unique group. Aisha is working with S&E on increasing engagement between Degree Apprentices and the Students’ Union.

Authentic Assessments & Academic integrity
Aisha is working to review and improve the format of assessments within the faculty, ensuring that students get a diverse range of assessments to improve authenticity and gain employability principles. This in turn would improve integrity of assessments. Aisha has been discussing with faculty executives on the challenges academics may face with students using AI, such as chatGPT, and instead work on how students can use it effectively in assessments. To help inform this work, Aisha attended a WonkHE workshop, alongside Jovani, Vice President of Humanities and Social Sciences, that discussed what great assessment looks like, how it might change in light of generative AI, what students might want from assessments, and how Students’ Unions can shape the assessment agenda.

Employability Curriculum
Aisha is working on a proposal for her project to embed employability principals onto the curriculum within the faculty of Science & Engineering. The project is to focus on implementing criteria such as graduate attributes, graduate outcomes and more across all schools and course for both undergrads and postgrads. She has had several meetings with QM-Academy, the Careers & Enterprise Team, as well as faculty executives in S&E to discuss this project and how we can begin to review the curriculum to implement the employability principals.

Welfare & Liberation
Lighting Improvement
Tahmid Khan, Vice President Welfare, is working to improve the lighting provision on and off campus. At present, the focus of the project has been on off-site lighting, with a particular emphasis on the areas surrounding Mile End Campus and Whitechapel Campus. Tahmid has met with senior members of Tower Hamlets Council to discuss the project and identify common areas of interest. He has also met with staff from the University of Cambridge Students’ Union, who worked on a similar project, to gain insight into developing a long-term project strategy.

Tahmid collected primary data on the lighting provision on and off-campus at Mile End and Whitechapel at the end of August. Using this data, Tahmid is compiling a paper detailing his findings and recommendations for areas of improvement, which will be sent to members of Tower Hamlets Council and relevant members of the University, respectively.

Black History Month
Matthew and the team have begun planning for Black History Month which begins in October with the planning led by an Organising committee made up from Students, Reps and Student Group members who self-identify as part of this community. This committee have been enthusiastic with their ideas, discussing culture and fashion showcases, various workshops on different issues that affect the community and creating content for the month to be used online. Upcoming events include a book club with Alumni Caleb Femi, which will coincide with sharing content, student spotlights and supporting student-led events in preparation for October.
Women’s Safety on Campus

Aisha is working to improve women’s safety on campus this year. She is currently working with the Sexual Assault Harassment Advisory team at QM to introduce a survey by the Students’ Union on women’s safety. The data will be used to write up a report for the university on what is needed on campus. The survey content & details will include questions on women’s experience on campus, how safe they feel, the support they get, as well as what events/campaigns students would like to engage with when it comes to raising awareness.

Accommodation Review Platform

Tahmid is working on creating a platform that would allow students to review and give feedback on their accommodation and their housing provider. The platform is to be located on our website. The project aims are to provide both the Students’ Union and the University a more regular source of information on the student experience within the accommodation sector. Tahmid has begun meeting with Housing & Residential Services staff to discuss the project and to build a collaborative approach for developing the review platform.

Improving the Multi-Faith Provision

Tahmid has been working with the team to write a paper on engaging with the university to develop the multi-faith provision. This is part of a broader push to improve multi-faith spaces on campus, as they have been identified as inadequate for several years. A draft paper, which is to be presented to relevant members of the University for feedback, is currently being prepared.

Additionally, Tahmid has been providing support to finalise the Multi-Faith Centre timetable for the first semester of the new academic year, and this has now been released. It is hoped that reverting back to a semester based timetable will allow for more flexibility in usage times and result in greater satisfaction rates amongst student groups. The new system will be reviewed at the end of the first semester.

Cost of living

Serena and Tahmid Khan, VP Welfare, met with the Higher Education Policy Institute to discuss and contribute to a paper titled ‘How to beat a cost-of-learning crisis: Universities’ support for students’. The paper allowed the team to reflect on their struggles as students and help shape the means in which we prioritise how to support students during the cost-of-living crisis going forward.

Students Who Work

Jovani has worked with the team to start to gather data for his ‘Students Who Work project with Careers and Enterprise providing support. Jovani is aiming to pinpoint the most overwhelming problems that students who work face in order to identify how to narrow any gaps and ensure these students are able to reach their full potential.

Student Opportunities

Student Groups

Our 2022-23 student group feedback survey, conducted over summer, showed a positive increase in student group experiences for both committee members and student members. 87.2% of committee members felt part of a community with 71.6% of student members feeling part of a community and feeling welcome in their student group. 91% of committee members felt they had made a positive impact to student group member’s experience. 94% of committee members felt they had developed skills through their committee role. We asked a new question this year to committee members on the impact their role had on their wellbeing with 77% saying their role had a positive impact on their wellbeing. Our Impact & Engagement Intern will be working to improve some key focus areas such as reward and recognition and our social media presence. We are very pleased with the results of the feedback survey, and we plan on retaining such positive results.

This year is already shaping up to be another busy one for all our student groups! We have already hosted extra training this month for all student groups, as well as volunteer group and student media induction sessions taking place recently. Welfare Rep training is currently taking place which is being co-delivered by our Student Engagement Team, Sports Club Team and Student Voice team. The Student Engagement Team have been working on ways to collect success stories from our student groups so that we can celebrate all the amazing work they do in a more visible way. The team are very excited for the year ahead and we can’t wait to support all the amazing work our student groups do.
Sustainability

The canal clean ups continue to be popular, with our first Big Green Canal Clean, partnered with Residential Life, taking place at the end of September. Our Sustainability Officers are very engaged, with great projects planned including a medicinal herb garden, creating social green spaces, litter picks and a sustainability hub. Sustainability training has been delivered to Student Groups and will be rolled out to Sports Clubs at the end of September. Teams from across the Student’s Union will actively contribute to the Green Impact Accreditation effort this year including Student Voice, Student Engagement, Exec Members and the Events Team.

We have also been working closely with the new QMUL Sustainability team on a variety of projects including a student evaluation of sustainability in the curriculum, creating student roles, a Sustainability Action Network and pulling together a new Sustainability Strategy.

Matthew is working with the team to bid for a Centre for Public Engagement Large Grant to fund a role that would work with external partners to engage the public with the University and help achieve the partners sustainability goals. Matt is also creating links between the Students’ Union and other parts of the university, including a collaboration with the Institute for Humanities and Social Sciences Environmental Futures Programme Director. Upcoming plans include bringing an arts organisation to speak about photography and environmentalism during Sustainability Week and a Sticky Campus proposal combining tropical and subtropical plant teaching and learning, alumni engagement, and an arts/culture display.

Volunteering

At the time of writing, there are 65 volunteering opportunities for students to choose from on our Community Volunteering Hub, as well as two Give Volunteering A Go opportunities, and nine student-led volunteering groups that students can join. The Volunteer Fair is set to take place the week commencing 2nd October, date to be confirmed due to recent TFL strikes being announced, and this will be an opportunity for students to meet 48 of our partner charities and 7 of our student-led volunteering groups.

Get Active

Get Active is a part of our recreational sport programme offering a timetable of weekly sport and physical activity opportunities for students, staff and alumni. We are excited to introduce a broader range of sessions this year to engage more of the university community to take part in physical activity and will be offering yoga, meditation and dance in addition to our usual sporting offers which include badminton, football, table tennis and many more.

The programme has had a successful start to the academic year, firstly with the employment of 5 new student staff members. Get Active supports the university by running pop-ups on campus for events and key university dates and this included supporting the Residential Services across Arrivals Weekend. Pop-ups were also run across the Welcome Fairs, with 418 students taking part across activities such as badminton, cornhole, touch tennis and table tennis. The programme has expanded this year and has grown its partnership with residential services offering exclusive membership options to our residents.

Club Sport

Club sport has started the year with clubs currently undertaking their extensive programme of committee training. We had 65 clubs in attendance at both Mile End and Whitechapel Welcome Fairs welcoming all new and returning students. The Club Sport Board and Sports Officers will be having their first meetings in October which allows the opportunity to discuss new club affiliations and key dates this year. The first round of the Development Fund will be taking place in October, which will be an opportunity for clubs to apply for extra funding to support and develop their club. Leagues will be starting on Wednesday 12 October for BUCS and/or LUSL, and we are very excited to see how our teams perform this upcoming year.

Social Leagues

The Social Leagues will commence the week beginning Monday 10 October. This year we will be running football, netball, basketball and cricket. The leagues will also be recruiting and upskilling student staff as umpires, referees and officials over the next few weeks.

Dentistry PTSR Social Responsibility Volunteering

Inductions have been delivered to Year 2, 3 and 4 UG Dentistry students, as well as Year 1 Dental Hygiene students and some Foundation students. These students complete a minimum of 8 hours of volunteering per academic year for their Professionalism, Teamwork and Social Responsibility module. Students can choose
which of our volunteering opportunities to take part in. Last year a number of these students chose to continue volunteering, including 3 students achieving bronze volunteering hours awards (25+ hours), and 3 achieving silver volunteering hours awards (50+ hours).

**Raise and Give (RAG)**

Student Groups have already started their RAG fundraising for the year, including Groups fundraising for the earthquake in Morocco. Last year an impressive £64,859.69 was raised across the year, so we look forward to seeing how much is raised this year.

*Serena–Amani Al Jabbar*
*Students' Union President*
*28th September 2023*
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## Paper Title
Code of Practice on Free Speech

### Outcome requested
To consider and provide feedback on the Code of Practice on Free Speech before the Code is submitted to Council for approval.

### Points for Senate members to note and further information
- Senate is being consulted on the revisions to the Code of Practice on Free Speech.
- Note the indicative timelines for implementing the new regulatory approach by the OfS.
- Note the further work to be undertaken in relation to ensuring compliance to the new legislation and regulation.
- Discuss the Code of Practice on Free Speech (an updated Free Speech Policy) in Appendix A.
- An additional paper on ‘Measures to secure and promote Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech’ has been prepared by Dr Shah and Professor Saha. The recommendations for training, implementation and review of existing policies align with the proposals in this paper. The draft Code sets out how complaints will be considered and the proposal to create a new Vice-Principal role is not supported although we do envisage a role for champions at various levels across the institution.

### Questions for Senate to consider
- Does the Code clearly articulate the values of QMUL in relation to freedom of speech?
- Are the roles and responsibilities clearly articulated?
- Is Senate satisfied that the Code reflects the requirements of the legislation?

### Regulatory/statutory reference points
The Free Speech Policy has been significantly updated to reflect the new obligations of the Free Speech (Higher Education) Act. It is proposed that the Policy will now be referred to as the Code, since this more closely reflects the requirements of the legislation.

The OfS has now published indicative timelines for their regulatory approach. New statutory duties come into force on 1 August 2024 and the OfS complaints scheme will be launched at this time. New conditions of registration and monitoring of overseas funding will come into force from 1 September 2025.

The proposed Code ensures the Queen Mary is compliant with the new legislation and the associated regulatory requirements from the OfS. The Code has been subject to external legal review, but a final legal review will be undertaken prior to submission to Council.
| **Strategy and risk** | The Code upholds and reinforces the University’s commitment to academic freedom and free speech, in support of the 2030 ambitions, including to ‘foster innovation and creativity, disrupt conventional thought, and respond with imagination to new opportunities to further our vision, mission and academic ambitions.’

The Strategic Risk Register includes a risk related to a ‘failure to comply with the ongoing conditions of registration with the OFS’. The risk tolerance for this risk is 8 and there is a low level of appetite for this risk. |
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<td>Danny Hassell, Policy and Governance Lead</td>
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1. Introduction and Executive Summary

1.1 The Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023 is now law, having received Royal Assent in May 2023. The Bill was first introduced to parliament in May 2021. As a result of the legislation, updates to the Code of Practice are required.

1.2 The University’s current document is the ‘Freedom of Speech Policy’, however, to bring the name in line with the references within the legislation and other institutions, this policy will be known going forward as ‘The Code of Practice on Free Speech’.

1.3 The Code will be approved by Council, but the Code also requires that Senate should be consulted on revisions. Therefore, the Code is being submitted to Senate for consultation before being recommended to Council for approval at its November meeting.

1.4 The Act sets out the specific requirements that should be included within a provider’s Code:

(a) the provider’s values relating to freedom of speech and an explanation of how those values uphold freedom of speech,
(b) the procedures to be followed by staff and students of the provider and any students’ union for students at the provider in connection with the organisation of:
   (i) meetings which are to be held on the provider’s premises and which fall within any class of meeting specified in the code, and
   (ii) other activities which are to take place on those premises and which fall within any class of activity so specified,
(c) the conduct required of such persons in connection with any such meeting or activity, and
(d) the criteria to be used by the provider in making decisions about whether to allow the use of premises and on what terms (which must include its criteria for determining whether there are exceptional circumstances).

1.5 The OfS has also advised that they consider that ‘such a code should provide a broader framework for ensuring free speech at the university or college. This means that we would expect a university’s free speech code to include broader statements about free speech and academic freedom, and to extend to activities such as teaching and curriculum content’.

1.6 This Code has undergone external legal review and has been discussed by a working group of Senate. As a result of the feedback received, the current version of the Code has been drafted and has been considered by SET.

2. Legislative Context and Background

2.1. The legislation places the duty on higher education providers to take the steps that, having ‘particular regard’ to the importance of freedom of speech, are reasonably practicable for it to take to secure free speech within the law for staff,
members, students and visiting speakers. In relation to academic staff, there is also the duty to secure their academic freedom. Academic freedom means freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom and put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing them at risk of loss of their job or privileges or the ability to secure promotion or employment at another institution.

2.2. There are several further practical elements as to how providers must demonstrate this, including maintaining a code of practice, preventing the use of non-disclosure agreements related to sexual abuse, sexual harassment or sexual misconduct, or bullying and harassment and requirements related to the recording of overseas funding.

2.3. The legislation introduces, for the first time, duties upon students’ unions in relation to having particular regard to the importance of free speech.

2.4. The law allows for civil claims for a breach of duty (a statutory tort), meaning a person can bring civil proceedings against a provider or the students’ union in respect of a breach of any of the above duties if that breach causes the person to sustain a loss. However, proceedings may only be brought where the person has brought a complaint on the matter under the relevant complaints scheme and a determination made in respect of the complaint.

2.5. Providers are also required to actively promote the importance of free speech and academic freedom.

2.6. The legislation places duties on the OfS to promote the importance of free speech and academic freedom, including through the introduction of initial and ongoing conditions of registration related to free speech. In particular, this means that the OfS must ensure institutions have in place adequate and effective management and governance arrangements to secure compliance by the governing body of the institution with their duties.

2.7. The legislation also introduces a free speech complaints scheme, to be operated by the OfS and for the OfS to appoint a director for freedom of speech and academic freedom to oversee the performance of their free speech functions.

3. Implementation and Compliance

3.1. The first director for freedom of speech and academic freedom, Arif Ahmed, took up his post on 14 August 2023. The OfS have advised they now expect to consult on key elements, such as the new conditions of registration, to give providers, staff, students and other interested parties an opportunity to inform their approach.

3.2. The OfS have stated they are taking a phased approach to implementing their new regulatory approach and have published indicative timelines for this. On 1 August 2024, the new statutory duties on free speech, including for students’ unions come into force and the OfS will launch their free speech complaints scheme. On 1 September 2025 the conditions of registration on free speech and
academic freedom will come into force, together with the provisions related to
the OfS’ monitoring of overseas funding.

3.3. Further work will be undertaken by Directorate of Governance and Legal Services
to create an action plan focussed on ensuring compliance with the legislation and
regulation and the implementation of the Code, working with others across the
University as required.

3.4. The content of this plan is likely to include:
- Possible training and/or guidance being made available for academic
  staff.
- Checking that any overseas funding is record in a manner which would
  enable reports to be run, if required by the OfS.
- Reviewing any associated policies and procedures to ensure compliance
  and suitable references to the Code, for example HR policies and events
  procedures.
- Ensuring there are fit for purpose procedures for handling complaints
  related to free speech and academic freedom, considering the proposals
  from the OfS for their complaints scheme.

3.4 The plan will also evolve as further details of the regulatory approach of the OfS
becomes clearer.

4. Consultation and Engagement

4.1. Last academic year Senate established a working group, including academic
members and representatives of the SU to review the Code. Key issues raised by
the group and addressed within the revisions include:
- Aligning information on legislation more closely with specific wording of the
  legislation itself.
- Providing greater clarity on the university’s values and how these relate to free
  speech.
- Inclusion of references to academic freedom.

4.2. The initial drafts of the Code, prior to discussions of the working group, were
subject to external legal review and the final proposed Code will also be reviewed
externally before being submitted to Council for approval.

5. Next Steps

5.1. Feedback will also be sought from the SU. The code will then we submitted to
Council for approval.

5.2. Further work will be undertaken associated with the development of the action
plan and completion of associated work to ensure compliance.
Code of Practice on Free Speech

1. Introduction and Values

1.1. Queen Mary University of London (‘Queen Mary’, ‘the University’) has a longstanding commitment to promoting and encouraging free debate and enquiry. This commitment is enshrined within the University Charter, which states that:

The University shall uphold freedom of speech within the law and academic staff shall have freedom within the law to question and test accepted ideas, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges [academic freedom].

1.2. The values of free speech are fundamental to the University’s academic mission. The university:
   a) encourages individuals to express themselves freely and to hold their own opinions, even if their views or are unpopular or could upset or offend others;
   b) expects mutual respect and tolerance of those with different views;
   c) recognises that free speech must operate within the law.

2. Purpose

2.1. The purpose of this Code is to ensure that as far as reasonably practicable, freedom of speech within the law is secured for members, students and employees of Queen Mary as well as for visiting speakers and that academic freedom within the law is secured for academic members of Queen Mary.

2.2. In matters of free speech and academic freedom, this Code will take precedence over other policies and procedures of the University.

3. Legislative Context

3.1. Queen Mary has adopted this Code of Practice (‘the Code’) to ensure that it acts in accordance with the duties imposed upon it by Section 43 of the Education (No 2) Act 1986, as updated by the Higher Education and Research Act 2017 and the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023.

3.2. Also, there are other requirements that the Queen Mary must consider, to comply with various elements of legislation and regulation.

3.3. The Education Act (No 2) 1986 (Section 43) imposes specific obligations on higher education providers (‘providers’) to promote and protect freedom of speech and
requires that they: “shall take such steps as are reasonably practicable to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured for members, students and employees of the establishment and for visiting speakers.” The Act includes a duty on provider governing bodies to issue and keep updated a code of practice setting out the procedures to be followed by members, students and employees in connection with meetings on the provider’s premises.

3.4. The Education Reform Act 1988 (section 202) (reinforced by the Higher Education and Research Act 2017) makes clear that academic staff have freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges they may have at their institutions.

3.5. The Higher Education and Research Act 2017 (HERA) makes it clear that all universities and colleges which register with the Office for Students (OfS) must uphold the existing laws around freedom of speech and follow the OfS’s regulatory framework. Under the framework the governing bodies of registered universities and colleges should take ‘such steps as are reasonably practicable to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured within the provider.’ HERA also includes a general duty for the OfS to protect institutional autonomy including academic freedom.

3.6. The Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023 requires higher education providers (‘providers’) to have particular regard to the importance of freedom of speech and take steps that are reasonably practical to secure freedom of speech within the law for staff, members, students and visiting speakers. It also requires providers to secure academic freedom within the law for academic staff.

3.7. Freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 9) and freedom of expression (Article 10) are safeguarded by the European Convention on Human Rights and incorporated into UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998.

3.8. The Equality Act 2010 places a duty on Queen Mary to have due regard to the need to; eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between all members of the University’s community.

3.9. The Protection from Harassment Act 1997 creates both civil and criminal offences for harassment and makes provision for protecting persons from harassment and similar conduct.

3.10. The Public Order Act 1986 contains a range of criminal offences relating to violent conduct, speech or actions that threaten violence or cause fear, harm or distress. The Act also makes it an offence to use threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour either with the intention of stirring up racial and religious hatred, or in circumstances where it is likely racial or religious hatred will be stirred up as well as stirring up hatred on grounds of sexual orientation.

3.11. The Terrorism Acts of 2000 and 2006 define certain criminal activities including inciting acts of terrorism, disseminating terrorist publications or belonging to or supporting proscribed organisations. Terrorism is defined as including the use or threat of serious
violence against a person or serious damage to a property for the purpose of
advancing a political, religious or ideological cause. The Counter Terrorism and
Security Act 2015 places an obligation on Queen Mary to have due regard to the need
to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism (‘the Prevent Duty’).

4. Scope

4.1. This Code is applicable to:

a) the legal personality of Queen Mary University of London;
b) all persons (academic or otherwise) working for the University or undertaking
duties on its behalf, including members of Council;
c) all students at the University, including those who are registered, in association, or
affiliates, and including those taking part in activities organised by Queen Mary
Student Union (‘QMSU’) and by its affiliated clubs, societies and other groups;
d) visitors speaking at or taking part in meetings, events or other activities on
University or QMSU managed premises (including lectures, seminars, committee
meetings, conferences whether live streamed or recorded) and any other activities
(referred to as ‘events’)
e) all events and meetings held by the University or endorsed by it or using its
facilities whether including an external speaker or not, together with all events
which are University organised, funded or branded, including events organised by
individuals, groups or societies using its name or resources (including lectures,
seminars, committee meetings, conferences whether live streamed or recorded)
and any other activities (referred to as ‘events’)

5. Principles

5.1. Queen Mary is committed to securing the freedom within the law of its academic staff
to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial
or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves at risk of loss of their jobs or
privileges at the university or the likelihood of their securing promotion or different
jobs at another provider being reduced.

5.2. The University operates a presumption that exposure of students to course materials
and statements made and views expressed by a person as part of teaching, research or
discussions about any subject matter that is connected with the content of a course
are unlikely to constitute harassment unless otherwise demonstrated that these
matters do in fact amount to harassment.

5.3. The University does not take an institutional position on political, cultural and
religious debates. Instead, it endeavours to provide a platform to facilitate discourse
on contemporary issues by encouraging critical debate within the law, where
expression of views within the law by different parties is tolerated.

5.4. This means that we encourage a wide range of views which might entail the airing of
opinions and ideas that are unpopular, controversial or provocative and foster an
environment where academic freedom and freedom of speech and expression is
secured within the law.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

6.1. Council is responsible for the approval of this Code.

6.2. Responsibility for the interpretation and implementation of this Code is delegated to the President and Principal (the Principal Officer) by the University’s Council.

6.3. Heads of Schools and Institutes, Directors of Research Institutes and Centres, Directors of Professional Services and the President of the Students’ Union are responsible for the day-to-day implementation of this Code and accountable to the President and Principal for ensuring that this Code and its principles are applied consistently across all activities under their management.

6.4. In academic schools and institutes, including research institutes and centres, the responsibility of implementing this Code relates to all education and research related activities and events organised or sponsored by the school or institutes.

6.5. The President and Principal shall report to Council on the circumstances of any significant infringements of, and departures from, the provisions of this Code. Any such infringements or departures, in whatever respect, may render those responsible liable to disciplinary action under the relevant University policy.

6.6. For the purposes of procedures for events (Section 7, below), the following are considered ‘Designated Officers’; Heads of Schools and Institutes (for events hosted within their respective schools and institutes) and for all other events, the Designated Officer will be the Head of Security, or their designated deputy.

7. Procedures for Events

7.1. Procedures relevant to this Policy (such as those for booking rooms or arranging events on campus) shall be published separately and may be subject to change as the need arises.

7.2. All room bookings will be made in line with the relevant room booking policies and procedures. Nothing in those policies and procedures will conflict with the principles of this Code.

7.3. In considering whether to permit its premises (including online platforms) to be used for (or its name to be associated with) a particular activity on campus or remotely, Queen Mary will apply a clear policy of free speech within the law. In doing so, the University will consider whether the views or ideas to be put forward (including the manner of their expression) or whether the activity in question:

a) constitutes a criminal offence (and whether a participant has a previous conviction in relation to words either written or spoken);
b) constitutes a threat to public order (including whether a participant is from an organisation that is officially proscribed by the UK Government);
c) constitutes a threat to the health and safety of individuals attending the event or in the locality, which cannot be satisfactorily managed;
d) incites others to commit criminal acts;
e) infringes the legal rights of others or breaches legal requirements in respect of non-discrimination.
f) seeks to disrupt an authorised event or activity, on Queen Mary premises or online; any protest must be conducted without infringing the rights of others, including the right to freedom of speech.

7.4. The expression of views which are unpopular, controversial or provocative or which cause offence do not, if lawful, constitute grounds for the refusal or cancellation of an event or an invited speaker.

7.5. Queen Mary reserves the right to impose such conditions upon the use of its facilities as are reasonably necessary for the discharge of its obligations relating to the health and safety of its registered students, employees and other persons lawfully upon its premises or for the efficient conduct and administration of its functions. Conditions for events may include, for example, restrictions on access by those outside the University.

7.6. Queen Mary reserves the right to decide that practical considerations such as the cost, short notice period or difficulty of providing the necessary mitigations may require an event to be modified, curtailed, postponed or - in exceptional circumstances – cancelled. The University will bear the cost of appropriate security for approved events to safeguard freedom of speech within the law.

7.7. Queen Mary expects speakers and those taking part in activities to respect the values noted above (in section 1), to be sensitive to the diversity of its community, and to show tolerance to all sections of its community. These precepts apply in particular to the way in which views are expressed and the form of activities, including any form of protest activity.

7.8. Permission may be withheld only on the grounds indicated in 7.3, 7.5 and 7.6, or if the organiser cannot or will not ensure compliance with any conditions set by the Designated Officer. It shall, in all cases, be open to the Designated Officer to invite the Police to be present at any activity on University premises or premises managed by QMSU.

7.9. It shall be open to the Designated Officer to withdraw permission for an activity if, having originally granted permission, he or she so judges that the activity will not in fact conform to this Code.

7.10. It shall be open to the Designated Officer to withdraw permission for an activity or event to be held in association with the name of Queen Mary University of London where the meeting or event is being held on premises or online platforms not owned or controlled by the University.
8. Appeals and Complaints

8.1. Appeals against the rulings of the Designated Officer, in relation to events and speakers, may be made to the President and Principal, whose decision shall be final. The President and Principal may delegate the consideration of such an appeal to the Chief Governance Officer and University Secretary. Such an appeal must be received within two working days of the decision of the Designated Officer.

8.2. Any complaints related to events organised by QMSU will be subject to the relevant complaints policy/procedure operated by QMSU1.

8.3. Students can submit a complaint related to concerns about matters that affect the quality of a student’s learning opportunities or student experience via the Student Complaints Policy2.

8.4. Academic Staff can submit a complaint related to their academic freedom as part of HR Codes of Practice3.

8.5. Any other complaints related to free speech at the University may be submitted for consideration under the University’s Whistleblowing Procedure.

9. Review

9.1. This Code will be reviewed at least every three years. Senate will be consulted as part of any review and on any significant revisions of the Code.

9.2. Minor revisions to this Code that do not affect the rules, principles or intent of the Code may be approved by the University Secretary and Chief Governance Officer on behalf of Council.

---

1 https://www.qmsu.org/governance/
2 https://arcs.qmul.ac.uk/media/arcs/policyzone/academic/Student-Complaints-Policy-(2022-23).pdf
3 https://hr.qmul.ac.uk/procedures/ & https://hr.qmul.ac.uk/media/hr/docs/working-at-qm/policiesprocedures/Introduction-2010.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Measures to secure and promote Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome requested</td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>consider</strong> new internal roles, processes, training and reviews as proposed in this paper, in response to the <a href="https://www.gov.uk/higher-education-freedom-of-speech-act-2023">Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points for Senate members to note and further information</td>
<td>The Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023 introduces new duties and additional risks for universities. These include a new Free Speech complaints scheme at the OfS (Office for Students) and a new statutory tort. A QMUL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech is required by the Act and should be considered for approval by Senate in its October 2023 meeting. However, as this paper explains, it is also of paramount importance that QMUL sets up appropriate internal roles within the university and new robust internal processes, mechanisms, training, and policy reviews to comply with the Act and minimise possible risks. Relevant sections of this paper may also need to be reflected in a Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper makes the following recommendations:

- QMUL should create a new role of Vice-Principal for Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom who would oversee the duty to actively promote free speech and sit on appropriate high level committees. There should also be academic freedom leads at each faculty.
- QMUL should set up an internal free speech complaints scheme for staff and students mirroring the one at the OfS.
- QMUL should provide training for staff and students on the new Act and the university’s freedom of speech duties.
- QMUL should review existing policies and governing documents for compliance with the legislation, including recruitment and promotion procedures, and policies around Dignity at Work, grievance, research approvals, IT, whistleblowing, and discipline; QMUL should consider liaising with external bodies to ensure its policies align with academic freedom best practices and legal requirements.

The above recommendations are closely aligned with recommendations made by leading legal experts (such as James Murray, one of the architects of the new Act). Moreover, many of the above steps are implemented or being considered for implementation at other leading UK universities. Therefore, they represent best practice in this sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Senate to consider</th>
<th>Do Senate members have any comments on the approach proposed in this paper? Is Senate happy to endorse the recommendations above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Regulatory/statutory reference points** | The Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023  
The Education Act (No 2) 1986  
The Higher Education and Research Act 2017 (HERA)  
The Education Reform Act 1988  
The Equality Act 2010  
OfS conditions of registration A1-A3 |
| **Strategy and risk** | Senate already has responsibility for academic freedom oversight.  
Aligns with the Queen Mary Strategy 2030 (Excellence in Education; Excellence in Student Engagement; Excellence in Student Employability Excellence in Learning Environment)  
Failure to have adequate structures to secure academic freedom and free speech for academic staff, students, and visiting speakers would carry significant monetary and reputational risks. The OfS can issue fines if it upholds a complaint under its complaints scheme. The OfS can also use its enforcement powers under the OfS conditions of registration (which can include suspension of registration or even de-registration). Moreover, eligible persons who pursue a civil complaint in the courts under the new statutory tort provision can be awarded large monetary compensation if they are successful. |
| **Reporting/consideration route for the paper** | Senate October 2023 |
| **Authors** | Abhishek Saha (Professor of Mathematics and member of the task and finish group on freedom of speech policy), Prakash Shah (Reader in Culture and Law and member of the task and finish group on freedom of speech policy). |
| **Sponsor** | }
1 Background

The Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act 2023 (henceforth referred to as “The Act”) creates new duties for universities to secure and promote freedom of speech and academic freedom. The most important parts of the Act are the new core duties for universities and student unions as set out in sections A1, A2, and A3 inserted into HERA (The Higher Education and Research Act 2017), protecting freedom of speech for academic staff, students and visiting speakers. Moreover, the Act introduces a new position of Director of Free Speech and Academic Freedom (henceforth referred to as “Director”) on the board of the OfS who will have overall responsibility for the free speech functions of the OfS.

Prof Arif Ahmed has been appointed as the inaugural Director and he took up his new position officially in August 2023. He wrote shortly after his appointment was announced: “New legislation means universities and colleges must promote, and take steps to secure, academic freedom and free speech within the law. The regulator will interpret this broadly. Breaches could include: cancelling a talk on women’s rights due to internal political pressure, or disciplining a lecturer for provocative anti-monarchist tweets. In response to a breach the regulator can issue fines.” He has previously described suppression of free speech at universities as a step towards totalitarianism. It is therefore clear that Prof Ahmed will robustly enforce the new legislation. A recent major speech by Prof Ahmed at King’s College London sets out clearly his strong and wide-ranging vision for his new role.

The duties contained in the Act may be enforced in three ways: (1) a new statutory complaints scheme to be administered by the Director on behalf of the OfS; (2) the enforcement powers of the OfS (which can include large fines and even suspension of registration); and (3) a new statutory tort to allow claims in the civil courts for breaches of the A1 duties. Due to the new regulatory regime and enforcement mechanisms and the new duties introduced, the Act is expected to have a great deal of impact on the sector. James Murray, a leading legal expert on academic freedom and one of the architects of the Act, has remarked that there seems to be an attitude among some in the sector that the bill does not change much as it builds on existing duties. However, Murray has described the Act as a seismic event for universities. In his words, “Institutions are going to have to do a lot of work to get up to a baseline standard where they are compliant with the law. […] There’s a lot to do and the head in the sand attitude that I’ve seen a lot at the higher levels of universities is something that is going to have to right itself pretty quickly as they get to grips with it.”

A QMUL Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech is required by the Act and is being considered for approval by Senate. However, it should be clear from the above discussion that due to the new duties and enforcement mechanisms introduced by the Act much more is required. Failure to have adequate structures to secure academic freedom and free speech for academic staff, students, and visiting speakers would carry significant monetary and reputational risks for QMUL. The rest of this paper sets out some recommendations on new internal roles, processes, training and reviews QMUL should put in place.
2 A VP for freedom of speech and academic freedom at QMUL

The Act secures the freedom within the law of academic staff to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions (which need not be related to their field of expertise), without placing themselves at risk of loss of their jobs or privileges or reduction in the likelihood of their securing promotion. The Act also introduces new duties to promote the importance of free speech and academic freedom. Earl Howe, the Government’s representative when the Act passed through the Lords indicated that the duty was about creating a culture of free speech where students and staff felt able to express their views confidently. Additional guidance on how universities can carry out these core duties is expected from the OfS.

To ensure that these duties are carried out effectively and to mitigate risks, this paper recommends that QMUL creates a position with meaningful influence to oversee the university’s duties with respect to freedom of speech and academic freedom. We believe that creation of this new role (“Vice-Principal for Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom” at QMUL) is vital if QMUL is serious about creating the culture of free speech that the Act envisages. The President and Principal has overall responsibility for implementation of the Code of Practice on Free Speech as delegated by the University’s Council. However, given that the President and Principal has many other duties and responsibilities, it makes sense to have another senior academic at the Senior Management Team who advises the President and Principal on free speech issues and who is entrusted with: actively promoting freedom of speech and academic freedom at QMUL in line with the new A3 duties (duty to promote the importance of freedom of speech and academic freedom); ensuring the development and implementation of improved policies; overseeing the internal free speech complaints scheme as and when it is created and defending free speech on campus; cultivating and championing a free-speech culture among students and staff through events, talks, communications, trainings and courses. The above duties cannot be taken over by the existing structure of Executive Deans of Faculties or Heads of Schools and Institutes because issues of freedom of speech cut across Schools and Faculties and need QMUL wide attention. In addition, executive Deans and Heads have many other responsibilities and therefore it is important that there is someone at college level with focused responsibility for free speech issues and who is directly accountable to the President and Principal.

The above recommendation is closely aligned with what has been recommended by various experts on academic freedom. In their article “Preparing for the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill: a Practical Guide and Compliance Checklist”, leading legal experts Murray, Lewis and Lomas from the law firm Mishcon de Reya recommend that universities have “an internal champion for academic freedom and freedom of speech who holds meaningful influence within the institution or who sits on the relevant executive body”. Similarly, Suissa and Sullivan recommend in their paper that universities should “appoint a champion for academic freedom within the senior leadership team, in order to ensure that there is a voice positively promoting academic freedom and that it forms part of the discussion of all university policies and practice.” Furthermore, the law (Sub-sections A1(1)-(2) of HERA) requires that QMUL take “the steps that, having particular regard to the importance of freedom of
speech, are reasonably practicable for it to take” and a recent report by the Best Free Speech Practice (a committee consisting of senior lawyers, academics and free speech campaigners) argues that appointing a dedicated Free Speech Officer for the staff, members and students of and visiting speakers to QMUL is clearly a reasonably practicable step which will be likely to make a material difference to its ability to secure freedom of speech.

This paper also recommends that there should also be academic freedom leads at each Faculty which would ensure protection and promotion of academic freedom across various disciplines and allow staff and students to raise any concerns about academic freedom to an appropriate person within their Faculty.

3 An internal free speech complaints scheme

The Act establishes a new statutory complaints scheme at the OfS that eligible persons (staff, students and visiting speakers) can use if they believe their free speech rights have been breached by a university or a student union.

While the OfS have not yet (as of October 10, 2023) consulted on the full details of their proposals for their free speech complaints scheme, we do know that this scheme will be specifically for free speech matters and will be overseen by the Director; moreover we know that the current timeline from the OfS expects the scheme to come into effect on 1st August 2024.

To mitigate risks, this paper recommends that QMUL should set up its own internal free speech complaints scheme overseen by the QMUL VP for Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom. An internal complaints scheme would allow eligible persons who believe their free speech or academic freedom has been infringed to attempt resolution internally. The details of this scheme could be finalised over the next year to mirror the OfS proposals for their scheme so that it the internal QMUL free speech complaints scheme is up and running by 1st August 2024 and takes into account any guidance from the OfS that arrives in that period.

As was pointed out by Matt Western MP in the debate at the Commons, each upheld free-speech complaint that goes to the courts could potentially cost over £100,000 for a university if the sums awarded by the courts are similar to those for violations of the Equality Act, and taking legal costs into account. An internal complaints scheme would be able to reduce the risk substantially. Furthermore, the Act allows for the new OfS complaints scheme to have a provision that a free speech complaint is not to be referred under the scheme until the complainant has exhausted any internal procedure for the review of complaints which is provided by the university; obviously, in order to make use of this provision, QMUL needs to set up an internal complaints scheme.

An internal complaints scheme that is dedicated to freedom of speech is a key item in the compliance checklist for the Act provided by Mishcon de Reya. Furthermore, several other universities (e.g., the University of Derby) have already set up an
internal free speech complaints scheme, while others are in the process of doing so. Therefore, QMUL would be following best practice by establishing such a scheme. In addition, such a complaints scheme should be accessible to staff, students and visitors, with a clear and visible information on how to make a complaint, applicable procedures, outcomes, and timings.

4 Training for staff and students

The Act requires that QMUL must, at least once a year, bring the main A1 provisions of the Act (duty to take steps to secure freedom of speech) and the QMUL code of practice for Freedom of Speech to the attention of its students. Moreover, there is a growing realisation within the sector that students and staff need training in the practice of productive disagreement. For example, Michael Spence, the president of UCL, has argued that “practising the skill of disagreeing well is crucial, not only for the university to do its work, but for democracy more broadly to survive”. Therefore, this paper recommends that QMUL organise regular training for all its staff and students on the main provisions of the Act, the legal duties to secure freedom of speech, the philosophical arguments and debates underpinning the value of academic freedom, and the practice of productive disagreement.

In organising such training, QMUL should considering partnering with external organisations who have developed resources for these purposes. For example, the Heterodox Academy has developed a toolkit consisting of two empirically validated interventions for use on college and university campuses that contribute to a climate of free expression, increase empathy and perspective-taking, intellectual humility, and open-minded cognition. The recently established London Universities’ Council for Academic Freedom is planning to develop resources to help promote academic freedom and best practices for universities. Furthermore, a recent report published by the Policy Institute at King’s College London reviews a range of policy interventions universities could put into place to enhance freedom of speech on campus. By effectively training its staff and students on freedom and academic freedom, QMUL will not just improve the climate of freedom of speech on campus but will also reduce the likelihood of breaches of free speech rights occurring and thus reduce its risks from the Act.

5 Review of existing policies

As noted by Murray in a recent paper, the Act will have significant implications for employment relations and “in particular, the new duties around hiring and managing employees which merit very serious consideration, especially when hiring, disciplining and dismissing academics.” Therefore, it would be crucial to review existing QMUL policy around recruitment, whistleblowing, and discipline to ensure compliance with the Act.

Furthermore, as noted earlier, the Act secures the freedom of academic staff to express controversial or unpopular opinions without hurting their promotion
prospects. This applies equally to research and teaching. The initial command paper from the government which led to the Act warned that universities or department heads “should not force or pressure academics to teach from their own ideological viewpoint, or to only use set texts that comply with their own viewpoint. This applies equally to contested political ideologies that are not associated with a particular political party or view, such as ‘decolonising the curriculum’.” Therefore, it is imperative that QMUL ensures that its existing promotion procedure is fully compliant with these requirements and academics are not penalised in any way for exercising their academic freedom. Similarly, QMUL policies on research ethics and funding approvals may need to be reviewed to ensure that they adequately protect academic freedom.

Murray, Lewis and Lomas from the law firm Mishcon de Reya have also written: “One issue which we often see is providers’ harassment policies not properly reflecting the interaction between unlawful harassment under the Equality Act 2010 and the law protecting academic freedom and freedom of speech. It is particularly important to get this right as disciplining an academic for harassment without considering their free speech rights can lead to further difficulties.” Therefore, it would be important to ensure that QMUL’s Dignity at work policies as well as EDI policies reflect the protections arising from the Act. In fact, as Suissa and Sullivan explain, it would be important to “assess all university policies to ensure their alignment with both academic freedom and equality legislation”.

Other policies which may need to be reviewed are IT policies and policies governing social media usage. Notably, the command paper from the government is explicit that a disciplinary code which refers to ‘offensive speech’ or to ‘bringing the university into disrepute’ without reference to the right to free speech may act to inhibit free speech or academic freedom that is within the law.

A recent Universities UK briefing entitled “How can universities prepare for the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Act?” warns that the duty to have “particular regard to the importance of free speech” suggests that steps to protect free speech need to be prioritised above other institutional objectives. The briefing recommends that universities should review a wide range of their policies, procedures and codes and gives an extensive suggested list on page 26 of the briefing which could provide a starting point. This is also the position of this paper.

To summarise, this paper recommends that QMUL should review existing policies, procedures and governing documents for compliance with the legislation, particularly recruitment procedures, promotion procedures, Dignity at Work policy, grievance policy, research ethics and funding approvals, IT policies, and discipline policy. QMUL should consider liaising with external organisations working on academic freedom as well as seek specialist legal advice to ensure its policies align with academic freedom best practices and legal requirements. It is likely that there will be future guidance from OfS on some of these matters, which would also need to be incorporated into policy.
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9. Academic integrity
Part 2: Matters For Discussion
At the meeting held on 8 June 2023, Senate agreed that it would discuss academic integrity in more detail at the meeting of 19 October.

The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office has compiled some draft principles to support Queen Mary’s approach to academic integrity, and has also provided details of work that will be undertaken to support more significant amendments to the Academic Misconduct Policy for 2024-25.

Senate is invited to consider the draft principles and to note the work that is currently underway to improve our approach to handling cases of academic misconduct.

- A task and finish group will be established to review the Academic Misconduct Policy for 2024-25. The group’s recommendations will be considered in detail by the Education Quality and Standards Board before consideration by Senate in June 2024.

- The draft principles for responding to academic misconduct are for discussion, with a view to informing the task and finish group and the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.

1. Does Senate agree with the proposed actions to support the changes to the Academic Misconduct Policy 2023-24 with a view to developing this approach further for 2024-25.

2. Does Senate have any additions or amendments to the draft principles to support Queen Mary’s approach to academic integrity?

1. Office for Students: Conditions of Registration
3. QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education

Aligns with the Queen Mary Strategy 2030
- Excellence in Education
- Excellence in Student Engagement
- Excellence in Student Employability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellence in Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Principles for Academic Integrity & Misconduct at Queen Mary

Queen Mary is committed to embedding academic integrity across all areas of the curriculum. The University promotes effective assessment design and ensures that students are supported in developing a sound understanding of expectations in relation to academic integrity. Our approach aligns with Condition B2 of the Office for Students’ Conditions of Registration in the provision of ‘support relating to understanding, avoiding and reporting academic misconduct’, and this commitment is reflected in the revised process for considering first incidents of academic misconduct within a student’s home school or institute.

Queen Mary strives for proportionality in addressing issues of academic integrity and misconduct, and considers that the review of initial integrity issues at a local level provides a focus on learning and promotes the development of good scholarship. Such local conversations or processes can allow students to gain valuable feedback and improve their academic skills when minor issues arise, and reserves the central misconduct process for dealing with significant concerns. These principles are designed to help ensure that educational and remedial actions are paramount, without compromising academic quality and community expectations.

Procedural fairness is central to any consideration of misconduct. Procedural fairness includes making sure that the process is accessible, inclusive and clear for students to understand and engage with. In practice, this means they should always have adequate information about what evidence or concerns are being considered and a fair opportunity to respond. It also means that decisions should be independent, reasoned, and confidential. Decisions about the appropriate action and outcome will strive to take into account the following:

- It is recognised that assessment and misconduct matters can be stressful for students. A supportive, educational approach with opportunities for early remediation should be explored wherever appropriate.
- To ensure quality & standards, all marks awarded must be a true reflection of a student’s achievement. Where the integrity of an assessment has been compromised, it is normally expected that the outcome will require resubmission of the student’s own work to obtain credit. Penalties which do not require resubmission are normally applied where it is clear that a sufficient proportion of the work can be considered the students own achievement, for example, minor instances of plagiarism in a larger body of the student’s own work.
- Outcomes and actions recognise the importance of consistency and clarity, while striving to give due consideration to individual circumstances. To ensure fairness and consistency for all students, decision-makers will provide reasons for any outcome. Where they have decided to vary from the university guidance on outcomes/penalties for any good reason they will include an explanation of the factors considered. Good reasons might include the considerations outlined below.
- Responses should be proportional to the extent and severity of the misconduct.
- Honesty & integrity – the use of paid services or where a student shows no attempt to produce their own work will be treated with the utmost seriousness. A student’s response to concerns raised may also be taken into account; for example contrition and reflection may warrant leniency, whereas sustained intention to deceive throughout the case may call for more serious actions.
- Repeated instances – repeated occurrences of misconduct will normally be treated more seriously. Lack of industry or engagement with learning and support which results in repeated misconduct will normally result in escalating outcomes.
• The assessment context – this can include expectations about the student’s academic experience (e.g. level of study), and/or the nature and value of the assessment (e.g. is it a significant piece of work or milestone, or accounting for a considerable amount of the module or classification).

• Any relevant accompanying behaviour – actions impacting other members of the Queen Mary community, such as coercion, deceit or falsely implicating an innocent student may be taken into account.

• The effect of the penalty – are the practical implications of a penalty on progression or awards proportionate and appropriate?

• No advantage – all decisions will consider whether or not a student who committed academic misconduct will be advantaged over a student who failed an assessment or module honestly, and attempt to ensure this is not the case.

To support the successful implementation of amendments to the Academic Misconduct Policy 2023/24 at Senate in July 2023, the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office are working towards the following actions:

1. Delivery of training for all staff members involved in handling academic misconduct cases, to cover best practice guidance, regulations, and technical aspects (using the MySIS Misconduct Dashboard). Faculty and School leadership are asked to encourage all relevant members of their teams to attend one of these training sessions, which will be delivered on a range of dates from November-April.

2. Bi-weekly drop-in sessions with Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office staff members, open to all staff members who would like guidance or support with academic misconduct cases.

3. A Misconduct Chair’s Forum to be held each semester, for all Senate appointed Academic Misconduct Chairs to share experiences and raise issues identified in the course of their role.


5. The appended Principles for Responding to Academic Misconduct at Queen Mary and updated Penalty Guidance draw on relevant regulatory points and existing guidance documents. Senate is asked to consider the Principles, which will form the basis of guidance to support Actions 1, 3 & 4.

6. Collaboration with IT Services and Planning Department to create a PowerBi dashboard based on data from the MySIS Academic Misconduct Workflow, to support educational and operational activities related to academic integrity.

7. Academic Integrity & Misconduct Workstream of the EQSB Assessment sub-Board considering completion rates of the Academic Integrity at Queen Mary QM+ Module and misconduct data, with view to better promote and integrate positive behaviours and good academic integrity in responses to concerns with student work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of misconduct</th>
<th>Example misconduct</th>
<th>Commonly applied penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Plagiarism/collusion                                   | • Small amount of plagiarism
• First finding of misconduct by a first-year UG student | Central Penalty iv / School penalty iii.                                                |
|                                                        | • First finding of misconduct by a second or third-year UG student
• First finding of misconduct by a PG student          | Central Penalty iv or vi / School penalty iii.                                         |
| Misconduct in invigilated examinations                 | • Mobile phone or unauthorised electronic device on person
• Unauthorised material on person
• Having writing on body
• Communicating with another student
• Failing to follow the instructions of an invigilator
• Copying the work of another student                  | Central Penalty vi.                                                                  |
| Ghost-writing                                          | • Contract cheating
• The use of websites like Chegg, Bartleby, Course Hero where students actively request their work is completed by a third-party | Generally misconduct of this kind will incur severe penalties that reflect the nature of the case. Students should expect central penalty vii as a minimum. |
| Other types of misconduct                              | • Fraudulent reporting of source material
• Falsification of data
• Impersonation of another student                      | Generally misconduct of this kind will incur severe penalties that reflect the nature of the case. Students should expect central penalty vii as a minimum. |
| Unauthorised or unacknowledged text manipulation which undermines the integrity of an assessment | • Using Generative AI to produce work which is presented as the student’s own        | For further discussion                                                                  |
| A second or subsequent offence of any kind             | See above examples                                                                  | Escalating outcomes, relative to previous penalty. This means usually central penalty vi or above. |
10. Education Quality and Standards
Board report
Part 2: Matters For Discussion
Presented by Stephanie Marshall and Anthony Warrens
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paper Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Education Quality and Standards Board: summary minutes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>The Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> the summary minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Points for Senate members to note and further information** | The Education Quality and Standards Board met on 24 May, 26 July, and 6 September 2023. This paper provides a high-level overview of those meetings.  
Full papers and minutes are available on the EQSB QMplus page: https://qmplus.qmul.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=6851 |
| **Questions for Senate to consider** | None |
| **Regulatory/statutory reference points** |  |
| **Strategy and risk** |  |
| **Reporting/consideration route for the paper** | Senate only. |
| **Sponsor** | Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education) |
Education Quality and Standards Board 24 May 2023

The Board:

1. CONFIRMED the minutes and reviewed the actions of its previous meeting.

2. NOTED update reports from the Vice-Principal (Education) and the QMSU Vice-Presidents.

3. CONSIDERED and ENDORSED the following documents, recommending approval by the Senate.
   a. Academic Regulations 2023-24 (making a recommendation to increase the threshold for progression to a year abroad from 60.0 to 65.0 – this was not approved by the Senate).
   c. Assessment Handbook 2023-24 (including formal codification of the existing expectation of a 15 working day turnaround for marking and feedback).
   d. Academic Misconduct Policy (including the addition of references to use of artificial intelligence, and changes to the thresholds for referral of cases to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office such that there was greater scope to investigate cases at school/institute-level).
   e. Appeal Policy (noting that students would in future have 21 days in which to submit an appeal with evidence, rather than the former 14 days with an additional seven in which to submit additional evidence).
   f. Student Complaints Policy.
   g. Admissions Policy 2024-25.

4. CONSIDERED the draft Principles of Programme Design, which included detailed proposals for the development of governing principles that would inform the future design of all taught provision, in line with Queen Mary’s aims and values and with the OfS’ Conditions of Registration. The Board gave feedback and set actions to revise the Principles.

5. CONSIDERED a document that mapped Queen Mary’s provision against the OFS B Conditions of Registration that related to quality and standards, and considered how to further embed knowledge and understanding of the Conditions across the University and to further enhance alignment with the Conditions.

6. NOTED an update on plans to acquire a curriculum management system that would act as an electronic workflow for programme and module development and as a portfolio of Queen Mary’s academic provision.

7. CONSIDERED plans for the future of programme review procedures

8. NOTED the output reports from the pilot Enhanced Programme Reviews of CCLS, SBBS, and WIPH.
Education Quality and Standards Board 26 July 2023

The Board:

1. CONFIRMED the minutes and reviewed the actions of its previous meeting.

2. NOTED update reports from the Vice-Principal (Education) and the QMSU Vice-Presidents.

3. APPROVED the Principles of Programme Design following revisions made after the previous meeting, to come into immediate effect as a guidance document. ENDORSED the document, recommending that the Senate approved it as mandatory policy to come into effect from the 2023-24 year, applying to all new programmes and putting in place timeframes for the review of all existing programmes to ensure alignment.

4. ENDORSED the Queen Mary Peer Observation Policy subject to a few small amendments, recommending approval by the Senate.

5. CONSIDERED the Queen Mary Mixed-Mode Education Policy, recommending a few small amendments before consideration by the Senate.

6. AGREED a need for review of the timing of module amendments, and especially of late changes made by schools and institutes after students had completed module pre-selection, with a view to minimising such changes.

7. CONSIDERED a proposal to add two new professional doctorate awards to Queen Mary’s Statutes and Ordinances. The Board noted that it was generally not desirable to add new awards where a new programme would be sufficient, and agreed actions for further discussion. It was subsequently agreed to endorse a proposal for one new award, the Clinical Doctorate.

8. APPROVED non-standard term dates for the BSc Oral Health.

9. APPROVED Student Guidance on Generative AI.

10. APPROVED minor amendments to the Interruption of Study Policy.

11. APPROVED several Admissions policies:

   a. General Terms and Conditions 2024-25
   b. Admissions Policy on Student Immigration 2024-25
   c. Admissions Policy for Students Under the Age of 18 2024-25
   d. Admissions Policy: MBBS Malta 2024-25
   e. Admissions Appeals and Complaints Policy 2024-25
   f. Admissions Policy for UG FMD Programmes 2024-25
   g. Accreditation of Prior Learning Policy 2024-25 (conditionally approved, subject to textual amendments)

12. APPROVED new QM Extra activities and academic prizes.
The Board:

1. CONFIRMED the minutes and reviewed the actions of its previous meeting.

2. NOTED update reports from the Vice-Principal (Education) and the QMSU Vice-Presidents.

3. CONSIDERED and ENDORSED the EQSB terms of reference and membership for 2023-24, recommending approval by the Senate.

4. CONSIDERED and ENDORSED the EQSB indicative business plan for 2023-24.

5. CONSIDERED the report of the External Member of the Undergraduate Degree Examination Boards and set several actions:
   a. review of procedures to reduce the numbers of suspensions of regulations.
   b. development of a common University policy on mark scaling.
   c. review of regulations and procedures for extramural years of study, especially years abroad.
   d. development of role descriptors for SEB and DEB Chairs.
   e. recruitment of a new External Member for 2023-24, following the completion of Maureen McLaughlin’s term of office.

6. CONSIDERED but did not approve amendments to the Policy on Editorial Assistance for Research Degree Theses, seeking clarification on several points before reconsidering the Policy.

7. APPROVED several QM Extra activities and academic prizes. The Board did not approve all the requests, noting that some concerned academic skills that should be addressed within programmes of study rather than as extracurricular activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Queen Mary Peer Observation Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome requested</td>
<td>Senate is asked to ratify the Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points for Senate members to note and further information</td>
<td>The paper shares the proposed Queen Mary Peer Observation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions for Senate to consider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/statutory reference points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and risk</td>
<td>Strategy 2030 is informed by the Excellence in Education pillar which states the “education we provide is led by world-class academics”. In line with best practice in the sector, a formal peer observation policy ensures the development of our educators and enhancing the quality of the student learning experience. The policy also encourages and fosters a supportive community of practice amongst educators to share best practices, aligning with the strategy’s commitment to create an inclusive, supportive and innovative learning experience. Finally, the policy ensures our commitment to our educators being “equipped to meet the needs of diverse learners, and can support students achieve their full potential”. The risks of this not being embedded as a policy include a weak learning community of educators, lack of development for our educators and inconsistent approaches to peer support across the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/ consideration route for the paper</td>
<td>For Senate only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Janet De Wilde, Director of Queen Mary Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Queen Mary Peer Observation Policy

Introduction
This Peer Observation policy has been informed by sector wide practice on developing educational and teaching practice through peer review. The aim is to ensure the education practice is representative of current thinking and practices in the subject matter including being appropriately informed by recent subject matter developments; research, industrial and professional developments; and developments in teaching and learning, including learning resources.

Purpose
Peer observation of teaching is an enabling process, for staff with teaching responsibilities to reflect on and improve their teaching practice. This policy should therefore be used by all teaching staff as they work together to increase the effectiveness of their teaching through the four stages of review: observation, discussion, reflection, and enhancement.

This process has the potential for sharing best practice across disciplines thus improving the quality of the student learning experience. It can also be a catalyst for creating communities of practice.

Observers, and those who are being observed, are encouraged to use the peer observation process to identify and share good practice. This can be used to demonstrate performance for progression and professional recognition.

Implementation

1. Peer observation should be undertaken in a supportive and collegial manner. It should be focused on enhancing practice rather than judgmental. An essential aspect of peer observation is to develop reflection and enhancement for both the observed and the observer. Guidance on how to undertake peer observation can be found here Observation of teaching - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)

2. Peer observation must take place at least once every academic year for all staff delivering teaching.

3. Line Managers should confirm at appraisal when peer observation has taken place, and staff are encouraged to share their observation (s) with their line manager to demonstrate reflection on and enhancement of their teaching practice.

4. Observers should be:
   i. University staff members, normally from the same Faculty.
   ii. Have, as a minimum, the teaching accreditation at FHEA level: Teaching Recognition - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)
   iii. Understand the 2030 strategy: Strategy 2030 - Queen Mary University of London (qmul.ac.uk),
iv. Be familiar with our Queen Mary Education Approach: The Queen Mary Education Approach - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)

5. To ensure fair and effective practice, the process should not be reciprocal and not the same person every year.

6. Observation from educators external to the university (e.g., from other institutions or from professional practice) should be regarded as additional to the internal process.

7. The University’s approved peer observation form should be used. Teaching-Observation-Pro-Forma-2019-20.docx (live.com)

8. The process is intended to be two-way with active contribution from observer and observed. The observer is expected to remain present for the whole session and to provide detailed comments. Peer observation can cover the full range of teaching activities including lectures, seminars, field trips, and practical classes as exemplified by Active Curriculum for Excellence (ACE).

9. The school may keep a log of the date of the observations that have taken place each year however the record of observation is for the observed to retain.

Observers should consider:

1. The quality of education materials including:
   i. The design of teaching materials for example: PowerPoint presentation layout, supporting material etc.
   ii. The design of Learning Online & blended learning resources.

2. The learning outcomes and the learning activities to support those; including for example small group work, large group work, learning by doing, engagement activities in session, opportunities for flipped learning, blended learning, Peer Led Team Learning, Team based learning, and Problem Based Learning.

3. Assessment tasks, including provision of materials, constructive alignment exemplars, assignment guidance and marking schemes. Assessment and Feedback - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)

4. Inclusivity including provision of opportunities for all students, examples from a diverse Inclusive Curriculum - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)

5. Graduate Attributes Graduate Attributes - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)

Reference
Conditions of registration - Office for Students
## Senate Paper

**Paper Title**

Principles of Programme Design

**Outcome requested**

Senate is asked to **approve** the Principles of Programme Design

**Points for Senate members to note and further information**

Following the May and September EQSB and discussions during and post the Board meeting, the principles have been updated and clarified. EQSB endorsed the policy and agreed that the revised Principles would be presented as a policy which, once approved, would constitute formal requirements for programme design. Senate is asked to note the Principles of Programme Design as outlined in this paper. A follow-up paper will come to Senate to present the agreed principles as a policy, accompanied with an implementation plan.

**Questions for Senate to consider**

Does Senate approve the Principles of Programme Design as principles?

**Regulatory/statutory reference points**

Office for Students – Conditions of Registration (especially B1-5)

**Strategy and risk**

Directly aligns with the Queen Mary Strategy 2030

Mitigates potential for any risks related to potential noncompliance with the OfS Conditions of Registration

**Reporting/ consideration route for the paper**

For Senate only

**Authors**

Janet De Wilde, Director of Queen Mary Academy

**Sponsor**

Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)
Principles of Academic Degree Programme Design

These programme design principles are designed to support our 2030 strategy. With the 2030 strategy, our educational strategy states that our programmes are always devised with the student at the centre, and are coherent, easy to navigate and support overall progression. The strategy also highlights that the Queen Mary Graduate Attributes are embedded in all our programmes, so that our students develop the knowledge, skills, adaptability, and resilience to succeed in an ever-changing global job market and become active global citizens. The following principles have been developed to support delivery of the strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Design Principles (for credit bearing programmes)</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Clear Programme leadership**                            | There should be:  
- Clear leadership of a programme, with a clear oversight of component modules.  
- Clear accountability across all modules comprising the programmes.  
- A minimum of 2 meetings per annum between Programme Leads and Module Organisers. | Clear educational oversight | [Academic Leadership Development - Queen Mary Academy](qmul.ac.uk) |
| **2. Coherent Programmes**                                  | A Programme should have:  
- Coherence and should be distinct and defined. Core and/or compulsory modules ensure programme coherence in that all students graduating from a defined programme must have at least completed all modules defined as core and compulsory, and passed all modules defined as core.  
- Module alignment within programmes is explained in appendix 1  
- Pathways and support for students to select modules.  
- Programme and associated modules should adhere to the Queen Mary Academic Credit Framework.  
- Elective modules may serve an important purpose in allowing students to personalise their learning, | Compliance with Coherence | [Programme level outcomes mapping tool](qmul.ac.uk)

[Queen-Mary-Academic-Credit-Framework-(June-2017).pdf](qmul.ac.uk)
selecting options that allow students to specialise and focus on knowledge, skills and behaviours / attributes most appropriate to their plans for postgraduate employment or further study. Elective modules can be further considered in two distinct categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Programme Aims, Programme Level Outcomes and Programme Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Programme should have:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear programme aims articulating the purpose of the programme and clearly explaining what a learner is expected to know and be able to demonstrate after completion of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programme level outcomes that are holistic and aspirational and lead to strong Graduate Outcomes and not simply the sum of the relevant module learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programme level outcomes mapped to module learning outcomes and the component module learning outcomes should be consistent with the programme descriptors for awards at the relevant level and constructively aligned with assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with requirements from professional bodies and degree apprenticeships etc where relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear stages for the programme allowing for academic progression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Programme Assessment Mapping</th>
<th>A Programme should have:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Constructive alignment of learning outcomes and assessment at module level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parity in terms of quantity of assessment across modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety of assessment types across programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formative assessment and opportunities for students to act on feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Progression of knowledge and skill development across programme assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| |
| The B Conditions state that “educational challenge” means a challenge that is no less than the minimum level of rigour and difficulty reasonably expected of the higher education course, in the context of the subject matter and level of the course.” |

| |
| Program level outcomes mapping tool |
| Intended Learning Outcomes - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk) |
| FHEQ, SEEC, Subject Benchmark Statements |

OFS Condition B4, providers must ensure that students are assessed effectively. We need to deduce overassessment and assessment overlaps. The responses to the NSS questions on assessment mean action needs to be taken. Assessment design

<p>| |
| |
| Assessment and Feedback - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Programme teaching and learning approaches and activities</th>
<th>Programme level mapping of assessment undertaken to identify any overassessment or gaps in assessment of learning outcomes.</th>
<th>Programme level mapping can also identify assessment bunching with regards to deadlines and submission dates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme level mapping to identify opportunities for programme level assessment approaches and/or integrative assessments</td>
<td>to improve academic integrity (Generative AI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in room</td>
<td>Be clear on the delivery modes used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MME hybrid teaching (where applicable)</td>
<td>Our strategy states that we will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure that the holistic education and learning experience we provide is world-leading, co-created with students and employers as appropriate, and reflects our diverse and international community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure that the holistic education and learning experience we provide is world-leading, co-created with students and employers as appropriate, and reflects our diverse and international community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACE approach</td>
<td>The Queen Mary Education Approach - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Learning</td>
<td>Open and bespoke workshops - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-creation</td>
<td>Open and bespoke workshops - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer led team learning</td>
<td>Open and bespoke workshops - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Based Learning</td>
<td>Enhancing asynchronous education course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem based Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Date: 06-09-2023

Version 5
6. **Planning staff-student contact**

A Programme should have:
- Clearly articulated staff-student contact opportunities.

**Digital content and delivery (where applicable)**
- Online learning - Asynchronous (where applicable)

And student work should be designed to:
- Include independent study and formative work
- Include a range of learning activities as describe by the ACE approach (Active Curriculum for Excellence) to enhance student engagement

Programme design should:
- Support students’ transition from one level to another to complement the distinctiveness of different levels.
- Ensure that a suitable range of learning resources is made available, and that they are accessible, regularly refreshed, and represent a diversity of perspectives.
- Account for both the digital and physical infrastructure required to support the learning activities, consulting with school staff, estates, ITS, and library as appropriate.
- Include the Principles for Inclusive Curriculum covering the content, delivery, and assessment across all its component modules.
- Consider embedding the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals (QM Environmental Sustainability Policy 2020).

**Co-creation**
- **Inclusive Curriculum - Queen Mary Academy** ([qmul.ac.uk](http://qmul.ac.uk))
- **Co-creation: educators and learners as change makers - Queen Mary Academy** ([qmul.ac.uk](http://qmul.ac.uk))
- **Sustainability in the Curriculum - Queen Mary Academy** ([qmul.ac.uk](http://qmul.ac.uk))

**Co-chairing and co-creating in SSLCs course**

**Co-creation resources**
- Effective Advising and Signposting course
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Employability</th>
<th>A programme should have:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employability skills clearly identified and developed (with input from Careers and Enterprise as appropriate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate attributes identified and embedded in curriculum through teaching and learning, authentic assessment, academic advising, and other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge Skills and Behaviours clearly identified for Degree Apprenticeship programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enterprise skills identified where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entrepreneurship identified where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OFS B3 4c. Graduate employment and progression to professional jobs and postgraduate study.*

*Graduate Attributes - Queen Mary Academy (qmul.ac.uk)*

---

---
Appendix: Module definitions and alignment / contribution to programme level learning outcomes

Individual modules can be classified as follows depending on the strength of the relationship between the module level learning outcomes and the programme level learning outcomes to which each module contributes.

At the highest level, modules can be classified as core, compulsory or elective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Type</th>
<th>Alignment / contribution to programme level learning outcomes</th>
<th>Regulatory implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Very strong – Module level learning outcomes make an essential contribution to the programme level learning outcomes such that it would not be possible for a student to evidence that they have met all of the programme level learning outcomes without meeting most / all of the module level learning outcomes for each core module.</td>
<td>Module must be taken and must be passed for a student to demonstrate that they have met one or more of the programme level learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Very strong – Module level learning outcomes make an important (not necessarily essential) contribution to the programme level learning outcomes. It would not be possible for a student to evidence that they have met all the programme level learning outcomes without meeting at least some (not necessarily all) of the module level learning outcomes for each compulsory module.</td>
<td>Module must be taken but does not need to be passed for a student to demonstrate that they have met all of the programme level learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Variable – Module level learning outcomes align and contribute to the programme level learning outcomes, but the strength of that alignment and contribution can range from very strong to tangential. It may be possible for a student to evidence that they have met all of the programme level learning outcomes without meeting the module level learning outcomes for each elective module.</td>
<td>No requirement to take or pass any given elective module, other than to ensure that a student has completed and passed the requisite number of credits in each year of study and at each level as stipulated in the Academic Regulations (although see below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Guided elective modules – where elective modules are organised (by the Programme Director) into one or more subsets and it is compulsory¹ for a student to complete elective modules to a defined credit value from each subset of guided elective options. (For example, may be two or more specified elective modules of the same credit value for a student to choose between). Students retain agency in selecting which modules they wish

¹ N.B. Depending on the number of credits associated with each guided elective module, it may be necessary for a student to not only complete but to pass guided elective modules in order to meet the requirements for progression and/or award as stipulated within the Academic Regulations. In this event, a subset of guided elective modules becomes, by definition, core rather than just compulsory, but each specific module still meets the definition of an elective, in that students are neither required to complete nor to pass any specific individual module.
to complete, but the choice of electives is guided by the organisation of electives into subsets to ensure that programme level learning outcomes can be met by each individual student (see below).

- **Free choice elective modules** – where students **may select any elective module** from a defined list in accordance with the Academic Regulations (as relate to total credits that need to be completed and passed in any one year of study and at any particular level).

The alignment of these two different types of elective module to the overarching programme level learning outcomes differs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Type</th>
<th>Alignment / contribution to programme level learning outcomes</th>
<th>Regulatory implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guided elective</td>
<td><strong>Strong to very strong</strong> – Within each defined subset, module level learning outcomes make an important if not essential contribution to the programme level learning outcomes such that it would not be possible for a student to evidence that they have met all of the programme level learning outcomes without at least completing, it not passing, at least one guided elective from each defined subset. Within each defined subset, there is strong alignment between the module level learning outcomes across the elective modules in that subset.</td>
<td>Within each defined subset of guided elective modules, modules to the specific credit value <strong>must be completed</strong> (and, normally, must be passed) for a student to demonstrate that they have met one or more of the programme level learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free choice elective</td>
<td><strong>Variable</strong> – It would be possible for a student to evidence that they have met all of the programme level learning outcomes without meeting at least some (not necessarily all) of the module level learning outcomes for each free choice elective module.</td>
<td>Modules do <strong>not</strong> have to be completed or passed for a student to demonstrate that they have met all of the programme level learning outcomes (other than to ensure that a student has completed and passed the requisite number of credits in each year of study and at each level as stipulated in the Academic Regulations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure programme coherence (in accordance with the OfS Condition of Registration B1), when designing degree programmes, **at least 50%** of the overall programme content should be comprised of modules that are defined as core, compulsory or guided elective modules (**i.e.**, less than 50% of the programme content should comprise free choice elective modules). It is anticipated that for a degree programme spanning two or more sequential years of study (**e.g.**, a Bachelors or undergraduate integrated Masters programme), the proportion of core, compulsory or guided choice elective modules would normally be higher in the early years of the programme and the proportion of free choice elective modules would make a greater contribution to the later years of the programme. Proportions would be as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Core, compulsory or guided elective modules</th>
<th>Free choice elective modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>≥ 75% (≥ 90 credits)</td>
<td>≤ 25% (≤ 30 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>≥ 50% (≥ 60 credits)</td>
<td>≤ 50% (≤ 60 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>≥ 25% (≥ 30 credits)</td>
<td>≤ 75% (≤ 90 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Year 4)</td>
<td>≥ 25% (≥ 30 credits)</td>
<td>≤ 75% (≤ 90 credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Senate is asked to approve this request.

This is a request for an amendment to the Academic Regulations for the MBBS and the BDS, the qualifying medical and dental degrees in the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, to introduce a third attempt as standard for all students. The regulatory change would take effect from 2023-24 entry, though the relevant examination boards would use existing discretionary provisions in their regulations to make the third attempt available to all students in the interim period until the new regulations take effect.

The request was discussed in detail by EQSB and proposed for further consideration at the cross-Faculty EQSB Assessment Sub-Board. Following this, it was approved at EQSB by Chair’s Action in June 2023. This was discussed at the July 2023 Senate meeting and felt it needed further discussion at a subsequent Senate meeting. Hence, it is being tabled at the October 2023 Senate meeting.

The MBBS and BDS programmes currently offer students two attempts to pass – a first attempt (with teaching) and a resit (assessment only). The Examination Board has the discretion to allow a third attempt which, if granted, is taken in attendance with full teaching in the subsequent academic year.

“4.92. ii. in a very limited number of cases, where a student has failed to pass any or all Sections of a Part at the second attempt and does not meet the requirements of (i), above, but is deemed to have sufficient potential to succeed, the Board may permit the student to re-take the year for a third and final attempt with strict conditions imposed by the Subject Examination Board (such conditions will be to retake all elements [including those passed] in full attendance and take and pass all assessments in Sections A, B, C, D and E as required by the mark scheme). Such a student will be closely monitored and unsatisfactory performance may lead to deregistration at any point in the year. On passing the Part, such a student will not have their marks capped to the pass mark.”

Academic Regulations 2022-23 (MBBS)

FMD requests to make this discretionary provision available to all students on the MBBS and BDS programmes. However, the marks for the third attempt would be capped to the minimum pass mark at module level, as is the case for re-
assessment elsewhere across the institution. The following are among the key reasons behind the proposal:

1. **The General Dental Council allows up to four attempts for students to achieve professional accreditation.** The General Medical Council provides three sits for international medical graduates to complete their licensing examination. Though this does not directly link to the number of attempts universities may offer for their degree programmes, discussion with other providers has shown a general trend toward increasing the number of attempts for these programmes.
   - This recognises the vocational nature of the programmes and their methods of delivery and the high level of investment of student, university, and public resource and time into a student’s studies, while not compromising academic standards, at the time of a national drive to increase the numbers of doctors and dentists being trained.
   - FMD has confirmed that it does not seek to introduce four attempts for the degrees.

2. **Discretionary provisions can, by their nature, be difficult to apply fairly, consistently, and without challenge.** The current regulations have been subject to query and appeal previously. Moving to a clearer set of regulations that does not allow for exceptions or special arguments will permit better management of our provision and clearer messaging to students.

3. **The MBBS and BDS are self-contained awards.** The Assessment Sub-Board of EQSB discussed at length the potential implications and issues of fairness for other Queen Mary programmes and concluded that this did not present an obstacle. Unlike a BSc or BA (for example), each of the MBBS and BDS is taught as a single programme, supervised by a single Institute. Hence, this change would not mean that another programme using the same award but taught in a different School had different standards applied. Though this had not been requested, the EQSB Assessment Sub-Board did note that it would not support the extension of this amendment to other programmes in the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry (e.g. BSc programmes) for that very reason.

4. **MBBS and BDS students are required to maintain regular clinical contact for significant parts of their studies.** This means that the third attempt needs to be taken in attendance, requiring an additional year of study (and of fees and living costs, from the student) which is a model not readily transferable to other programmes. The student would take all summative assessments within the academic year and will have the ability to have the better mark recorded for the transcript. The module mark will be capped to reflect the retake.

5. **Historically, Queen Mary allowed three attempts for most awards (though not the MBBS or BDS).** Detailed review showed that only a tiny minority of students who failed at the second attempt went on to pass at the third attempt, which – for those programmes – was a resit of the assessment without a repeat of the teaching, taken out of attendance and without the
support and engagement that the MBBS/BDS model would provide. The Sub-Board did not support a return to that previous position for other Queen Mary provisions and noted that two attempts (a first attempt and one resit) was by some distance the most common approach in the sector for non-clinical programmes. This is not true for the MBBS and BDS degrees, where it has been our experience that those students who return on appeal and successfully repeat the previously unsuccessful year continue to be successful in subsequent years.

6. The MBBS and BDS have maximum durations of study of seven years. The MBBS and BDS are five-year programmes, meaning that, in practice, no student could be granted the third attempt more than twice during their studies. If it became apparent at any stage that a student would not be able to complete within seven years, the student would be deregistered (after individual consideration) under this regulation:

   “2.46 The maximum duration of study is the normal duration plus one year (excepting the MBBS and BDS programmes, where it is the normal duration plus two years). A student who exceeds this limit will have their registration and enrolment terminated and will cease to be a student. Queen Mary may also deregister a student where it is no longer possible for a student to complete a programme within the remaining period of permitted maximum duration.”

   Academic Regulations 2022-23

7. The MBBS and BDS have noted an increase in students requiring additional support in recent years (even before the pandemic) and have made increased use of the discretionary third attempt. This prompted a review of the regulations, but the proposal is not a direct attempt to accommodate the needs of a particular cohort, but rather a reflection on the general approach to pedagogy and student support, particularly considering the accrediting bodies’ more flexible approaches.

8. As a regulatory change this amendment, if approved, can only take effect from the 2023-24 regulations (for students starting on the programmes from that year), but the same provisions would be available for all currently registered students using the widespread application of the existing discretionary procedures in recognition of the current external environment.

9. If approved, the Academic Regulations 2023-24 will be amended accordingly. This will require small but meaningful changes to the final sentence of regulation 2.85 (below) and to relevant sections of the MBBS and the BDS progression and award regulations in section 4.

   “2.85 A student has a maximum of two attempts to pass a module – the first attempt, and one resit. In rare circumstances the resit may be replaced by a retake. MBBS and BDS students also have two attempts
but may, under prescribed circumstances and at the discretion of the
examination boards, be granted an exceptional third attempt.”
Academic Regulations 2023-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Senate to consider.</th>
<th>1. Are members supportive of the proposal in the context of the MBBS and BDS degrees?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Are members satisfied that implementing this change for the MBBS and the BDS would not unfairly disadvantage students registered on other Queen Mary programmes and awards?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory/statutory reference points</th>
<th>OfS Conditions of Registration B4 (assessment – particularly “academic regulations are designed to ensure that relevant awards are credible” and B5 (alignment with sector-recognised standards). Queen Mary University of London Academic Regulations General Medical Council (GMC) and General Dental Council (GDC) policies and procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy and risk</th>
<th>No specific points.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</th>
<th>Considered and endorsed by the EQSB Assessment Sub-Board. Considered and endorsed by the Education Quality and Standards Board. Senate to consider for approval.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Paper and Coversheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dr Nimesh Patel, Institute of Health Sciences Education Head of Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professor Rakesh Patel, Head of MBBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dr Swati Nehete, Institute of Dentistry Lead for Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dr JAG Buchanan, Institute of Dentistry Director of Taught Programmes In Consultation with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Simon Hayter, Head of Academic Quality and Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sponsor | |
|---------| |
Appendix

Proposed changes to Section 4 of the MBBS and BDS Academic Regulations

The Medical and Dental schools’ sector is slowly moving to providing students with additional sits within a repeat year. The processes by which these are offered to students varies between institution. For instance, Aston University permits all students up to three attempts at an examination, with two of those attempts being within a single academic year. Cardiff University is currently going through the process of changing regulations for MBBS to permit an automatic third attempt with a fourth being granted under exceptional circumstances. The Southampton MBBS programme provides an automatic third attempt as part of its current university regulations. The GMC allows up to four attempts at the Medical Licensing Assessment, depending on local university rules.

In a recent survey carried out by the Dental Schools Council, it was identified that the ability to award third sits is supported by academics in all schools and two schools already have automatic third sits.

An additional sit in a repeat year would allow students to consolidate their learning from the previous year and succeed. It has been our experience that those students who return on appeal and successfully repeat the previously unsuccessful year continue to be successful in subsequent years. The opportunity of an automatic third sit as defined by the proposed change of regulations outlined below would allow students to remain on the programme without the additional anxiety of an appeal process. Students who are then repeating the year would be offered the necessary support, both academically and pastorally, to provide the maximum opportunity for success.

The proposal allows the subject examination board to automatically give students a third attempt without consideration of circumstances or potential to succeed, which
is currently the case as described in the academic regulations. Any student who then fails at the third attempt would then be automatically deregistered without consideration of circumstances or potential to succeed. Students would still have the right to appeal after deregistration as is currently the case.

Consultation with student representatives has been positive and it is felt that this would be clearer, supportive, and better understood.

It is recommended that these revised regulations are implemented and supported at Subject Examination Boards in the 2023/24 academic as they would be viewed in the best interests of students.

Dr Nimesh Patel
Head of IHSE Assessment

Prof Rakesh Patel
Head of MBBS

Dr Swati Nehete
IoD Lead for Assessment

Dr JAG Buchanan
Director of Taught Programmes

---
Academic Regulations amendments:

Number of attempts (MBBS)
4.87 On successful completion of Section A, a student will normally be allowed two attempts at examinations in Sections B, C and D during an academic year: one first attempt or first sit, and one resit attempt.

Number of attempts (BDS)
On successful completion of clinical requirements, LiftUpp requirements and in-course assessments whilst meeting expectations of the GDC, a student will normally be allowed two attempts at end of year examinations during an academic year: one first attempt or first sit, and one resit attempt.

Resits (MBBS and BDS)
4.88 Resit marks will normally be capped at the pass mark.

Retakes (MBBS)
4.92 The Subject Examination Board may consider as follows:

i. Where a student has failed to pass any or all Sections of a Part at the second attempt in the Late Summer examination period, the Board will permit the student to re-take the Part for a third and final attempt. Strict conditions will be imposed by the Subject Examination Board which may include to retake and pass all elements [including those passed] in Sections A, B, C, D and E as required by the mark scheme. Such a student will be closely monitored, and unsatisfactory performance may lead to deregistration at any point in the year. On passing the Part, such a student will have their marks capped to the pass mark for the module.

ii. Where a student fails to pass an examination at the second attempt in the Summer examination period, the Subject Examination Board shall permit a capped third sit in the Late Summer examination period.

iii. If a candidate fails more than one of Sections B, C or D at the first attempt in the Summer sitting and the Late Summer sitting is less than four weeks from when the candidate is notified of the failure, the Subject Examination Board may, taking into account previous academic performance, normally require the candidate to repeat the year before taking their second attempt at the failed examinations.

Retakes (BDS)
The Subject Examination Board may consider the following:

i. Where a student has failed to pass any or all sections of a Part at the second attempt in the requisite examination period, the Board may permit the student to re-take the year for a third and final attempt with strict conditions imposed by the Subject Examination Board. These conditions will include retaking and passing all elements [including those passed] in full attendance. The student will need to meet requirements for clinical practice elements,
LiftUpp requirements and in-course assessments whilst meeting expectations of the GDC. A student in this position will be closely monitored, and unsatisfactory performance may lead to deregistration at any point in the year. Upon passing the Part, the student will have their marks capped to the pass mark for the module.

ii. Where a student fails to pass an examination at the second attempt in the summer examination period, the Subject Examination Board may permit a capped third sit in the Late Summer examination period if deemed appropriate.

iii. If a student fails more than one element at the first attempt in the summer sitting and the resit examinations are less than four weeks from when the candidate is notified of the failure, the Subject Examination Board may, taking into account previous academic performance, require the candidate to repeat the year before taking their second attempt at the failed examinations.

Deregistration (MBBS and BDS)
4.93 Failure of any element at the third attempt will lead to deregistration from the programme.
11. Wolfson Institute of Population Health
new centre structure
Part 2: Matters For Discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paper Title</strong></th>
<th>WIPH Proposal for New Centre Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>approve</strong> the creation of a sixth centre and to rename an existing centre within the Wolfson Institute of Population Health (WIPH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points for Senate members to note and further information</strong></td>
<td>The WIPH recently appointed Professor Peter Sasieni, a renowned expert in cancer screening, prevention and clinical trials and his large group of 50 staff. This will increase the WIPH headcount to c450 staff, 100 PhD students and ~500 PGT students. Offers to opportunity to create a globally leading centre for early cancer detection and diagnosis at the WIPH. Recognises the rapidly growing national and international reputation of the preventive neurology team who are achieving significant impact with their work. This change will not result in any redundancies and no additional funding is being requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions for Senate to consider</strong></td>
<td>In accordance with point 5. of Ordinance A12, Senate are requested to approve the formation of an additional centre within the WIPH and the renaming of an existing centre, the administrative home of which will be within the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory/statutory reference points</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and risk</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting/consideration route</strong></td>
<td>Senate to approve before publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for the paper</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Authors**       | Professor Fiona Walter, Institute Director, Wolfson Institute of Population Health  
Ellie Stewart, Institute Manager, Wolfson Institute of Population Health |
| **Sponsor**       | Professor Sir Mark Caulfield, VP Health, FMD |
Wolfson Institute of Population Health

Author: Fiona Walter, Wolfson Institute of Population Health
SET Sponsor: Mark Caulfield, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry

Summary Request
The recent appointment of Professor Peter Sasieni, an internationally renowned expert in cancer prevention, clinical trials and cancer screening, offers the opportunity to combine our extant international strengths in cancer and create a globally leading Centre for Early Cancer Detection at the Wolfson Institute of Population Health (WIPH). Professor Sasieni will be bringing with him a group of 50 research and clinical trial staff. The WIPH will increase to approximately 450 staff, with more than 100 PhD students and about 500 postgraduate taught students. Our existing Centre for Prevention, Detection and Diagnosis will become oversized. Within this existing Centre is the Preventive Neurology Unit, founded in 2017 following strategic investment by Barts Charity, and demonstrating rapid growth and quality outputs.

Approval is therefore requested to create a sixth centre within the WIPH and to revise the named existing Centre to accommodate this exciting and prestigious recruitment. This change will not result in any redundancies and no additional funding is being requested. In particular, there is sufficient administrative support in the budget for a new Centre.

The current WIPH centre structure is:
- Centre for Evaluation and Methods
- Centre for Prevention, Detection and Diagnosis
- Centre for Primary Care
- Centre for Psychiatry and Mental Health
- Centre for Public Health and Policy

The proposed new WIPH centre structure (see Appendix A) is:
- Centre for Cancer Screening, Prevention and Early Diagnosis (renamed from Centre for Prevention, Detection and Diagnosis)
- Centre for Evaluation and Methods
- Centre for Preventive Neurology (new)
- Centre for Primary Care
- Centre for Psychiatry and Mental Health
- Centre for Public Health and Policy

Introduction
The Wolfson Institute of Population Health (WIPH) was formed in 2021, merging the former Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine and the Institute of Population Health Sciences. WIPH is part of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry and delivers internationally recognised research and teaching in population health, mental health, primary care and preventive medicine.
The health of populations around the globe has steadily improved over the last century; however, health systems face growing challenges in delivering better health. Climate change, environmental degradation, poverty, inequality, ageing populations, urbanisation, political upheaval, migration on an unprecedented scale, and more recently, the COVID pandemic, combine to exacerbate existing and create new needs. The Institute is a grouping of scientists and educators in applied health sciences, including public and global health, health services and primary care research, clinical trials, health policy and economics, health data science, behavioural and social sciences, epidemiology, biostatistics, translational and implementation science.

The Vision
QMUL’s Strategy 2030 focuses on excellence in education and research. The Institute brings together researchers and educators active in the field of population health, primary care and prevention who, with others in the FMD and the wider university, demonstrates to funding, Government, national and global health bodies the commitment by Queen Mary to develop research-informed policy responses to the population health, public health, primary care and prevention agenda.

The Institute’s strategic aims over the next five years are to:

- Enhance the recognition of the Institute as a centre of excellence for the study and advancement of population health, prevention, primary care and public health at a local, national and global level;
- Provide an intellectually stimulating and diverse environment for the development of talented staff and high-quality training of postgraduate students;
- Provide the highest calibre education in public health, primary care and prevention;
- Achieve the highest impact from our research through influencing, developing and implementing and evaluating new health policies and clinical practices.

Rationale
WIPH currently comprises five Centres including the Centre for Prevention, Detection & Diagnosis. We propose renaming this Centre and creating a sixth Centre.

(A) Centre for Cancer Screening, Prevention and Early Diagnosis
We propose to integrate the Sasieni Group (moving from Kings College London on 1st September 2023) within the existing Cancer Prevention Unit and Cancer Detection and Diagnosis Unit in the Centre for Prevention, Detection & Diagnosis into a new Centre for Cancer Screening, Prevention and Early Diagnosis, which will be jointly led by Professor Sasieni and Duffy.

Integrating the Sasieni group will bring immediate and immense benefits to the University. We envisage delivering an international centre of excellence in translational cancer screening, prevention and early diagnosis that will conduct practice changing research and teaching for at least the next two decades. Our vision is to transform cancer detection in the UK so that the NHS leads the world. This will be attained through raising cancer awareness, increasing early cancer diagnosis, and improving access to and outcomes from cancer screening. Working with and for patients and the public, we will provide evidence to enable the government and the NHS to make good policy decisions and to reduce inequalities in cancer outcomes. The academic staff will include epidemiologists, statisticians, GPs and other clinicians, plus psychologists and other behavioural scientists. The centre will also include a specialist clinical trials unit, currently among the leading cancer trials units in the country (one of only seven to receive CRUK funding) attracting grants to deliver the largest and most influential trials in the field internationally. Of note is the NHS-Galleri Trial, a ground-breaking large (140,000
randomised) study to see how well a new blood test (that can detect signs of many different types of cancer in a blood sample) would work in an NHS screening programme. The aim of the trial is to see if using the Galleri test alongside existing cancer screening can help to find cancer early when it is usually easier to treat and thereby prevent advanced cancer.

The Centre also focus on national and international capacity building, linking with Walter’s Cancer Research UK-funded annual CanTest International School for Cancer Detection Research in Primary Care. It will harness teaching expertise to contribute modules in research methods, epidemiology, biostatistics, diagnostics, qualitative research, and clinical trials methodology to new and existing education offerings.

The move to Queen Mary will also facilitate succession planning for Professor Sasieni’s retirement as Professor Gabe (Professor of Biostatistics and Clinical Trials) is well placed to take over as Director. There will also be a need to identify a new Deputy Director from oncology or cancer surgery at Barts Health NHS Trust. This is an opportunity to build closer collaborations within FMD between the WIPH and Barts Cancer Institute (BCI).

(B) Centre for Preventive Neurology

We propose to transition the Preventive Neurology Unit (PNU), currently part of the Centre for Prevention, Detection and Diagnosis, into a new Centre for Preventive Neurology. The Preventive Neurology Unit was founded in 2017 following strategic investment by Barts Charity. Its overall goal is to challenge the belief that diseases of the brain are incurable and cannot be prevented through research and, ultimately, intervention and policy change. Early detection can slow the disease process and improve support for people with the conditions. The group’s research is focused on risk factors for neurological disease, early detection, clinical cohort creation, resource generation, clinical trials (drug and non-drug), biomarkers, use of routinely collected health care data, research in under-represented populations, influencing policy, and PPIE.

The core themes of Parkinson’s disease, multiple sclerosis and dementia are led by Professor Alastair Noyce, Dr Ruth Dobson and Dr Charles Marshall respectively. The academic staff include clinicians, statisticians, epidemiologists, health psychologists, with strong public and patient engagement. The group has a headcount of ~65 individuals working in or affiliated with the team; approximately half are research focused, 10 are postgraduate students, and 7 are professional services staff. Fifteen planned posts will bring our total number to ~80. The group has nurtured collaborations across the WIPH with the cancer, psychiatry and primary care teams, health psychologists and epidemiologists, leading to collaborative grant applications and awards.

The proposed transition to Centre status is reflective of their rapidly growing reputation as national and international leaders in their respective fields, across both academic and clinical arenas. The group has seen a year-on-year increase in grant income. The current total grant income of >£12m is generated from a range of major UK funders (NIHR, MRC, Innovate UK), charities (Parkinson’s UK, Michael J Fox Foundation, Cure Parkinson’s, MS Society, NMSS, BMA Foundation) and industry (Alchemab, Charco Neurotech, Biogen, Merck). The group has published >200 articles, including in the New England Journal of Medicine, Nature Genetics, Lancet Neurology, JAMA Neurology, Brain, Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry, Annals and Neurology, and their research regularly features in mainstream news on the television, radio and print media. Their impact is rising, and several projects have been prioritised for the upcoming REF cycle.

The Centre will continue to take an active role in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching. The groups are currently contributing to the year 2 module Human Science and Public Health and leading the year 3 module Public Health for the MBBS programme. The Centre will develop a module in
neurology and contribute to modules in epidemiology, global health, preventive medicine, methodology and engagement for new and existing postgraduate education offerings.

Patient and public involvement and engagement (PPIE) is central to the Preventive Neurology Unit’s work. The group actively engage with those affected by the research through various means: each disease area has dedicated advisory groups that guide research direction, patients are integrated into both undergraduate and postgraduate education, and the groups explore health challenges with co-researchers. Through all of this, the groups prioritise representation and inclusivity, ensuring these groups represent our patient populations and communities. Alongside a dedicated working group to uphold PPIE across the groups, preventive neurology researchers also explore the theoretical implications of PPIE as a research theme, contributing to Institute (WIPH Public Advisory Panel) and University participatory practices (through links with the CPE). The group is pursuing innovative PPIE approaches through collaborations with the Drama department and the QM Arts and Health Network.
Appendix A

WIPH Current structure

![Diagram of WIPH Current structure]

WIPH proposed future structure
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12. Research Integrity Policy
Part 2: Matters For Discussion
### Senate

#### Paper Title
**Research Integrity Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome requested</th>
<th>To approve the revised Research Integrity Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Points for Senate members to note and further information | The existing policy, approved by Senate in 2014, is provided in Appendix A for comparison. The most significant amendment is the acknowledgement that the Research Integrity Committee have assumed responsibility for research integrity policy and strategy within the University. Previously, this resided with the Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee (QMERC). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Senate to consider</th>
<th>Is Senate satisfied with the revisions to the policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Regulatory/statutory reference points | The University subscribes to the commitments of the Universities UK (UUK) Concordat to Support Research Integrity. |

| Strategy and risk | Ensuring that our research is carried out with rigour and regard to ethical considerations is a professional responsibility of all researchers and is essential to our reputation for research excellence. This is required to ensure the confidence of funders and others. Ensuring that our governance and processes for dealing with allegations of research misconduct are transparent and robust allows for the quality of our research and reputation to be maintained. |

| Reporting/consideration route for the paper | |

| Authors | James Patterson, Research Integrity and Assurance Officer |
| Sponsor | Professor Andrew Livingston, Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation) |
Queen Mary Policy on Research Integrity: Revised version

Queen Mary University of London is committed to the highest standards of integrity and probity in the conduct of research and our procedures are aligned to those established by the United Kingdom Research Integrity Office (UKRIO). To this end, the University subscribes to the commitments of the Universities UK (UUK) Concordat to Support Research Integrity, which are as follows:

- Maintaining the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research.
- Ensuring that research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal, and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards.
- Supporting a research environment that is underpinned by a culture of integrity and based on good governance, best practice, and support for the development of researchers.
- Using transparent, robust, and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise.
- Working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to reviewing progress regularly and openly.

These commitments form an integral part of Queen Mary’s approach to the ethical conduct of research, its mission, and values. The Queen Mary Strategy and the statement of our values are published at http://www.qmul.ac.uk/strategy/the%20strategy/index.html

The Queen Mary Research Integrity Committee has been granted authority by Senate to discuss and propose policies for embedding a culture of good research practice, characterised by honesty, rigour, transparency, care and respect, and accountability. This encompasses issues such as training and data-management among others. The Committee is also charged with the oversight of investigations into allegations of research misconduct.

In tandem, the Senate has authorised the Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee (QMERC) to review the ethics of research studies involving human participants recruited outside the NHS. This is to ensure that ethical risks are minimised in accordance with University policy. The Committee is also responsible for ensuring that researchers and other colleagues are advised appropriately about research ethics and for developing relevant policy.

Queen Mary Policy on Research Integrity

Queen Mary is committed to producing and promoting high quality research which is conducted according to the highest standards of integrity. To support these aims, in all fields of research, Queen Mary has adopted the commitments of the UUK “Concordat to support research integrity” which are:

- Maintaining the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research;
- Ensuring that research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal, and professional frameworks, obligations, and standards;
- Supporting a research environment that is underpinned by a culture of integrity and based on good governance, best practice, and support for the development of researchers;
- Using transparent, robust, and fair processes to deal with allegations of research misconduct should they arise;
- Working together to strengthen the integrity of research and to reviewing progress regularly and openly.

These commitments form an integral part of Queen Mary’s approach to the ethical conduct of research, its mission and values. The Queen Mary Strategy and the statement of our values are published at [http://www.qmul.ac.uk/strategy/the%20strategy/index.html](http://www.qmul.ac.uk/strategy/the%20strategy/index.html)

All Queen Mary research policies require that ethical risks should be minimised; risks should be appropriately and adequately managed where they cannot be eliminated.

Research must be demonstrably independent.

Conflicts of interest should be avoided; if a conflict cannot be avoided, it should be clearly declared to all those involved in the study, its publication, and any work resulting from it.

The Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee has been authorised by Senate to advise on all research policies, to oversee their ethical content, and to provide advice on ethical and related issues arising from their implementation. This includes training of researchers, data management, research misconduct, discrimination, confidentiality, and acceptance of funding.

The Senate has granted authority to the Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee to establish criteria, processes, and procedures to enact this policy and to grant approval to research according to its terms.

Authorisation

This policy was approved by the Queen Mary Senate on 4 December 2014

Further information

Please see [http://connect.qmul.ac.uk/research/ethics-of-research-committee/index.html](http://connect.qmul.ac.uk/research/ethics-of-research-committee/index.html)

---

1 [http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Pages/Theconcordattosupportresearchintegrity.aspx#UpN4tdJSgqo](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Pages/Theconcordattosupportresearchintegrity.aspx#UpN4tdJSgqo)
13. Professional Doctorate award title of Clinical Doctorate (DClin)
Part 2: Matters For Discussion
Presented by Anthony Warrens
Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper title</th>
<th>New award title of Clinical Doctorate (DClin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome requested</td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>approve</strong> the introduction of the new award title of Clinical Doctorate (DClin) on the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, and with the approval of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB) and the Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB). If approved, Council will be asked to approve the addition of the award of Clinical Doctorate to Ordinance A16, section 1.6 denoting research degrees (FHEQ level 8) awarded by Queen Mary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Points to note and further information | The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry plans to introduce new professional clinical doctorates. These programmes are designed for practicing clinicians and will be delivered through the Queen Mary International Clinical Academy (QMICA). The vision for the Academy is to establish a first-in-UK world-class International Clinical Academy specialising in clinical postgraduate education for international students. The new Clinical Doctorate programmes, together with the existing suite of Doctor of Clinical Dentistry (DClinDent) programmes, will form a core offering at level 8 doctoral study to fulfil part of the following underpinning aims of the Academy to provide:  
- a varied portfolio informed by market research and “global” need;  
- exposure to a different health system and culture, gaining insights into medical ethics, regulation, inclusive medicine, the management and finance of healthcare, and the role of government in healthcare;  
- the opportunity to develop and professionalise students’ experience of medical education as an academic discipline;  
- an agile portfolio that is responsive to population health needs in the next century, particularly in the context of increased global warming and conflict;  
- flexibility in offering pathways for specialized clinical areas as well as in health infrastructure, e.g. health leadership, medico-legal, etc.;  
- flexible learning approaches and levels, including Clinical CPD, Clinical MScs, and Professional Clinical Doctorates;  
- high quality placements with partner NHS organisations with a clear reciprocal benefit. This ‘hands on’ opportunity will make this programme unique (to the best of FMD’s knowledge) and will be the principal reason for its international attractiveness. FMD has already ensured that this will be an attractive approach to NHS partners at the level of delivery teams as well as Trust leadership. |
The Clinical Doctorate programmes will be key elements in the QMICA plans as:

1) an enabler for developing specific cohorts of clinicians and clinical academics at Queen Mary. This has been initiated as part of conversations with institutions in the Middle East (such as in Qatar) but also builds on previous discussions, such as in Malaysia. These degrees may also potentially provide a route for UK clinical trainees, raising the FMD faculty profile and reputation;

2) an enabler for the development and enhancement of relationships with NHS partners;

3) a means of developing a route to delivery of elements of the QM Strategy 2030, by providing at the highest levels the possibility of ‘integrated placements, internships and research projects’ embedded in the programme curriculum and linked to the real-world NHS experience.

The Research Degrees Board has seen detailed papers presenting a template for the structure of the DClin full-time and part-time awards. The Board commends the Faculty for the significant investment of effort and careful consideration put into the development of the new programme offering and the discussion about the most appropriate award titles.

The Faculty proposal paper is annexed for information. The initial proposal was to create two new Professional Doctorate award titles of Doctor of Clinical Medicine and Doctor of Clinical Surgery. Following discussion with RDPEB and EQSB about concerns over a potential proliferation of award titles and regulations as more specialisms were developed, it has been agreed to propose the more generic award title of Clinical Doctorate that could be applied across multiple programmes. The development of new programmes and specialisms will be accommodated in the programme name, for example Clinical Doctorate in Medicine, Clinical Doctorate in Surgery. The paper has been updated to refer only to the Clinical Doctorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to consider</th>
<th>(i) Does Senate approve the establishment of the new award of Clinical Doctorate (DClin) to support the underpinning aims of the postgraduate Queen Mary International Clinical Academy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/statutory reference points</td>
<td>New programme proposals will be considered jointly by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board and the Taught Programmes Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategy and risk | **Queen Mary Strategy 2030**  
This proposal supports the following components of the 2030 strategy:  
- Education  
- Research and Innovation  
- Global Engagement  

**Risk**  
The QMICA Operations Board meets regularly to discuss and monitor progress in addressing the key factors underpinning the proposals e.g. NHS placements, new posts, development of partnerships and funding steams. Progress is being made in these key areas: |
- Placements. Barts Health NHS Trust has agreed to provide placement opportunities for DClin students to enable them to gain the experience required as the basis for work toward modules in years 2 and 3 of the programme. QMUL are working towards drafting a placement agreement with the Barts Health Education Academy.
- Programme staff. The Faculty has approved the business plan including new roles to support QMICA and the Clinical Doctorate programmes. The QMICA project manager has been appointed and the plans include funding for a programmes manager and academic lead/director.
- Funding. The Faculty is discussing plans with potential overseas bodies.

### Reporting/consideration route for the paper

**Approvals:**
1. Subject to approval by Senate, the proposal will be recommended to Council’s Governance Committee to approve the addition of the new award title to Ordinance A16 1.6– Research Degrees (FHEQ level 8).

### Sponsors

Vice-Principal (Health)
Deputy Vice-Principal (Health)
Dean for Education, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry

### Contact

Professor Maralyn Druce, Deputy Dean for Education, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
[mar.druce@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:mar.druce@qmul.ac.uk)

Mary Childs
Research Degrees Office, for the Research Degrees Board
[m.childs@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:m.childs@qmul.ac.uk)
Proposal for Professional Clinical Doctorate (DClin)

Consultation: QMICA Operations Board Chaired by Professor Irene Leigh

Prior to convening the QMICA group various discussions had taken place around this within a working group comprising:

- Professor Anthony Warrens (co-Chair of the Curriculum Workstream): Dean for Education
- Professor Maralyn Druce (co-Chair of the Curriculum Workstream): Deputy Dean for Education
- Professor Irene Leigh: (Lead for Queen Mary International Clinical Academy Operations Board)
- Professor Paul Chapple: Deputy Dean for Postgraduate Research
- Professor Paul Anderson: Professor of Oral Biology
- Mary Childs: Assistant Academic Registrar
- Alice de Havillan: Academic Quality and Standards Officer
- Adam Wilkinson: Faculty Strategy Officer (Research)
- Philip Gill: Faculty Strategy Officer (Education)
- Zi Parker: QMUL Doctoral College Manager
- George Borrie: Faculty Education Manager

Approval of award title of DClin for addition to Ordinances:

Timeline for hurdles to be cleared identified as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board / Committee</th>
<th>Target Meeting Date for DClin Proposal Submission</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – approval of degree title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD TLC for discussion of paper and part one</td>
<td>April 20th 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD VP Health Executive Board</td>
<td>May 11th 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMUL Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB)</td>
<td>June 7th for June 21st 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMUL Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB)</td>
<td>July 26th 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 – approval of specific programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD TLC for Part one</td>
<td>June 8th 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD VP Health Executive Board</td>
<td>June 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD TLC for consideration of full proposal</td>
<td>September or latest October 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMUL Professional Doctorates Committee</td>
<td>November 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

This proposal is for the incorporation of the Professional Clinical Doctorate award at Queen Mary. Queen Mary has recently introduced several professional doctorates for example: DPsych and DClinDent in the Faculty of
Medicine and Dentistry; and an Engineering Doctorate (EngD) within the Faculty of Science and Engineering. Adding Professional Doctorates in Medical and Surgical disciplines would position the university to offer a higher level of educational development in our disciplines and would meet a need outlined by partners in other health systems. This proposal has been initiated as part of conversations with institutions in the Middle East (such as in Qatar) but also builds on discussion with institutions with whom we have had previous discussions such as in Malaysia. It would increase the range of research options available for senior clinicians and provide opportunities to develop professional skills at a high level for UK trainees and international graduates.

The Queen Mary International Clinical Academy (QMICA) group have been scoping and developing a ‘map’ of the relevant educational offering around CPD and taught postgraduate programmes, and on the basis of the experience in other disciplines, market research and working with international partners in the healthcare space, the addition of Professional Doctorates would form a cornerstone of higher-level research training and educational programming and promote opportunities within and together with our NHS clinical partners.
ACADEMIC CASE FOR THE PROFESSIONAL CLINICAL DOCTORATE

CURRENT OFFER

TAUGHT PROGRAMMES:
Currently, for clinicians and clinical academics wishing to study at Queen Mary, we offer a number of taught (Level 7) programmes at PgCert, PgDip and MSc level as well as MRes programmes which provide a greater emphasis on – and more time spent in – research projects and dissertations. Some of these programmes provide a relatively broad basis for further development (healthcare research methods for example) while others are very focussed on the development of professional skills (such as genomics, gastroenterology and so on). There are some 1+3 programmes that provide research training as a base for a lab-based PhD. However, there is a gap for clinicians who would like to develop their clinical research skills to a higher level while incorporating professional development in their given field in a way that would best further career progression.

Research Programmes (PhD and MD(Res)):
Many clinicians take ‘time out’ of their clinical training to pursue a period of formal research training. This is limited by and large to students able to find funding either from grant awarding bodies or from funds held by the project supervisor. On occasion, commercially sponsored or pharmaceutical research may form the basis for such a research degree. Traditionally PhD programmes are completed full time (for UK clinicians this requires special permission for time out of training programmes, in order to pursue the research degree); MD(Res) programmes may be pursued full time or sometimes part time alongside a reduced level of clinical commitments. Both qualifications are looked upon favourably by employers and by clinicians wishing to build careers in clinical academia, although in general the numbers of UK students registered for MD(Res) has declined, in favour of PhD. There is scope for utilising the higher-level professional research requirements incumbent on doctors to build towards a more professionally-relevant research qualification for practicing clinicians.

BENEFITS OF INTRODUCING PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE PROGRAMMES IN MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Enhancing the capacity to build and offer a more professionally-relevant research qualification for practicing clinicians.

A Professional Doctorate programme such as this is designed to deepen research knowledge, skills, attitudes, and practices. Hence, graduates from these programmes will be better equipped to develop educational practice, curricula, and policies to shape reform efforts and to drive innovation. Completion of a professional doctorate via this process supports clinicians to continue a research programme alongside work or training roles. It may also allow engagement with industry partners for example for support in pharma-funded studies. Such a programme allows students to undertake relevant training to support their research programmes rather than follow a wholly prescriptive direction. The relationship with our NHS partners will also be a significant training ‘draw’ for international candidates and the
clinical exposure in turn is utilized in the various Level 8 modules offered.

For too long, the postgraduate training on offer from UK universities which has often been a required threshold for career progression within the NHS has been of limited relevance to the future careers of the clinicians involved. These degrees are designed to provide training of lifelong relevance to clinicians, whether they work in the UK or abroad and in 'traditionally' academic or non-academic centres.

Increasing reach to a broader range of international students
Introducing this route to further study provides a progression opportunity for existing clinical MSc students but also provides an opportunity for clinicians working at senior levels to develop a portfolio of high level clinical and research skills as well as to complete projects that are of benefit to their countries and institutions as well as supporting their own career development. Evidence from the success of the suite of DClinDent programmes on offer have shown these kinds of professional research programmes to be both attractive to and valued by international learners. The DClin programmes are designed to enable students to access suitable elements of their learning remotely in a blended learning format (enabling some of their time to be spent off campus or even in their home countries which should make this particularly attractive to individuals who wish to spend some time in the UK but for practical reasons are unable to relocate. In line with the PGR regulations, the programme length for full time students would be 3 years and part time would be 6 years of study.

Offer for Professional Development for clinicians from Partner Institutions (TNE enabling plan)
This proposal supports the TNE plans for the university as, once established, may function as a basis for further development of specific programmes which could offer a higher level of professional development to partner institutions with whom we are having discussions. The university has ambitious plans for expansion in TNE and to have this opportunity within our offer will strengthen Queen Mary’s position as a leader in this area, building on the excellent international reputation of the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. Working with UK training deaneries it is possible that the part time option would be well supported by the Deaneries responsible for oversight of UK higher medical training and the part time option could be managed alongside the ‘less than full time training’ processes in place in Deaneries whereby it is possible to apply to reduce overall hours of NHS work. Anthony Warrens and Maralyn Druce have already had preliminary discussions with HEE about this.
STRUCTURE OF PROPOSED CLINICAL DOCTORATE

Credits
The proposed credits for the Clinical Doctorate degree programmes will be aligned to the existing university regulations for Professional Doctorates (see page number 117 onwards).

Duration
The duration of the programmes will align with the minimum and maximum duration in the current university regulations (see page 115).

Pathways and Exit awards
The design of any programme would have to explore different pathways and consider that Professional Doctorates may experience a certain attrition rate, given the demands of undertaking significant postgraduate study alongside a busy professional role. There are suitable early exit points at PgCert, PgDip and MSc levels and these will be indicated in the specific programme proposals. Students exiting at an even earlier stage will receive a transcript indicating the number of completed taught module credits, which could be used via the usual credit transfer/APL arrangements towards another relevant programme at Queen Mary or elsewhere.

Design and Delivery
The DClin will encompass programmes designed and delivered through a collaborative effort. They will incorporate taught modules provided in ‘suites’ by teams used to delivering these groupings of modules within existing taught provision or will incorporate new ‘suites’ of taught modules to meet particular learning needs. There are two new modules designed to be taught centrally. Level 8 module topics will be selected according to the interests of the student to allow the development of suitable and discipline-specific knowledge and research projects. Supervisors will therefore be drawn directly from the relevant clinical and academic areas with oversight by dedicated programme and module leaders. The design will be based on our educational approach but will certainly use the latest approaches including blended learning.

Principles of Programme Structure
The Professional Doctorate should equip clinicians with generic and specialty-specific clinical expertise including up to date knowledge and, where practicable, clinical skills and understanding. The design is modular and comprises 540 credit-equivalents with a maximum of 180 credits at Level 7 and the remainder at Level 8. The bulk of the taught modules and perhaps some of the research components could be studied off-campus with appropriate governance arrangements in place, including programme and module leadership as well as appropriate levels of professional service staff support to ensure optimal oversight and management of the programme delivery, as outlined in the business case.

120 credits (generally eight elective modules of 15-credit Level 7 material) are drawn from a portfolio of specialty-relevant education within FMD – there are a number of possible tracks, each with a different learning style but which both favour generic research-relevant areas. A further 60 credits are drawn from bespoke modules for this programme. These Level 7
modules are followed by a number of research and professional modules to complete the Professional Doctorate. In the future, new programme proposals could offer alternative specific suites or tracks or the development of specific and further bespoke modules; an example would be 120 credits plus the 60 bespoke credits to comprise an initial MSc in Advanced / Clinical Medicine.

**Formal structure in detail**

The structure of the programme has been considered at TLC and RDPEB including notes on modules that already exist that are incorporated into the diet and new modules to be proposed and approved in order to create a complete programme. The aims / areas covered as well as assessment type are noted in each of the modules but more detailed information about aims, learning outcomes, teaching methods and formative and summative assessment will be outlined in the further and detailed module and programme proposal documentation for review at TLC and joint ad hoc committee of TPB and RDPEB as part of standard governance processes.

**Relationship of Clinical Activity and the Educational Programme**

The structure of the programme anticipates that students will be engaged in clinical activity to support the level 8 elements of the programme. It is anticipated that some or all of this time may be undertaken as clinical placements with NHS partners in the specific specialties of interest to the students. Barts Health Trust are aware of the proposal and supportive of its development and we are working towards the development of Service level agreements as part of the development of such placements. Entry requirements for students would therefore include eligibility for GMC registration to enable them to fully participate in clinical departments to support the development of their research and professional portfolio activity.

---

**CASE FOR CLINICAL DOCTORATE INCLUDING MARKET ANALYSIS**

**Home students**

It is likely that initially the pool of internal students will be small and limited to the part time option to ensure that salaried work can continue during ongoing studies. Commitment to a 6-year part time programme is likely to extend beyond training years and therefore this is likely to further limit the pool of individuals.

**International / External students**

A professional education doctorate offer by Queen Mary will be a novel offering for clinicians from both the UK and internationally. External students will be able to join from international healthcare organisations, including our TNE partners. It is likely that numbers will be small and from selected partner markets initially and as more organisations express interest in enrolling their doctors in our programme, the more we will be able to modify the components of the programme (for example the specialty areas for research and portfolio development) to meet the needs of the specific cohorts of applicants. Overall, we might anticipate a cohort of around 5 students in the first intake. The choice of ‘track’ for the taught modules will not impact on the funding or support required as 6 of the modules are already taught as part of existing PgDip provision and do not require additional teaching support to accommodate these students, while the two new modules are common to both ‘tracks’. Given that
the first year of the programme (full time) or first two years (part time) comprise taught modules, this early phase gives time for DBS and OH checks prior to any activities within the NHS Trust and applications for research ethics approval (in UK and home country if research is conducted overseas) for later project work, likewise for applications to Partnerships Board for approval of partners if required.

Specific Market reports
An extensive market research report has been provided by the marketing team and is included in Appendix Two (not enclosed).

Choice of award title
The use of DClin is in line with our existing suite of DClinDent programmes and have greater market recognition within the clinical world that the more generic DProf used in a wider and less focussed range of disciplines.

The use of an alternative option for a single degree classification that could be used across the university and indeed that may already be in existence and could be used instead of the current proposed new award titles was considered (such as Doctorate in Professional Studies). However, it was not felt that the applicants or possible partner institutions would have the same level of recognition of a more generic award title and that this would impact recruitment. As precedent, it was noted that the university already has some differentiated Professional Doctorates such as DClinDent and EngD, which have been able to recruit well within a highly specialised market.

The offering of programmes Clinical Doctorate in Medicine, Clinical Doctorate in Surgery etc. is relevant to the applicants who have already differentiated in terms of clinical career (physician-specialties or surgery) at the time of undertaking the research degree and who will therefore anticipate an award in line with the nature of their research activity, despite a similar programme structure.
14. Approval of membership and terms of reference for sub-boards of Senate for 2023-2024

Part 2: Matters For Discussion

Presented by Jane Pallant
Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Approval of membership and terms of reference for sub-boards of Senate for 2023-2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Outcome requested**

Senate is asked to **approve** the terms of reference and membership details of its sub-boards for 2023-24.

Terms of reference and membership for each of the following sub-boards is given below:

- Education Quality and Standards Board
- Taught Programmes Board
- Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board

The terms of reference and membership documents for the following sub-boards will be submitted to the next meeting of Senate:

- Ethics of Research Committee
- Partnerships Board

**Points for Senate members to note and further information**

n/a

**Questions for Senate to consider**

n/a

**Regulatory/statutory reference points**

n/a

**Strategy and risk**

n/a

**Reporting/consideration route for the paper**

n/a

**Authors**

Jane Pallant, Deputy Academic Registrar

**Sponsor**

n/a
The Senate is asked to **approve** the terms of reference and the membership of the Education Quality and Standards Board (EQSB) for the 2023-24 academic year.

**Terms of reference**
Scrutiny of summary reports relating to Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC) has been specifically added to the terms of reference. No other changes have been made other than the minor reordering of text.

**Membership**
Several changes have been proposed to the membership, principally to further strengthen links and communication between the Board and Faculties and Professional Services.

The Deputy Vice-Principal for Education (Programmes and Standards) (an existing member) will be appointed Deputy Chair.

The following will be added as members:

- the three Faculty Vice-Principals and Executive Deans.
- The Chief Operating Officer.
- the three Faculty Education Managers (or equivalent).
- the seven Chairs of the Degree Examination Boards (who previously held ‘in attendance’ status’).
- the Head of Academic Quality and Standards.

The Deputy Head of Academic Quality and Standards will be appointed Secretary (in attendance).
In previous years, each Faculty had three nominated members. This has been reduced to two, commensurate with the addition of the Faculty Vice- Principals and Executive Deans and the Faculty Education Manager as members and the inclusion of the (Faculty-based) DEB Chairs as full members. There are two current vacancies for nominated positions, for which the appointment process is underway.

The Board also proposes that an ex officio member unable to attend a meeting may nominate a suitable nominee to attend in their place with full membership rights for that meeting. However, a member who does not attend three consecutive meetings will be considered to have resigned their membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for Senate to consider</th>
<th>Is the Senate satisfied that the terms of reference accurately reflect the business and the powers of the Board, and that the membership is up to date and includes an appropriate balance of members to provide a range of informed opinion and expertise?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/statutory reference points</td>
<td>No specific points but the EQSB plays a key role in managing Queen Mary’s regulatory obligations including but not limited to work related to the Office for Students' Conditions of Registration. Appropriate terms of reference and membership will allow the Board to execute its responsibilities to the best possible standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and risk</td>
<td>No specific points, though as a principal organ of Queen Mary’s governance the EQSB plays a key role in supporting University strategies and mitigating risks. Appropriate terms of reference and membership are essential to the successful delivery of those responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</td>
<td>Endorsed by the EQSB. Senate to consider for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. To consider and advise the Senate on institutional strategies and policies which enhance learning, teaching and assessment across all Queen Mary programmes, and to promote excellent, research-informed teaching practice and curriculum design, and encouraging innovative approaches to learning by:

   a. supporting the development of staff involved in teaching and assessment;
   b. promoting developments in learning technologies and resources;
   c. supporting widening participation and outreach activities;
   d. taking steps to maximise the academic and career success of our diverse student body;
   e. analysing relevant performance indicators in relation to student progress and achievement, and student satisfaction.

2. To monitor indicators of progress in the Queen Mary Strategy 2030.

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

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

   a. matters arising from the conduct of examination boards, including external examiners’ reports;
   b. reports from external agencies, including the OfS, Ofsted, the QAA, PSRBs and Research Councils;
   c. reports and action plans arising from programme reviews and student surveys;
   d. reports and analysis relating to Student-Staff Liaison Committees.

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

   a. A standing sub-board is responsible for the detailed consideration of assessment matters (‘the EQSB Assessment Sub-Board’).

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

7. The quorum for the meeting is one third of the Board’s members.
Education Quality and Standards Board Membership 2023-24

Ex officio members

Vice-Principal (Education) and Deputy President and Principal (Chair):
Professor Stephanie Marshall

Deputy Vice- Principals (Education):

- Programmes and Standards (Deputy Chair): Professor Anthony Michael
- Strategic Projects:
  Professor Stefan Krummaker

Faculty Vice-Principals and Executive Deans:

- Humanities and Social Sciences: Professor Frances Bowen
- Health:
  Professor Sir Mark Caulfield
- Science and Engineering:
  Professor Wen Wang

Faculty Deans for Education:

- Humanities and Social Sciences: Elizabeth Gillow
- Medicine and Dentistry: Professor Anthony Warrens
- Science and Engineering:
  Professor Chris Bray

Dean for Postgraduate Research: Professor Tim Warner

Chief Operating Officer: Dr Sharon Ellis

Director of Governance and Legal Services: Jane Pallant

Head of Academic Quality and Standards: Simon Hayter

Director of the Queen Mary Academy: Professor Janet De Wilde

Director of Student Experience: Chris Shelley

University Librarian: Kate Price

Chairs of the Degree Examination Boards:

- Dentistry (Undergraduate): Dr John Buchanan
- Humanities and Social Sciences (Undergraduate): Professor Rachel Male
• Humanities and Social Sciences (Postgraduate): Dr Javier Sajuria
• Medicine (Undergraduate): Maria Hayfron-Benjamin
• Medicine and Dentistry (Postgraduate): Professor Mark Freestone
• Science and Engineering (Undergraduate): Professor Chris Bray
• Science and Engineering (Postgraduate): Dr Karim Malik

Faculty Education Managers (or equivalent):
• Humanities and Social Sciences: Dr Roussel de Carvalho
• Medicine and Dentistry: George Borrie
• Science and Engineering: Elizabeth Crooks

Queen Mary Students' Union:
• Vice-President (Humanities and Social Sciences): Jovani Palnoni
• Vice-President (Science and Engineering): Aisha Qadi
• Vice-President (Barts and the London): Amaan Abbas

Nominated members
Two academic nominees from each faculty with experience of education, quality, and standards. Normally, no more than one nominee should be a Deputy Dean or equivalent. * indicates a second term

• Humanities and Social Sciences: Sanmeet Kaur Dua (2020-21)*
  Vacant
• Medicine and Dentistry: Professor Maralyn Druce (2019-20)*
  Dr Lesley Robson (2019-20)*
• Science and Engineering: Dr Yasir Alfadhl (2021-22)
  Vacant

In attendance
Deputy Head of Academic Quality and Standards: Adam Streames
(Secretary)

Executive Officer (Education): Redwan Shahid
Head of Technology Enhanced Learning: Surjit Uppal
QMSU staff representative: Jonathan Otter
A member who does not attend three consecutive meetings will be considered to have resigned their membership.

An ex officio member who is unable to attend a meeting may nominate an appropriate colleague to attend in their place. Their nominee will count as a full member of the Board for that meeting.
Taught Programmes Board terms of reference 2023-24

The Taught Programmes Board has responsibility on behalf of the Senate for oversight of all taught provision (including non-credit bearing provision) and has a specific remit for the consideration of new programme proposals (and associated modules), significant programme amendments and programme suspensions/withdrawals. The responsibilities of the Taught Programmes Board are as follows:

1. To ensure that there is full and consistent consideration of new programme proposals;
2. To ensure that proposals are of a high academic standard, of an appropriate quality, and comply with Queen Mary’s internal strategic and external regulatory obligations (eg the Office for Students’ Conditions of Registration);
3. To ensure that the programme approval process is independent from the School/Institute that is proposing the development;
4. To provide procedures that allow for the most efficient turnaround times, greater responsiveness and the most cost-effective use of Queen Mary’s resources;
5. To recognise the contribution that can be made to the process by School/Institute learning and teaching lead staff and committees.

Terms of reference

1. To consider the detailed academic proposals for new taught programmes of study and related modules (including those delivered through collaborative provision);
2. To consider new module proposals where these are related to a new programme of study, or are delivered through:
   i. collaborative arrangements,
   ii. work-based learning,
   iii. apprenticeship programmes,
   iv. summer school modules,
   v. study-abroad,
   vi. distance learning.
3. To consider and (if appropriate) approve new taught programmes;
4. To consider and (if appropriate) approve proposals for significant amendments to programmes of studies;
5. To receive reports of module proposals and amendments to modules that have been approved by School/Institute Education Committees and scrutinised by the Directorate of Governance and Legal Services;

6. To establish groups to undertake specific tasks related to the Board’s remit and to consider recommendations from these groups. The Board has a standing sub-board for the consideration of apprenticeship programmes (the Degree Apprenticeships Programmes Sub-Board (DAPS)).

Procedures and constitution

1. The Board will hold no fewer than six and no more than ten meetings each academic year.

2. The Board, when fully constituted, has 26 members. For a meeting to be deemed quorate at least nine members must be present, including at least one member from each Faculty.

3. If a meeting is not quorate, the Chair shall decide whether to a) postpone and rearrange the meeting, or b) proceed with the meeting but note that all decisions will be considered preliminary and unconfirmed until and unless the agreement of sufficient members to meet the quorum is secured.

4. The Taught Programmes Board is managed by the Academic Quality and Standards Team in the Directorate of Governance and Legal Services. Correspondence should be with the Team (qualityandstandards@qmul.ac.uk) and not directly with the Chair.

5. The Academic Quality and Standards Team will issue deadlines for the approval process. Complete proposals for new programmes must be received 20 working days prior to the date of the meeting of the Board. Submissions must include:
   
   i. Part 1 programme proposal with approval from the Education Strategy Steering Group (ESSG).
   
   ii. Part 2 programme proposal with School/Institute approval (Head of School/Director of Institute or Director of Education).
   
   iii. Programme specification.
   
   iv. Module proposal forms for any new modules, with School/Institute approval (Head of School/Director of Institute or Director of Education).
   
   v. External Advisor comments and a response to those comments.
   
   vi. A joint working statement (where multiple Queen Mary schools/institutes contribute to the programme).
   
   vii. A memorandum of agreement (where the programme is collaborative with an external institution or body).

6. The Academic Quality and Standards Team will reject any proposal that:

   i. is submitted after the deadline (in which case it will be considered at a subsequent meeting)
   
   ii. contains errors, is not completed to a high standard, or is unclear and raises queries (in which case the Team will attempt to resolve the issues with the proposers, but which may not be possible for the intended meeting of the Board).
   
   iii. does not include all of the required documents and approvals.
iv. does not adhere to the appropriate policies or regulations.

v. that otherwise does not meet the requirements of Queen Mary’s programme approval process or of external regulatory requirements.

7. The Academic Quality and Standards Team will scrutinise all documentation for completeness, adherence to required regulations and curriculum frameworks (e.g. QMACF, FHEQ), external support (where appropriate), support from the School/Institute Education Committee, aligned with the Planning Round.

8. The relevant Head of School/Institute or Director of Education and the programme proposer will be invited to attend the meeting to discuss the proposal with the Taught Programmes Board.

9. The Academic Quality and Standards Team will allocate proposals to meetings in accordance with deadlines, ensuring that full consideration of proposals takes place.

10. Programmes will not normally be approved where there are any outstanding queries or issues. In rare circumstances, approval may be granted subject to completion of certain conditions. In such cases, approval will only be granted on satisfactory completion of specified actions linked to the conditions. Depending on the nature and scope of the conditions, the Chair may approve the programme by Chair’s action, refer the matter to the Board by circulation, require the matter to be considered at the next Board meeting, or delegate specific authority for approval to the Head of Academic Quality and Standards.

11. Where the Board sets an action or a condition of approval this must be completed by the specified deadline, which will normally be the next meeting of the Board. If this deadline is not met, then the programme must be resubmitted and considered afresh at a future meeting unless a request for extension has been submitted to DGLS and agreed by the Chair (an extension will only be considered where there is good reason why an action cannot be completed by the original deadline and where the programme team contacts DGLS in advance of the deadline).

12. A programme (or module) must run exactly as it was approved by the Board. If, exceptionally, there is good reason why any amendment is necessary before or during the teaching of the first cohort then this must be considered by a fully convened meeting of the Board; good reason might include a change to external regulation, for example changes to a degree apprenticeship standard that take immediate effect.
### Taught Programmes Board membership 2023-24

#### Ex officio members

- **Deputy Vice-Principal for Education (Programmes and Standards) (Chair)**
  - Professor Anthony Michael

#### Faculty Deans for Education:

- **Humanities and Social Sciences**
  - Elizabeth Gillow
- **Medicine and Dentistry**
  - Professor Anthony Warrens
- **Science and Engineering**
  - Professor Chris Bray

#### Two Deputy Deans for Education from each Faculty:

- **Humanities and Social Sciences**
  - Professor Rachel Male
  - Dr Javier Sajuria
  - FMD to confirm
- **Medicine and Dentistry**
  - Dr Mark Freestone (2022-23)
  - Dr Kristin Braun (2025-26*)
  - S&E to confirm
- **Science and Engineering**
  - Dr Rachel Appleton
  - Dr Aisha Qadi

#### Head of Education Programmes

- Dr Emily Salines

#### Head of Academic Quality and Standards

- Simon Hayter

#### Head of Technology Enhanced Learning

- Surjit Uppal

#### Head of Library Teaching and Learning Support

- Dr Alistair Morey

#### Director of Marketing and Widening Participation

- Priti Patel

#### Queen Mary Students’ Union Faculty Vice-Presidents:

- **Humanities and Social Sciences**
  - Jovani Palnoni
- **Medicine and Dentistry**
  - Amaan Abbas
- **Science and Engineering**
  - Aisha Qadi

#### Nominated members

- **Three academic staff from each Faculty:**
  - **Humanities and Social Sciences**
    - Dr Daniel Peart (2026-27*)
    - Professor Michael McKinnie (2023-24)
  - **Humanities and Social Sciences**
    - Dr Andrew Russell (2026-27)
    - Dr John Buchanan (2023-24)
  - **Medicine and Dentistry**
    - Dr Kristin Braun (2025-26*)
    - Dr Mark Freestone (2022-23)
  - **Science and Engineering**
    - Dr Shabnam Beheshti (2024-25)
    - Dr Jayne Dennis (2025-26)
    - Dr Craig Agnor (2023-24)
Notes on nominated members

1. Each Faculty has three nominated members. The Faculty Dean for Education makes these nominations, which must be submitted to the Secretary at qualityandstandards@qmul.ac.uk.

2. A nominated member has a four-year term of office and may hold up to two consecutive terms. The date next to a member’s name indicates the final year of their current term. An asterisk indicates that they are in their second term.

3. Where a vacancy arises before the end of a term of office, the new member will begin a new four-year term and be eligible for re-appointment in the same way as other members.

4. To ensure continuity of the Board’s business and expertise, variable terms of office should be used to stagger the end-dates of members (i.e., a member may be appointed to an initial term of three- rather than four-years to stagger the end-dates).

5. The Chair will contact any member who does not attend two consecutive meetings. A member who does not attend three consecutive meetings will be considered to have resigned their membership.
The Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board is a sub-board of Senate.

Terms of reference

- To consider and approve proposals for all new research degree programmes, including all proposals for collaborative research degree programmes;

- To consider and approve proposals for the withdrawal of research degree programmes;

- To consider amendments to the Academic Regulations for research degree programmes, and associated policies and guidance;

- To consider and approve nominations of internal and external examiners for all research degrees examinations;

- To monitor outcomes of research degree examinations and review examiners’ reports;

- To approve awards of research degrees to individual candidates;

- To consider requests for interruptions of study and extensions to the maximum registration period/writing-up period;

- To monitor compliance with the Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes within Schools and Institutes;

- To consider action to be taken following the publication of national guidance relating to research degrees, and the quality assurance and monitoring activity of external agencies such as QAA, the Office for Students, UK Research and Innovation, and research funders;

- To have oversight of the admission of students to research degree programmes;

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

- The quorum for the meeting is one third of the Board’s members.

Membership
• Dean for Postgraduate Research [Chair]
  Professor Tim Warner (ends March 2024)

• Faculty Deputy Deans for Postgraduate Research
  Dr Akram Alomainy EECS (S&E) (ends July 2024)
  Professor Paul Chapple WHRI (SMD) (end date tbc)
  Dr Costanza Russo CCLS (HSS) (ends January 2024)

• One further representative from each Faculty
  Dr Guven Demirel, School of Business and Management (HSS) [term of office 2023-24 and 2024-25]
  Professor Himadri Gupta, School of Engineering and Materials Science (S&E) [term of office 2023-24 and 2024-25]
  Dr Eleni Hagi-Pavli, Institute of Dentistry (FMD) [term of office 2023-24 and 2024-25]

[Faculty representatives are appointed for a term of two years. The appointment may be extended by one year to a maximum of three years with the approval of the Board. The Faculty representative should not be from the same school or institute as the Faculty Deputy Dean. The Faculty representative is usually one of the Directors of Graduate Studies from amongst the schools or institutes of the Faculty concerned.]

In attendance

• Assistant Academic Registrar (Research Degrees)
• Members of the Research Degrees Office
• Head of the Doctoral College

Mary Childs
Research Degrees Office

Approved by the Research Degree Programmes and Examinations Board at its meeting on 20 September 2023.
15. Indicative annual business plan for 2023-2024

Part 3: Matters for Report
Presented by Colin Bailey
**Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paper Title</strong></th>
<th>Indicative annual business plan for 2023-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>approve</strong> the indicative plan of core business for the 2023-24 academic session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points for Senate members to note and further information</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions for Senate to consider</strong></td>
<td>Are there any other items that members would like to add to the plan of business?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory/statutory reference points</strong></td>
<td>Senate has general responsibility for the academic activity of Queen Mary, including the management of academic standards and the quality of provision. Does the indicative plan of business enable Senate to fulfil its role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and risk</strong></td>
<td>Senate’s remit is aligned with: Queen Mary Strategy Office for Students: Regulatory Framework Quality Assurance Agency, UK Quality Code for Higher Education Committee of University Chairs, Higher Education Code of Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors</strong></td>
<td>Jane Pallant, Director of Governance and Legal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 October 2023</td>
<td>Senate terms of reference and membership 2023-2024</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President and Principal’s report</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-Principals’ reports</td>
<td>Vice-Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ Union President’s report</td>
<td>Serena-Amani Al Jabbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic integrity</td>
<td>Haylee Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom of Speech Code</td>
<td>Jane Pallant, Dr Prakash Shah, Professor Abhishek Saha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Observation of Teaching Policy</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles of Programme Design</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBBS/BDS regulations: third attempts</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall, Professor Anthony Warrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfson Institute new centre proposal</td>
<td>Professor Trevor Sheldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Integrity Policy</td>
<td>James Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Doctorate award title of Clinical Doctorate (DClin)</td>
<td>Professor Anthony Warrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of membership and terms of reference for sub-boards of Senate for 2023-2024</td>
<td>Jane Pallant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative annual business plan for 2023-24</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation from the Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)</td>
<td>Professor Andrew Livingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council report</td>
<td>Jonathan Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports from Boards of Senate</td>
<td>Vice-Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 December 2023</td>
<td>President and Principal’s report</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-Principals’ report</td>
<td>Vice-Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Union President's report</td>
<td>Serena-Amani Al Jabbar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial intelligence chatbots and assessments</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall/Externals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic assurance update</td>
<td>Jane Pallant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension of Regulations report 2022-23</td>
<td>Jane Pallant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-mode education</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing principles of programme design</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Outcomes Statement 2023</td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Research Misconduct Policy for Queen Mary and Barts</td>
<td>James Patterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint DClinDent and MSc Surgical Skills</td>
<td>Professor Anthony Warrens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary degrees and fellowships</td>
<td>Jonathan Morgan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative annual business plan for 2023-24</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council report</td>
<td>Jonathan Morgan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports from Boards of Senate</td>
<td>Vice- Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14 March 2024**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President and Principal’s report</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal’s report</td>
<td>Vice- Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Union President’s report</td>
<td>Serena-Amani Al Jabbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation from the Vice-Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)</td>
<td>Dr Philippa Lloyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report on Student Casework (2022-23)</td>
<td>Jane Pallant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDI Annual Report</td>
<td>Alex Prestage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester dates 2029</td>
<td>Jonathan Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative annual business plan for 2023-24</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of items for the next agenda</td>
<td>Professor Colin Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council report</td>
<td>Jonathan Morgan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports from Boards of Senate

13 June 2024

President and Principal’s report
Professor Colin Bailey

Vice-Principal’s report
Vice-Principals

Students’ Union President’s report
Serena-Amani Al Jabbar

Admissions policy 2025-26
Professor Stephanie Marshall, Chris Sleeman

Student casework policies 2024-25
Jane Pallant, Haylee Fuller

Academic regulations 2024-2025
Jane Pallant, Simon Hayter

Academic regulations and code of practice for research degree programmes: proposed changes for 2024-2025
Jane Pallant, Mary Childs

Assessment handbook 2024-2025
Jane Pallant, Simon Hayter

Indicative annual business plan for 2023-24
Professor Colin Bailey

Summary of items for the next agenda

Council report
Jonathan Morgan

Reports from Boards of Senate
Vice-Principals

Reports from Boards of Senate

Senate will receive reports from its sub-boards at each meeting. The Boards are noted below.

**Board**

- Taught Programmes Board
  - Led by Professor Stephanie Marshall

- Education Quality and Standards Board
  - Led by Professor Stephanie Marshall

- Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board
  - Led by Professor Andrew Livingston

- Partnerships Board
  - Led by Dr Philippa Lloyd

- Ethics of Research Committee
  - Led by Professor Andrew Livingston
16. Research and Innovation presentation
Part 2: Matters For Discussion
Presented by Andrew Livingston
17. Council report*
Part 3: Matters for Report
Presented by Jonathan Morgan
**Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Minutes of the Council meeting held on 06 July 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to note the minutes of the Council meeting held on Thursday 06 July 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points for Senate members to note and further information</strong></td>
<td>The Council minutes are provided in full. Key matters of business were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• President and Principal’s report [m. 2022.083]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deep dive on Faculty performance (HSS) [m. 2022.084]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current financial position [m. 2022.088]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tuition fee regulations 2024–25 [m. 2022.089]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions for Senate to consider</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory/statutory reference points</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and risk</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</strong></td>
<td>Senate 19 October 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authors</strong></td>
<td>Dr Nadine Lewycky, Head of Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Jonathan Morgan, Chief Governance Officer and University Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL
Thursday 6 July 2023

DRAFT UNCONFIRMED CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Present:
Melissa Tatton CBE (Chair)  Professor Colin Bailey CBE  Gil Baldwin
Ken Batty  Professor Kavita Datta  Martin Donkin
Patricia Gallan QPM  Celia Gough  Professor Yang Hao
Indy Hothi  Isabelle Jenkins  Maryanne Matthews
Professor Mangala Patel  Dr Alix Pryde  Adi Sawalha
Peter Thompson

In attendance:
Professor Frances Bowen  Dr Sharon Ellis  Karen Kröger
Dr Nadine Lewycky  Jonathan Morgan  Charles Sellar

Apologies:
Lord Clement-Jones CBE  Stella Hall

Welcome, apologies and declaration of interests

2022.081 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the apologies. There were no declarations of interests. The Chair said:

UCU letter on industrial action
[a] Members of Council had been sent a letter by the co-chairs of the local UCU branch committee regarding current industrial action. Council had received assurance at the beginning of the academic year on the management of industrial relations at the University. The issues raised by UCU would be dealt with by the Joint Consultative Forum as the appropriate venue.

Freedom of Information request about asbestos in the Whitechapel Library
[b] Some members of Council had been sent an email about a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 in relation to the management of asbestos containing materials in the Library at the Whitechapel campus. The issue could not be considered by Council, given the timing, and the appropriate governance process in the circumstances was to remit the issue to the September meeting of Audit and Risk Committee. The University Secretary added that an independent review of concerns raised in relation to alleged exposure to asbestos containing materials at the Whitechapel Library concluded that, based on a worst-case scenario, there was no cause for concern.
Chair's update (Oral report)

2022.082 Council received a list of the Chair’s recent activities as part of the papers.

President and Principal’s Report (QM2022/70)

2022.083 Council considered the President and Principal’s report. The following points were noted in the discussion:

**Student recruitment**

[a] Applications from China had plateaued, which could impact our projected tuition fee income, but there were mitigations the University could apply. We were reviewing our recruitment practices in China and considering whether to accept graduates from a wider pool of Chinese universities onto our postgraduate programmes.

[b] We were intending to maintain undergraduate entry standards in Confirmation and Clearing in order to avoid any negative impact on student continuation and employability rates. Students would continue to be admitted with lower grades based on contextual information on the understanding that they can succeed in Schools that provide a good level of support. Undergraduate application numbers across the University were strong and we were expecting to enter Clearing in only a select number of subjects.

[c] The UK market for postgraduate programmes had contracted significantly across the sector, probably because of the difficult economic climate.

**Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2028**

[d] The weighting given to research outputs in the next research assessment exercise would be reduced, with more weight given to research impact and environment scores. The effect would be to distribute funds more widely across institutions in England. Research outputs attracted the highest scores for Queen Mary in the last exercise, so greater attention would be given to improving our research impact and environment scores in future.

**Graduate outcomes and university rankings**

[e] The percentage of students in graduate-level work after 18 months (KPI 8) had risen to 84%, based on the latest available data for the student cohort starting in 2017–18 and graduating in 2020–21. However, graduate outcomes at the University remained below the levels seen at other Russell Group institutions with a different mix of students. The Complete University Guide and the QS World University Rankings had recently been published. Both rankings had revised their methodologies, giving greater weight to employer reputation and to student employability and continuation.

[f] Council asked whether earlier employability interventions could have a positive impact. Over the last year the University had disengaged from the University of London Careers Group, giving us greater freedom to invest in areas and initiatives that would be of most benefit to our students. Additional investment had been released to grow the University’s Careers and Enterprise Team and further targeted investment would be considered.
Council requested a deep dive into student employability with a breakdown across Schools and Institutes, to be added to the schedule of business for 2023–24.

**Visit to Hong Kong and China**

The President and Principal recently returned from Hong Kong and China where he attended graduation ceremonies for students on our joint programmes, as well as alumni chapter meetings.

**Industrial Action**

This was the sixth consecutive year of industrial action across the sector. The disruption in aggregate was small, but with some universities more heavily affected than others. Earlier in the year, the University entered into an agreement with the local UCU branch committee, reserving the right to withhold pay on the understanding that all students would be enabled to progress and graduate in a timely manner. Under the agreement, all teaching activities that were missed because of strike action were subsequently made up. When it later became apparent that participation in the marking and assessment boycott in some areas was putting at risk the ability of students to progress and graduate on time, the University moved to implement its policy on pay deductions.

Marking was complete for final-year undergraduate students in all Schools apart from English and Drama. As a result of the marking and assessment boycott, 109 students in English would be unable to graduate on time and a further 48 students in English would graduate without a final classification. 10 students in Drama were unable to graduate because of missing marks in English modules. The University had communicated with all the affected students. Approximately 1,000 first- and second-year undergraduate students in History, Politics and International Relations, and English and Drama also would not receive all their marks on time. A plan was in place to enable History students to progress by the end of July and discussions with the School of Politics and International Relations were under way. There was currently no plan in place to move ahead with marking in English. It was likely that our associate students would also be affected, which could have a negative impact on our partnerships in this area.

The University had notified the Office for Students of the position in line with the regulatory guidance on reportable events. Students were receiving support from their Schools and via a dedicated enquiry centre. Students who were unable to graduate on time with a classified degree had been offered tuition fee refunds of £500, reimbursement of out-of-pocket graduation costs and a dedicated graduation ceremony at a future date.

In contrast to claims made in the letter from the local UCU branch committee, academic standards had been maintained and regular quality assurance procedures and regulations had been followed. Additional staff engaged to assist with marking had been given a formal induction. Only two external examiners had resigned this year. The elected staff member (Humanities and Social Sciences) added that good leadership and careful management of the marking and assessment boycott meant that all
students in Geography would progress and graduate. There were no concerns that quality assurance had been compromised and the external examiners had been satisfied that all procedures had been followed correctly.

Council thanked staff for their efforts in getting as many students as possible to graduation.

**Action:** [g] University Secretary

## QMSU President's report (QM2022/71)

**2022.084** Council considered the QMSU President’s report. The following points were noted in the discussion:

[a] 280 students had been selected on a needs basis to have their cap and gown paid for through the graduation fund.

[b] Council asked for additional information about the issues raised in the report on disability awareness at the Inclusive Curriculum Steering Group. The QMSU President undertook to provide a summary at the next meeting.

**Action:** [b] QMSU President

## Deep dive presentation on faculty performance (Humanities and Social Sciences) (QM2022/72)

**2022.085** Council considered a deep dive presentation from the Vice-Principal (Humanities and Social Sciences) on Faculty performance. The following points were noted in the presentation and discussion:

[a] Graduate career outcomes within the Faculty had improved to 81% for the cohort graduating in 2020–21. This was up 5% on the previous year and an 8% improvement over three years. The improvements reflected the impact of interventions being implemented from 2017 onwards.

[b] Performance in the last Research Excellence Framework had been strong. All units of assessment apart from English had improved or maintained their rankings on research outputs. Drama had been rated first overall and Linguistics and Film were ranked first on research outputs. Six disciplines had also increased the number of researchers submitted for assessment by at least 75%. Council asked about the potential impact in the Faculty of changes to weightings in the next Research Excellence Framework. The greater recognition being given to public engagement in the assessment of research impact presented an opportunity for the Faculty.

[c] Researchers in the humanities and social sciences can take their research grants to competitor universities with relative ease, because they are typically less reliant on physical infrastructure and research teams compared to scientific and clinical researchers. The Faculty had created the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences to attract academics with grants and was working on ways to retain them.
[d] Council asked what actions were in place to improve staff engagement and satisfaction in the faculty. There was variation across schools, which could be attributed to local leadership and the existence of sub-cultures, but the scores had been disappointing overall. Further communications from senior management and visits to schools would help members of staff to feel connected to the wider University. Actions on pay and reward had been positively received.

[e] English was disappointed by its performance in the last Research Excellence Framework and had commissioned an external report to identify priorities for improvement ahead of the next assessment. Staff engagement scores in the discipline were historically low. There were also challenges in relation to student recruitment, which depends on the UK market for students on full degree programmes, although English also attracted the largest number of international associate students. Council asked whether consideration would be given to stopping work in a given discipline if staff and student engagement remained low. The Vice-Principal said that all schools were contributing to the Faculty’s finances and provided a social benefit. English had areas of strength in research income and associate student recruitment, and contributed to a rounded university offer in line with other Russell Group institutions, although the boundaries of the discipline may change over time.

[f] Council asked about the actions in place to address declining student satisfaction scores, and how student progression rates compared across schools and different student characteristics. Steps being taken to improve our other educational KPIs, especially student progression and graduate outcomes, would be important in improving student satisfaction. The Faculty was managing the number of students admitted through Clearing to ensure students are strongly committed to the discipline they end up studying.

[g] Council asked about the Faculty’s plans to increase international student recruitment in the context of the University’s commitment to social mobility. The intention was to maintain the currently level of undergraduate student recruitment from the UK while increasing recruitment of international students. Tuition fees for international undergraduate students varied by discipline and were benchmarked.

[h] Council asked how the Faculty was engaging with students who were unable to graduate because of the marking and assessment boycott. The challenge for undergraduate finalists was limited to English. Plans were in place to complete all the marking for associate students except in English.

Update on Environmental Sustainability (QM2022/73)

2022.086 Council considered an update on environmental sustainability. The following points were noted in the discussion:

[a] Investment in energy and carbon reduction initiatives had resulted in energy and carbon savings and reduced the impact of increased energy costs. We had accessed grant funding to support our work on decarbonisation and increasing the energy efficiency of our buildings.
[b] Council asked for an explanation for the increase in the carbon footprint of campus vehicles since the 2018–19 baseline.

*Action: [b] Chief Operations Officer*

**Finance and Investment Committee minutes (QM2022/74)**

**2022.087** Council noted the minutes of the Finance and Investment Committee meeting held on 07 June 2023.

**Current financial position (QM2022/75)**

**2022.088** Council noted the current financial position. The following points were noted in the discussion:

[a] Our research spend was at £131.6m, slightly behind our budget of £133.7m. We had created a task and finish group to identify blockages that might be slowing down the activation of new awards.

[b] Core pay remained at £237.0m, lower than budget owing to a higher level of vacancy savings. We had reviewed our staff recruitment processes and would be launching a new recruitment system this summer. Our pay grades were in line with the sector and, following a benchmarking exercise, it had already been agreed that some roles would routinely start above the minimum point of the grade, with other roles to be reviewed in due course. We were also reviewing our overall benefits package to ensure it remains competitive.

[c] Capital expenditure was lower than budget reflecting delays in planning permission for several projects. Given the delays, we would review how realistic our timescales were for future projects.

[d] We had a strong cash position which included funds secured through the private placement. This amount would decrease as the new School of Business and Management building progressed.

[e] Council asked whether the financial difficulties of Thames Water would have an impact on the USS pension scheme, which owned a 20% stake in the company. USS had said that it was unlikely to materially impact the valuation. The 2023 valuation was underway and there were indications that the position would improve because of the recent economic changes.

**Tuition Fee Regulations 2024–25 (QM2022/76)**

**2022.089** Council considered the Tuition Fee Regulations 2024–25. The following points were noted in the discussion:

[a] Council asked for the section on refunds to be reviewed so that the language was clear to students.

[b] Council approved the tuition fee regulations 2024–25 subject to the above amendment.
Action: [a] Chief Financial Officer

Senate minutes (QM2022/77)
2022.090 Council considered the minutes of the Senate meeting held on 08 June 2023.

Audit and Risk Committee minutes (QM2022/78)
2022.091 Council noted the minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting held on 22 June 2023.

Remuneration Committee report (QM2022/79)
2022.092 Council considered a report of the Remuneration Committee meeting held on 13 June 2023.

Minutes of the last meeting (QM2022/80)
2022.093 Council confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2023.

Matters arising (QM2022/81)
2022.094 Council noted the matters arising from the meeting held on 18 May 2023. The following points were noted in the discussion:

[a] Elections for two staff positions on Council were in progress. As part of the process, nominees would be offered the opportunity to speak with a current Council member before the ballot and potentially revise their election statements. Members were asked to send their availability to the Council Secretariat after the meeting.

Council annual schedule of business 2023–24 (QM2022/82)
2022.095 Council considered the annual schedule of business for 2023–24.

Draft agenda for the next meeting (QM2022/83)
2022.096 Council noted the draft agenda for the meeting on 05 October 2023.

Council membership (Oral report)

[a] This was the last meeting for Martin Donkin, Adi Sawalha and Charlie Sellar. Council thanked them for their significant contributions during their tenures.

[b] This was the last meeting of the academic year. Council thanked the President and Principal and the Senior Executive Team for their hard work over the course of the year.

Dates of Meetings 2023–24
- Thursday 05 October 2023, 1600 hours, Colette Bowe Room, Queens’ Building.
- Thursday 23 November 2023 at 1600 hours, Colette Bowe Room, Queens’ Building.
- Thursday 28 March 2024 at 1600 hours, Colette Bowe Room, Queens’ Building.
- Thursday 16 May / Friday 17 May 2024 – Annual conference including Council
meeting, central London, TBC.
• Thursday 11 July 2024 at 1600 hours, Colette Bowe Room, Queens’ Building.
18. Taught Programmes Board*
Part 3: Matters for Report
## Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Taught Programmes Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> the following proposals relating to programme and module academic developments that have taken place between 27 April 2023 and 13 September 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points for Senate members to note and further information</strong></td>
<td>The Taught Programmes Board met on 12 July and 13 September 2023. This paper provides a high-level overview of those meetings and of the wider academic development activity during the reporting period and the academic year 2022-23. The Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> that over 1,800 academic developments were made in 2022-23, more than double the 901 made in 2021-22. There is no one particular change that would readily account for an increase of this scale. Full papers and minutes are available on the <a href="http://example.com/">TPB webpage</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions for Senate to consider</strong></td>
<td>Comments from the Senate would be welcomed regarding the overall trend of increasing number of late module amendments and on actions that could be taken to aim at strengthening and aligning the programme portfolio with the 2030 Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory/statutory reference points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</strong></td>
<td>Senate only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taught Programmes Board 12 July 2023

The Board:

1. CONFIRMED the minutes and reviewed the actions of its previous meeting.

2. NOTED approval of the below listed programmes by Chair’s action.

   **EECS - BUPT (Beijing)**
   - BSc(Eng) Telecommunications Engineering with Management (Wireless)
   - BSc(Eng) E-commerce Engineering with Law
   - BSc(Eng) Internet of Things Engineering
   - BSc(Eng) Telecommunications Engineering with Management (Multimedia)

   **S&E - BUPT (Hainan)**
   - BSc Information and Computational Science

3. CONSIDERED and APPROVED programme amendments of the below listed programmes.

   - BSc Digital & Technology Solutions (Software Engineer), Degree Apprenticeship
   - BSc Digital and Technology Solutions (Data Analyst), Degree Apprenticeship

4. CONSIDERED and SET CONDITIONS FOR THE APPROVAL of the below listed programmes.

   - MSc Artificial Intelligence for Drug Discovery
   - MSc Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Science
   - MSc Actuarial Science and Data Analytics
   - MSc Applied Statistics and Data Science
   - MSc Risk Analytics

5. CONSIDERED and APPROVED amendments of the below listed TNE modules.

   - Technical English Language and Study Skills 1 (Hainan)
   - Technical English Language and Study Skills 2 (Hainan)
   - Data Analysis and Data Solutions (Hainan)

6. NOTED reports on academic developments approved by Schools / Institutes / Faculties and on planned new programme proposals, intended for launch in the academic year 2024/25.

7. CONFIRMED meeting dates for the academic year 2024/25.
The Board:

1. CONFIRMED the minutes and reviewed the actions of its previous meeting.

2. NOTED approval of BSc Management for Social Change by Chair’s action.

3. CONSIDERED and, subject to minor clarifications and Faculty confirmation of current memberships, ENDORSED the TPB terms of reference and membership for 2023-24, recommending approval by the Senate.

4. CONSIDERED and APPROVED BSc (Eng) Digital Media Technology (Hainan).

5. AGREED a need for review of the timing of module amendments, and especially of late changes made by schools and institutes after students had completed module pre-selection, with a view to minimising such changes.

6. AGREED a need for requesting for a review of current Part 1 approval process as it was felt it did not provide sufficiently holistic consideration of resource requirements and programme portfolio within and across Faculties.
Summary of Academic Developments 27 April – 13 September 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs approved</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs approved with conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module amendments</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Academic Developments in the year 2022/23

In the academic year 2022/23 DGLS has processed nearly 1900 academic developments. Of these roughly 1300 were module amendments, the bulk of which (amounting to over 650) were submitted in late July or early August. The published deadline of 24 July 2023 for submission of finalised minor module amendments was not adhered to in a number of cases.

During the year DGLS processed 21 Part 1 proposals, 21 Part 2 proposals and over 200 programme amendments, suspensions and withdrawals.

Compared to the previous academic year it can be noted that the number of developments has grown exponentially, doubling from 900 to over 1800. Particularly noticeable is the increasing number of module amendments: from 241 in 2021/22 to nearly 1300 in 2022/23. This exceptionally high volume has impacted Queen Mary's ability to resolve amendments as quickly as would be desirable and, therefore, Taught Programmes Board is reconsidering more stringent guidance and deadlines and would appreciate Senate's input.
19. Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board*
Part 3: Matters for Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper Title</th>
<th>Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board Executive Summary June – September 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome requested</td>
<td>Senate is asked to note the executive summary of business considered by the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board (RDPEB).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Points for Senate members to note and further information | This paper summarises business considered by RDPEB at meetings held in June – September 2023:  
• terms of reference and membership;  
• proposal for new award title of Clinical Doctorate (DClin);  
• new Masters by Research in Economics and Finance (International) [ResM];  
• review of guidance to examiners on taking account of the disruption caused by Covid-19 in examining a thesis;  
• other updates for report. |
| Questions for Senate to consider | Senate is asked to note the report. |
| Regulatory/statutory reference points | • Queen Mary Strategy 2030  
• Queen Mary Academic Regulations  
• Queen Mary Code of Practice for Research Degrees Programmes  
• Office for Students regulations and policies |
| RDPEB has oversight of quality and standards issues relating to research degree programmes. |
| Strategy and risk Reporting/consideration route for the paper |  
| Authors | Mary Childs, Research Degrees Office |
| Sponsor | Professor Tim Warner, Dean for Postgraduate Research Director of the Doctoral College and Chair of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board |
RESEARCH DEGREE PROGRAMMES AND EXAMINATIONS BOARD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
June – September 2023

Meetings and membership

1. The Research Degree Programmes and Examinations Board meets monthly. The membership comprises:
   - Dean for Postgraduate Research [Chair]
   - Faculty Deputy Deans for Research (PGR)
   - One additional representative (a school/institute Director of Graduate Studies) from each Faculty

   The secretariat is provided by the Research Degrees Office. The Doctoral College Manager is in attendance.

Examinations Business

2. The Board:
   - considers and approves nominations for internal and external examiners for research degrees;
   - considers and approves outcomes of research degree examinations and reviews all examiners’ reports;
   - considers and makes decisions on applications to interrupt studies and extensions to the thesis submission deadline;
   - approves awards for research degrees on behalf of Senate.

   Decisions are recorded in the minutes of the monthly meetings of the Board.

Terms of Reference and Membership

3. At its meeting in September, the Board conducted the annual review of its terms of reference and membership.

   The Board approved the terms of reference and membership. There are no changes.

   The terms of reference and membership are annexed at A to this report.
4. The Research Degrees Board and the Education Quality and Standards Board have recommended to Senate approval of the introduction of a new award title of Clinical Doctorate (DClin) proposed by the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry.

5. If approved, Council will be asked to approve the addition of the award of Clinical Doctorate to Ordinance A16, section 1.6 denoting research degrees (FHEQ level 8) awarded by Queen Mary.

6. There is a separate paper on Senate’s agenda.

Programme proposal from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences for Masters by Research in Economics and Finance (International) [ResM]

7. The Board has approved this new programme in the School of Economic and Finance for enrolment of new students with effect from 2023-4. This expands the programme offering into HSS. The first ResM students enrolled in the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2022-23.

8. The Masters by Research in Economics and Finance (International) [ResM] is a one-year programme of supervised research, examined by submission of a dissertation. The programme will provide the opportunity to recruit international students as part of articulation arrangements with partner institutions only.

Review of guidance to examiners on taking account of the disruption caused by Covid-19 in examining a thesis

9. In July 2020 the Board approved guidance to examiners on how to take account of the disruption caused by Covid-19 in their approach to examining the thesis for a research degree award. This guidance is sent to all examiners (internal and external) with the thesis and it is included in the examination guidance notes. In their joint report examiners are asked to include a statement summarising the discussion with the candidate of how their work was affected by Covid-19.

10. The Board has reviewed the guidance. There is one change only. A new statement is included that the policy does not apply to students who enrolled with effect from 1 August 2022 in the 2022-23 academic year, after which time the university was open fully for study. The policy is annexed at B.

Other business

11. The Board has under review:
   - the fee paid to internal and external examiners for examining a research thesis;
   - the policy on editorial assistance for research degree theses.

Mary Childs, Research Degrees Office, ARCS
The Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board is a sub-board of Senate.

**Terms of reference**

- To consider and approve proposals for all new research degree programmes, including all proposals for collaborative research degree programmes;
- To consider and approve proposals for the withdrawal of research degree programmes;
- To consider amendments to the Academic Regulations for research degree programmes, and associated policies and guidance;
- To consider and approve nominations of internal and external examiners for all research degrees examinations;
- To monitor outcomes of research degree examinations and review examiners’ reports;
- To approve awards of research degrees to individual candidates;
- To consider requests for interruptions of study and extensions to the maximum registration period/writing-up period;
- To monitor compliance with the Regulations and Code of Practice for Research Degree Programmes within Schools and Institutes;
- To consider action to be taken following the publication of national guidance relating to research degrees, and the quality assurance and monitoring activity of external agencies such as QAA, the Office for Students, UK Research and Innovation, and research funders;
- To have oversight of the admission of students to research degree programmes;
- To provide regular reports to Senate, including recommendations for further action where appropriate.
- The quorum for the meeting is one third of the Board’s members.
Membership

- Dean for Postgraduate Research [Chair]
  Professor Tim Warner (ends March 2024)

- Faculty Deputy Deans for Postgraduate Research
  Dr Akram Alomainy EECS (S&E) (ends July 2024)
  Professor Paul Chapple WHRI (SMD) (end date tbc)
  Dr Costanza Russo CCLS (HSS) (ends January 2024)

- One further representative from each Faculty
  Dr Guven Demirel, School of Business and Management (HSS) [term of office 2023-24 and 2024-25]
  Professor Himadri Gupta, School of Engineering and Materials Science (S&E) [term of office 2023-24 and 2024-25]
  Dr Eleni Hagi-Pavli, Institute of Dentistry (FMD) [term of office 2023-24 and 2024-25]

  [Faculty representatives are appointed for a term of two years. The appointment may be extended by one year to a maximum of three years with the approval of the Board. The Faculty representative should not be from the same school or institute as the Faculty Deputy Dean. The Faculty representative is usually one of the Directors of Graduate Studies from amongst the schools or institutes of the Faculty concerned.]

In attendance

- Assistant Academic Registrar (Research Degrees)
- Members of the Research Degrees Office
- Head of the Doctoral College

Mary Childs
Research Degrees Office

Approved by the Research Degree Programmes and Examinations Board at its meeting on 20 September 2023.
Annexe B

Research Degrees Programmes and Examination Board

Guidance to examiners on taking account of the disruption caused by Covid-19 in examining a thesis

1. Covid-19 has impacted on research students’ work in a wide variety of ways since early 2020. Students submitting their theses during periods of library and/or laboratory closure, for example, may have been unable to complete all their references. Students at an earlier stage of their research, on the other hand, may have had to revise the scope and methods of their project.

2. It is appropriate to take these circumstances into account when examining a thesis. This is in line with a principle articulated for PhD theses in Queen Mary’s Academic Regulations for Research Degree Programmes, Appendix 1, section 5: “The scope of the thesis shall be what might reasonably be expected after three or at most four years of full-time study”. Similar formulations are set out in relation to other research degrees: MPhil (para. 2), MD(Res) (para. 17).

3. What can “reasonably be expected” of a thesis submitted by a student whose work was disrupted by Covid-19, whether or not the student was granted additional time to complete their thesis because of that disruption, is not the same as what can be expected of a thesis completed in different circumstances.

4. There is no expectation that the “standard” of work done by students should have been compromised by studying through the Covid-19 crisis, rather that the volume of work, referencing etc. may have been affected.

5. For this reason we would ask examiners to consider the disruption experienced by students when making their decisions. In some cases, students may include a brief statement in their thesis to explain the impact of their disruption (e.g. a footnote in their introduction and/or conclusion to explain missing references, further fieldwork or experiments that would have been carried out if circumstances permitted, etc.). However, such statements may not always be present. Examiners must therefore ask a student, during their oral examination, to summarise briefly how their work was affected by Covid-19. The Outcome of Research Degree Examination report requires examiners to confirm that this matter was discussed. Examiners will also be prompted to include a statement in the joint report that they produce after the oral examination.

6. This policy applies to all Queen Mary postgraduate research students who enrolled before March 2020 – when UK universities and other research facilities began a period of closure, and when research travel was not possible – and who had not submitted their thesis for examination at that time. The policy does not apply to students who enrolled with effect from 1 August 2022 in the 2022-23 academic year, after which time Queen Mary was open fully for study. It will be reviewed annually.

7. Please contact the Research Degrees Office with any queries: pgrexaminations@qmul.ac.uk

For further information please see the information for examiners of research degrees
20. Ethics of Research Committee*
Part 3: Matters for Report
Paper Title | Ethics of Research Committee (QMERC)
---|---
**Outcome requested** | To note the executive summary report of the QMERC meeting on 21 June 2023 and action taken since.
**Points for Senate members to note and further information** | 
**Questions for Senate to consider** | N/A
**Regulatory/statutory reference points** | N/A
**Strategy and risk** | N/A
**Reporting/consideration route for the paper** | QMERC
Senate
**Authors** | Katherine Ouseley, Research Support & Development Manager
**Sponsor** | Professor Andrew Livingston, Vice-Principal (Research and Innovation)
QUEEN MARY ETHICS OF RESEARCH COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Meeting – 21 June 2023

Main Items Discussed & Relevant Action Since

Chair's succession planning / Securing strong leadership
Dr Helen Jenner is stepping down as Chair of QMERC at the end of 2024, after what will be 6 years of service. In collaboration with Dr Jenner, we are working towards recruiting her successor. We are also exploring ways to restructure the format of the Chairs roles. The current QMERC structure consists of external lay Chair of QMERC and one Deputy Chair who has been an internal, academic member of Faculty, in addition, the Committee has a membership based on the Chairs and Deputies from each of its 7 Review Panels. In recent years QMERC Committee(s) workloads have grown markedly as research ethics and integrity have become embedded throughout Queen Mary and research activity across our research-led institution has increased. This has led to year-on-year increases in application volume and complexity.

One proposal being considered is that the creation of three Vice Chair roles occupied to support the Chair and Deputy Chair would facilitate communication and embed research ethics in all Faculties. These three additional individuals should come from each of the three academic Faculties of Queen Mary. With one representative from each Faculty, it is hoped that communication between the QMERC, its central Review Panels and our research community will benefit as the relevant messages are transferred to the Directors of Research & Education, Heads of Schools and the active researchers in Faculties, working directly to achieve our Strategy 2030.
Application form goes online – successful launch of “QMEthics”

On 18 July the Research Ethics team launched QMEthics online application system. It has been an overwhelming success, much of which is owed to the staff and students who took part in the user acceptability testing phase and the careful planning and preparation in the design and implementation stages. The launch was not without glitches, these were recognised early and resolved within hours of identification. To continually monitor the system for user experience and functionality, we created 2-stage feedback opportunities. The first feedback form is sent with the application submission acknowledgment email and the second after a final decision on the ethics application. The information gathered will be used to understand user experience and to make improvements.

Devolved School Research Ethics Committees (DSRECs)

The DSREC Sub-Committee – whose dual function is to review the incoming applications from new DSRECs and to serve as a forum for debate among the Chairs and Deputies of our now n=12 operational DSRECs - met in June and September 2023. The subject of the June Sub-Committee was a discussion around the support and recognition for ethical review work; administrative and resource allocation and workload recognition for time spent conducting ethical reviews. We intend to submit a paper making the case for better recognition for the contributions to research ethics across the university, at the moment a voluntary endeavour. The subject of the September Sub-Committee was a discussion around the needs and requirements of the DSRECs to successfully integrate/onboard them into QMEthics.

The DSREC audit programme started in May, with the first audit of one of the longest running DSRECs, Sports and Exercise Medicine. The Psychology and School of Business Management (staff and PGR) DSRECs are scheduled to be audited in October.

Panel Membership

In September 2023 Panel G was created to enable quicker review times for our researchers and alleviate the current workload pressures felt by existing Panel
members and Chairs and prevent the addition of unscheduled meetings to meet fluctuating demand. As a result of the creation of Panel G we have made some changes to the membership of each of the 6 existing Panels, to ensure balance across Faculty representation. We have also promoted existing members to ensure our Deputy Chair roles are filled.

Breaches of Queen Mary Policy
We have seen a recent spike in the number of breaches of Queen Mary policy (where studies have started without ethical approval in place) reported to QMERC. This is not unexpected at this time of year as it follows thesis’ deadline submission season and failure to obtain the necessary approvals become evident, however they number more than we would have hoped. The vast majority are low-risk studies and reported through the DSRECs; thus the greater number is probably a reflection of broader engagement with research ethics across the University, leading to better reporting, as opposed to greater incidence.

Each of these are investigated with the support of the QMERC Chairs and dealt with individually. James Patterson, Research Integrity and Assurance Officer has been involved where necessary.

Lay members annual review
Dr Jenner held her annual meeting with the Lay members of Ethics Review Panels to thank them for their contributions and role development. The Lay and QM members will be invited to observe a QMERC Main Committee meeting as part of their continual development.

Metrics for 1 May 2023 to 30 September 2023
The report below provides a summary of the applications for QMERC ethical approval received and approved between 1 May 2023 to 30 September.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel review apps</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk apps</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMERC apps</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic applications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSREC set up applications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact officer**

Katherine Ouseley  
Research Support & Development Manager, JRMO  
Email: research-ethics@qmul.ac.uk
21. Partnerships Board*
Part 3: Matters for Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paper Title</strong></th>
<th>Partnerships Board – Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome requested</strong></td>
<td>Senate is asked to <strong>note</strong> the PB Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points for Senate members to note and further information</strong></td>
<td>This paper summarises the business of Partnerships Board from 10 May 2023 to 27 June 2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions for Senate to consider</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory/statutory reference points</strong></td>
<td>QMUL is required to comply with the expectations for quality detailed in UK Quality Code for Higher Education which states: ‘Where a provider works in partnership with other organisations, it has in place effective arrangements to ensure that the academic experience is high-quality irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.’ The Partnerships Board oversees QMUL’s partnership activity on behalf of Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy and risk</strong></td>
<td>Partnerships Board’s role is to assess and monitor the risks of QMUL partnership arrangements, approve partnerships as necessary and to consider relevant policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting/consideration route for the paper</strong></td>
<td>This paper is a report to Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author</strong></td>
<td>Dr Tuija Knowles, Directorate of Governance and Legal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor</strong></td>
<td>Dr Philippa Lloyd, Vice Principal (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary covers the Partnership Board meeting held on 27 June 2023. The next meeting of Partnerships Board will be held on 25 September 2023.

Consideration of new partnership proposals and renewals

1. Under the low-risk partnerships approval process, Faculties are responsible for considering and approving low-risk Faculty-level partnership proposals and renewals with both UK and international partners. A report of these low-risk approved proposals and renewals is then submitted to Partnerships Board for noting. During the reporting period, Partnerships Board has received notification of the following low-risk partnership proposals and renewals approved by Faculties and Professional Services.

2. Faculty of Science and Engineering
   - Universidad de las Américas Puebla (UDLAP), Mexico

3. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
   - None reported

4. Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
   - None reported

5. Professional Services (including Global Engagement Office and International Partnerships Office)
   - Beijing International Studies University (BISU), China
   - COMSATS, Pakistan
   - East China University of Political Science and Law, China
   - Hong Kong Metropolitan University, Hong Kong
   - OP Jindal Global University, India
   - Southwest Petroleum University, China

6. At the 27 June 2023 meeting the Board approval renewal of the following agreements.
   - Fulbright scholarships agreements (PG Award and Scholar Award), USA
   - Historic Royal Palaces: MA Heritage Management, UK

Reports

7. None
8. The Board confirmed the meeting dates for 2023/24 as follows:

   Monday 25 September 2023
   Monday 13 November 2023
   Monday 29 January 2024
   Monday 11 March 2024
   Wednesday 8 May 2024
   Monday 24 June 2024
22. Dates of future meetings

Part 4: Other Matters

Presented by Colin Bailey
23. Any other business

Part 4: Other Matters