Senate: 11.06.2026
Paper Code: SE2025.66

Queen Mary University of London

Senate

Paper Title	Minutes of the last meeting of Senate held on 12 March 2026.
Outcome requested	Senate is asked to **approve** the minutes of the last meeting.
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	Senate to approve.
Authors	Kaya Wiles, Executive Officer (Governance), Jane Pallant, Director of Governance and Legal Services.
Sponsor	Professor Colin Bailey, President and Principal

Queen Mary University of London

Senate

Unconfirmed Minutes of 12 March 2026

Present:

Prof Colin Bailey
Dr Livia A Carvalho
Dr Jayne Dennis
Dr Timothy Fulton
Dr Jürgen Groet
Prof Andrew Livingston
Dr Michaela MacDonald
Prof Wayne Morrison
Dr Anthony Phillips
Prof Javier Sajuria
Dr James Strong
Prof Daniel Todman
Dr Georgia Black
Dr Giorgio Chianello
Dr Pedro Elston
Dr Abimbola Giwa
Dr Eleni Hagi-Pavli
Dr Philippa Lloyd
Prof Simon Macklin
Dr Ali Nankali
Maria Rubbani
Diya Mary Selastin
Prof Elizabeth Tanner
Prof Christopher Tredwin
Prof Christopher Bray
Prof Martin Coward
Prof James Esson
Tushar Goyal
Samarth Lakhanpal
Prof Biagio Lucini
Prof John Marshall
Dr Émilie Oléron Evans
Prof Abhishek Saha
Dr Melanie Smuk
Prof Galin Tihanov
Prof Michelle West

In attendance:

Haylee Fuller
Jonathan Morgan
Prof Alastair Robertson
Danny Hassell
Jane Pallant
Prof Nick Vriend
Simon Hayter
Prof Deborah Rafalin
Kaya Wiles (Secretary)

Apologies:

Prof Amrita Ahluwalia
Dr Oscar Bandtlow
Dr Marie-Luce Bourguet
Prof Sir Mark Caulfield
Dr Giulia De Falco
Prof Richard Grose
Prof Ioannis Kokkoris
Prof Rachael Mulheron
Prof Simon Rawlinson
Prof Hazel Screen
Prof Wen Wang
Prof Alp Atakan
Prof Adrian Bevan
Prof Rob Briner
Prof Mary Collins
Prof Panos Deloukas
Prof Michael Harker
Prof Stephanie Marshall
Dr Sharri Plonski
Prof Kathryn Richardson
Prof Steve Uhlig
Prof Helen Bailey
Dr Erik Blair
Prof Liam Campling
Prof Ian Curran
Dr Lei Fang
Prof Martin Knight
Prof Jo Martin
Prof Thomas Prellberg
Prof Nitzan Rosenfeld
Prof Fiona Walter

Part 1: Preliminary items

Welcome and apologies

2025.103 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and **noted** the apologies received.

Part 2: Matters for Discussion

Academic Governance Review: Senate Size and Membership (SE2025.39)

2025.104 Senate **received** a paper outlining proposed principles for the future size and composition of Senate. The principles centred around curating a membership with the right skills that was diverse, balanced and effective.

2025.105 Senate **noted** that a larger meeting room equipped with microphones could resolve some of the issues attributed to the membership size.

2025.106 Senate **noted** that only 25 members had attended more than half of the meetings since the start of 2024-25. The larger membership mitigated against some of the impact of low attendance rates.

2025.107 Senate **noted** that further consideration would be given to the impact of hybrid meetings on effective governance, with a review of how this was managed at other institutions.

2025.108 Senate **noted** strong support for a subgroup of appointed members within the membership composition. This would aid Senate in ensuring it had the required skillset to provide effective governance. The were also benefits to retaining some elected members to strengthen democracy and Senate's exposure to differing perspectives.

2025.109 Senate **noted** the support for including Professional Services (PS) staff in relevant areas in the Senate membership. Further consideration could be given to the inclusion of PS staff from faculties as members of Senate.

2025.110 Senate **noted** that a role description had been developed by the academic governance review working group. This role descriptor explained the skills and knowledge required of a Senate member, and it was suggested that further thought could be given to a skills matrix in order to identify any gaps across the membership. The potential for adding co-opted members of Senate to address identified skills gaps was also discussed.

2025.111 Senate **noted** that there would be opportunities for members to be involved in further developments. Members were invited to contact the Policy and Governance Lead for more information.

Code of Practice on Free Speech **(SE2025.40)**

2025.112 Senate **received** the revised Code of Practice on Free Speech. Senate had last discussed a revised draft of the Code in October 2025, following the publication of regulatory guidance by the Office for Students (OfS). The Code had since been subjected to further legal review which had informed the proposed amendments.

2025.113 Senate **noted** the support for the inclusion of the OfS's three step framework for assessing compliance with the 'secure' duty.

2025.114 Senate **noted** that paragraph 1.2 (a) specified that the expression of all viewpoints would be encouraged, including those that were offensive. This statement formed a core part of the University's values in relation to freedom of speech, the University is required to encourage all forms of lawful expression, recognising that some members of the community may find the views or opinions expressed to be offensive.

2025.115 Senate **noted** that paragraph 3.2 clarified the position in relation to the scope of the Code which did not apply to purely commercial events and bookings. Members **noted** that Queen Mary Venues team had existing processes and criteria for assessing commercial bookings.

2025.116 Senate **noted** that the revisions in relation to paragraph 4.2 (d) implied a broad level of discretion regarding the conditions Queen Mary could impose on the display of materials, symbols and images. Members agreed that paragraph 4.2 (d) would be

updated to clarify that any conditions imposed on the display of materials, symbols and images would be proportionate to the circumstances. Members noted that any restrictions related to materials displayed on Queen Mary premises or on its digital platforms, including social media accounts owned by Queen Mary. The purpose of these restrictions was to signal neutrality in relation to political, cultural and religious debates, thereby preserving the forum for freedom of speech and academic freedom.

2025.117 Senate **noted** that paragraph 6.4 (f) stated that the Event Risk Mitigation Panel could change the format of an event to allow different views to be heard on a particular issue. It was suggested that this provision could be susceptible to bias in the decision-making process, with changes more likely to be recommended for controversial opinions. The Code clearly stated that any mitigations should go no further than necessary to address the identified risks, but it was agreed that this provision would be removed from the draft in relation to the remit of the Event Risk Mitigation Panel.

2025.118 Senate **noted** that QMSU were responsible for compliance with the Code of Practice in relation to activities in any QMSU building or outlet. Support from Queen Mary would be available, where appropriate.

2025.119 Senate **noted** the challenges around historical context and changing attitudes towards certain terms or phrases that may be used in teaching and learning or specific events. Members noted that any issues arising in this connection would be assessed on a case-by-case basis with members invited to discuss any concerns in relation to the application of the three-step process with colleagues in Governance and Legal Services outside the meeting.

2025.120 Senate **noted** that the definition of 'academic freedom' mirrored the definition given in the legislation. Academic freedom was not applicable to students or non-academic staff.

AI in Assessment: policy position paper (SE2025.41)

2025.121 Senate **received** a policy position paper on Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessment. Senate had endorsed the proposal to develop a policy in October 2025. Subsequently, a working group had consulted with key stakeholders and established the policy position on AI in Assessment.

2025.122 Senate **noted** that the policy should consider any interaction with the Queen Mary Intellectual Property (IP) Policy and ensure it was cross-referenced, where appropriate.

2025.123 Senate **noted** the importance of centring the use of AI around the educational context and desired learning outcomes.

2025.124 Senate **noted** that it would be useful to embed AI declarations into the QM Plus virtual learning environment. Any changes would need to be made across the institution; however generic wording could be used to ensure every student who submitted an assessment through QM Plus had been prompted to declare whether AI had been used in that assessment. The assessment cover sheet could be adapted to provide further information on how AI had been used.

2025.125 Senate **noted** the importance of ensuring staff and students had access to tools which would improve their understanding of AI. These tools would help students determine whether AI would be permitted in their assessments. The Queen Mary Academy

(QMA) provided support on the topic and had developed an online training course on Critical AI Literacy which was available to all staff.

2025.126 Senate **noted** that some students preferred not to use AI on ethical grounds. Queen Mary recognised this position but was committed to supporting the balance between sustainability and preparing students for employment.

2025.127 Senate **noted** that the policy stated that AI tools should not be used to make assessment decisions. Members **noted** that all assessment decisions would be made by the educator. Queen Mary acknowledged the inherent risk of bias in AI tools. Members noted that any AI tools that would be recommended for use would be tested for appropriateness, including the identification of issues relating to the level of bias.

2025.128 Senate **noted** that the proposed changes would be implemented in 2027-28. This timeframe allowed for the policies to be established and then implemented through module amendment processes. This work would align with changes to programme design and Curriculum 2030. Although there was a risk that not all changes would not have been embedded across the institution by the next Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) assessment, it was important to follow the appropriate processes and procedures. The timeframe did not prevent those who were already successfully using AI in assessment from continuing to do so.

2025.129 Senate **noted** the importance of developing good practice guidelines. It would be important for all Schools/Institutes to determine the appropriate level of AI use through a review of their learning outcomes. AI tools should be used where they specifically related to the skills and knowledge students were being assessed on. It was suggested that AI only be used in assessments once students had developed a foundational understanding of their degree subject. Consideration could also be given to ways assessors could mitigate against students being able to gain a distinct advantage through using paid-for AI tools.

2025.130 Senate **approved** the direction of travel outlined in the policy position paper. The policy would be brought back to Senate in June 2026.

Annual Report on Student Casework (2024-25) (SE2025.42)

2025.131 Senate **received** the Annual Report on Student Casework for 2024-25 covering academic misconduct, appeals, complaints and disciplinary matters.

2025.132 Senate **noted** that the number of academic misconduct cases had stabilised, having peaked during the pandemic. Cases were increasingly the result of technology-assisted misconduct. The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office (ACCO) had created an e-module in Queen Mary's Continuing Professional Development (CPD) platform on 'AI and Academic Misconduct'. The module was available to all staff, with 204 colleagues having enrolled so far.

2025.133 Senate **noted** that 20% of academic misconduct appeals had been upheld. This was an increase from 13% in 2023-24. Work would be done to enhance engagement and procedures at the earlier stages of the academic misconduct process. It took on average 73 days from the date of the assessment for Schools/Institutes to submit an academic misconduct case. ACCO would work with module convenors and Heads of Schools/Directors of Institutes to shorten this timeframe.

2025.134 Senate **noted** that the volume of appeals received continue to rise. This was a trend seen across the sector and acknowledged by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator

for Higher Education (OIA). Cases where appeals were not upheld still provided opportunities for learning as they often indicated issues where students had not received the information or feedback that they had been seeking following assessment. It was noted that further work would be required to support engagement with feedback mechanisms.

2025.135 Senate **noted** that there had been an increase in student complaints, however the increase could be attributed to process and record keeping enhancements rather than greater student dissatisfaction.

2025.136 Senate **noted** that the small decrease in disciplinary matters raised through Report + Support submissions did not translate to a reduction in the number of investigations as fewer students had withdrawn the process which was a good indicator that processes were working well.

2025.137 Senate **noted** that the small number of Fitness to Practise cases was in line with numbers for previous years. The Professional Capability and Fitness to Practise Policy had replaced the previous regulations for 2025-26 and emphasised the use of early interventions. The Policy stipulated the membership of the Fitness to Practice Committee, which would include a registered doctor or dentist (depending on the student's programme) and an external member.

2025.138 Senate **noted** the increase in the number of students escalating their case to the OIA. Despite this, the number of cases that the OIA found to be 'justified' had decreased.

Annual Apprenticeship Self-Assessment Report 2024-25 and Quality Improvement Plan 2025-26 **(SE2025.43)**

2025.139 Senate **received** the Annual Apprenticeship Self-Assessment Report for 2024-25 and the Quality Improvement Plan for 2025-26.

2025.140 Senate **noted** that the government would be restricting funding for Level 7 apprenticeships. This would apply to part of Queen Mary's existing provision, however early indicators suggested that businesses and students would continue to engage with Queen Mary's Level 7 apprenticeships.

2025.141 Senate **noted** that Queen Mary's commitment to social mobility extended across the apprenticeships provision. The University worked with The Sutton Trust to support students from state schools who were applying for apprenticeships. Ofsted highlighted social mobility as an area where Queen Mary performed well in its inspection report.

2025.142 Senate **noted** that apprenticeship programmes had student voice committees and an established framework for receiving and addressing feedback.

Degree Outcomes Statement **(SE2025.44)**

2025.143 Senate **received** the Queen Mary Degree Outcomes Statement for 2024-25.

2025.144 Senate **noted** the increase in the number of 'good honours' being awarded and the actions recommended by the Education, Quality and Standards Board (EQSB) to address the issue. In particular, the proportion of first-class awards made by Queen Mary required further consideration. Although not covered in this report, Postgraduate awards showed a similar trend with an increase in the number of merits and distinctions being awarded. Schools and Institutes had been asked to provide detailed

justifications for degree outcomes where a high number of 'good honours' were being awarded.

2025.145 Senate **endorsed** the draft (external-facing) Queen Mary Degree Outcomes Statement for 2024-25.

Part 3: Matters for Approval

Academic Governance Review: Education and Student Experience Board Structures and Terms of Reference **(SE2025.45)**

2025.146 Senate **received** a proposal on the education and student experience board structures and terms of reference.

2025.147 Senate **approved** the updated terms of reference and membership for the education and student experience board structures for Senate.

2025.148 Senate **approved** the policy approval levels for policies within Senate's remit. Terms of reference for boards of Senate would be updated in line with the approved policy approval levels.

2025.149 Senate **approved** the name of the Research Degrees Programmes and Examinations Board. It had been agreed that retaining the term 'Board', as opposed to 'Sub-Board', was preferred.

2025.150 Senate **noted** the update on student representation on the research-related boards, following discussion by Senate in December 2025.

2025.151 Senate **noted** the next steps in the academic governance review. The new structures would be implemented, and work would be undertaken around faculty-level education groups.

Proposal to rename the Queen Mary University of London School of Business and Management to "Queen Mary Business School" **(SE2025.46)**

2025.152 Senate **received** a proposal to rename the School of Business and Management the "Queen Mary Business School". The proposal outlined the rationale for the change and the details of the consultation that had been conducted.

2025.153 Senate **noted** that the cost implications had been assessed against the benefits of enhancing the School's competitiveness and reputation. As the School was moving into a new building, a large majority of the costs that would normally be associated with a name change had been included in the relocation budget. The cost of the name change at this time was therefore nominal.

2025.154 Senate **endorsed** the change in name of the School of Business and Management to the "Queen Mary Business School".

Semester dates 2033-34 **(2025.47)**

2025.155 Senate **received** proposed semester dates for 2033-34 and revised dates for 2027-28 and 2032-33 to accommodate on-campus winter graduation events.

2025.156 Senate **approved** the semester dates for 2033-34 and revised dates for 2027-28, 2032-33 and 2033-34.

Part 4: Matters for Report

Curriculum 2030 update **(Presentation)**

2025.157 Senate **received** a presentation on Curriculum 2030.

2025.158 Senate **noted** that Curriculum 2030 would allow Queen Mary to respond to internal and external changes that had occurred since Strategy 2030 was established. It would also provide a framework for addressing feedback received as part of Queen Mary's 2023 TEF outcome.

2025.159 Senate **noted** that the credit framework would be revised to enhance consistency within the curriculum. Programme design requirements would also be consolidated. Furthermore, the amount and type of experiential learning required within the curriculum would be defined.

2025.160 Senate **noted** the institutional risks of not delivering Curriculum 2030 on schedule. Risks included inconsistency in student experience and outcomes, financial loss in the short and medium term, significant loss of income if Queen Mary were awarded a Bronze TEF award, and a risk of increasing staff workloads due to inefficiency and duplication.

2025.161 Senate **noted** that the timeline had been developed with the aim of allowing meaningful change at pace. To assist with this, bespoke meetings will be arranged to approve programme design changes ahead of the 2027-28 academic year.

2025.162 Senate **noted** that targeted support might be required to achieve the desired level of experiential learning. It was advised that colleagues work with module leaders to establish the amount of experiential learning currently being delivered in their modules. This approach would allow resource to be focussed on those requiring more significant changes. The intention was for the target level of experiential learning to be driven by learning outcomes and have space for nuance.

2025.163 Senate **noted** that work was being conducted by Deans of Education and the QMA to assess current practice. A more in-depth audit of each programme would begin in April 2026. The data collected could be used to evidence Queen Mary's journey and should be shared with the TEF Steering Group to ensure it forms part of the TEF submission.

2025.164 Senate **noted** that consideration should be given to any capacity lost through the PS staff voluntary severance scheme given the significant amount of work that would need to be undertaken to achieve Curriculum 2030. The implementation plan would also need to factor in module convenors' workloads. Communications should also detail how the proposed changes would benefit colleagues.

2025.165 Senate **noted** a further update would be provided at the meeting in June 2026.

Employability and Graduate Skills Strategy* **(SE2025.48)**

2025.166 Senate **noted t**he draft Employability and Graduate Skills Strategy.

Minutes of the last meeting **(SE2025.49)**

2025.167 Senate **confirmed** the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2025.

Matters Arising* **(SE2024.50)**

2025.168 Senate **noted** that Council had approved the nominations for six Honorary Degrees, one Fellowship and one Queen Mary Medal following consultation with Senate by email in January 2026.

2025.169 Senate **noted** that Council had approved the nominations for three Fellowships and one Queen Mary Medal following consultation with Senate by email in February 2026.

2025.170 Senate **noted** that the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Steering Group (EDISG) had considered the definitions of antisemitism and Islamophobia at its meeting on 25 February 2026. EDISG had agreed a strategic approach to broad consultation and an equality analysis covering both definitions. The resulting Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) would be launched for consultation in March 2026.

Council report* **(SE2025.51)**

2025.171 Senate **noted** the minutes of the Council meeting held on 27 November 2025.

Taught Programmes Board* **(SE2025.52)**

2025.172 Senate **noted** the proposals relating to programme and module academic developments that had taken place between02 November 2025 and 24 February 2026.

Education Quality and Standards Board* **(SE2025.53)**

2025.173 Senate **noted** the executive summary of minutes from EQSB meeting held on 11 February 2026.

Partnerships Board* **(SE2025.54)**

2025.174 Senate **noted** the executive summary of business considered by the Partnerships Board (PB) from 12 November 2025 to 26 January 2026.

President and Principal's report* **(SE2025.55)**

2025.175 Senate **noted** the President and Principal's report.

Students' Union President's report* **(SE2025.56)**

2025.176 Senate **noted** the Students' Union President's report

Indicative Annual Plan for 2025-26* **(SE2025.57)**

2025.177 Senate **noted** the Indicative Annual Plan for 2025.26.

Part 5: Other matters

Dates of future meetings

2025.178 Senate **noted** the upcoming Senate meetings for 2025-26:

- 11 June 2026, 15:00-17:00

Any Other Business

2025.179 Senate **noted** that the Timetable Policy would shortly be circulated the members for consideration by email. The policy and any comments received would then be sent to the Chair for a decision by Chair's Action. An update would be provided the members at the next Senate meeting.