Queen Mary University of London

Senate

Paper Title	**Education Quality and Standards Board: summary minutes**
Outcome requested	The Senate is asked to **note** the summary minutes.
Points for Senate members to note and further information	The Education Quality and Standards Board met on **15 April 2026**. This paper provides a high-level overview of the meeting. 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	Office for Students (OfS) Conditions of Registration Ofsted Education Inspection Framework
Strategy and risk	-
Reporting/ consideration route for the paper	Senate only
Authors	Adam Streames, Deputy Head of Academic Quality and Standards
Sponsor	Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice-Principal (Education)

Education Quality and Standards Board 15 April 2026

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 **APPROVED** the following documents.

    a. Curriculum 2030: Proposal for revised Queen Mary Graduate Attributes
    The Board **noted** key points from the discussion, which included:
        i. it would be important to work with marketing for communications to pick up on trends around language and attractive attribute naming, and to ensure the group names and the communication around them were relevant.
        ii. it would be useful to surface a developmental e-portfolio type tool to contribute to the mapping and attainment of the graduate attributes for students and programme teams.
        iii. the questions in the GOS around employability would be better articulated with these grouped graduate attributes. For new programmes, or at a point in programme review, alignment can be simplified this way rather than asking all existing provision to undertake work to re-align.
    b. Scaling procedures, noting that they would return to the Board as part of the Marking Policy, which is part of the Assessment Handbook, at the May meeting.
    The Board **noted** key points from the discussion, which included:
        i. whether the 15-day marking turnaround process included allowance for scaling. It was agreed that scaling would class as an exception that would fall into the exceptions clause, and a timeframe for scaling clause would be included as there may be instances where the scaling is more complex.
    c. External Examining: revisions to External Examiner report template.
    The Board **noted** key points from the discussion, which included:
        i. the greater link to the OfS Conditions of Registration was a welcome revision, but that it assumed the external examiners were fully aware of the conditions. Enhancements would be made to the guidance so that awareness of the conditions can be raised.
        ii. the desire to revisit our external examining next year as we must ensure we are getting value from the process given the amount of resource spent on it, and that it remained fair and justifiable. The DfE and OfS were once again considering external examining, so there could be changes to the expectations in this area.
    d. External Examining: nomination criteria and terms of appointment.
    The Board **noted** key points from the discussion, which included:
        i. the appointment criteria for external examiners, allowing limited additional flexibility in the appointment of externals from the same institution, and requiring that new externals demonstrate evidence of their pedagogic experience demonstrate recognition of their teaching, either through a formal qualification or through membership of the HEA.
        ii. a new expectation that the contract of an external examiner will be terminated if they fail to submit a report on two occasions.

4. **DID NOT APPROVE** the revised processes for External Examining in its proposed form, recommending a wider review after the introduction of the Curriculum 2030 framework.

5. **NOTED** an update on School Enhancement Reviews, that the outcomes of the reviews completed so far have been positive. In the School of Business and Management and the School of Mathematical Sciences, the reviews had been useful for recommendations and taken on as part of the change for those schools. Reviews would continue to be commissioned for a particular problem, for example continued outcomes below benchmark KPIs, as and where needed.