

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

14 week response report

Internal Periodic Review of:

Date of review: 31 March – 01 April 2021

Date of 14 week response: 30 November 2021

Date of year on response:

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.

If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed. Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The review panel recommends that urgent action is taken to address the culture and practice of overworking within the Group through the development of a workload allocation model (WAM).	March 2022 end of trail of Vet School WAM. July 2022 decision by Group on feasibility of WAM.	Conversations have started to consider the feasibility of a WAM. The model current used by the Vet School will be trialled by the Group in the beginning of 2022 with progress reported in the annual response documentation. Due to resource and data management implications, it is likely that a college wide model will be required for PGT and the experiences of the Group will inform this decision making.	
2	The review panel recommends that the University's Information Services Group holds urgent discussions with experts from the Group and more widely to ensure that the technological architecture is not at odds with the University's Teaching strategy or pedagogical principles.		While being mindful of the University-level reviews into the fitness of IS systems and the Curriculum Transformation Project, the review panel recommends that the University's Information Services Group holds urgent discussions with experts from the Group and more widely to ensure that the technological architecture is not at odds with the University's Teaching strategy or pedagogical principles. There are clear lessons that can be learned from experts within the Group who have found that existing VLEs prohibit them from co-production of content with students. In terms of VLE platforms, Information Services needs to find a way to invest in plug-ins and workarounds to address more specialist needs. ISG regularly review the University's digital estate and learning technology systems. The emerging Digital Strategy includes a mapping of the technological architecture and the Director of Learning, Teaching and Web attends Senate Education Committee and Knowledge Strategy Committee to ensure that the platforms and tools provided at an enterprise level align with the University's teaching strategy and pedagogical principles. I hope that in the near future we will have support from across the University for a more root and branch overhaul of our main teaching platform. It will be a huge, multi-year project involving every course	

leader, every School office, every local learning technologist, large IT teams, changes to all the training, integrations, helpdesks, student handbooks, support pages and changes to teaching practice, but I think that the lessons learned from teaching this year and the institution-wide work on curriculum review will be a great place to start. I am looking forward to having the support of the CMVM staff in doing this work. ISG bids to the university for funding each year as part of the planning round and College support for more investment in learning technology will be welcome. Colleagues should feed requests for new tools and functionality to me (Director of Learning, Teaching and Web), or to Stuart Nicol (Head of Educational Design and Engagement) so that they can be reviewed and prioritised in our ongoing programme of projects and service development.

The history of VLEs at Edinburgh is characterised, as with so many areas of the university, by a proliferation of local solutions, which were unsustainable and confusing for users. In the past, our distance learning courses were offered on 13 different platforms, each with their own technical teams and support requirements. As the platforms aged [Knowledge Strategy Committee](#) recognised the risk of this technical debt and in order to sustain the online distance learning activity which brings the University thousands of learners each year, we have migrated all that distance learning to Learn through our [VLE consolidation project](#). We are now able to support this aspect of University business through a single helpdesk and the [70+ online distance learning masters level courses](#) are now delivered on Learn. Every course has a place on Learn VLE to manage learning materials and groups. The learning platform is integrated into other core systems and the timetable. It draws together data from across the University to ensure that the right people have access to the learning materials and communication tools that they needed.

There has been a multi-year project to consolidate multiple end of life VLEs into one platform for the university. The work on the VLE consolidation project occupied all of the effort of ISG technical teams for several years. This left Edinburgh far behind other institutions which have been investing in their VLE. In 2019 we embarked on our [Learn Foundations project](#) in an attempt to tackle the aspects of confusion and inconsistency that were badly impacting our students' experience. We moved [Learn to 'the Cloud'](#) before the pandemic and ISG hope to move it to the next version (Ultra) soon. This year, the amount of activity in the VLE has grown considerably and both the license and storage costs have increased. It is even more important now that colleagues ensure that they consider course design to make the best use of the platform for teaching. [Training in all aspects of using Learn](#) is available to all and we offer a bespoke programme of support for ['An Edinburgh Model of teaching online'](#).

			<i>Response from Melissa Highton – Assistant Principal Online Learning, Director of Learning, Teaching and Web – 22/07/2021</i>	
3	The review panel recommends that urgent attention is directed towards addressing the needs of online and professional programmes, particularly the ClinEd programme, primarily in order to address the concerns regarding the extensions and special circumstances system.		The Extensions and Special Circumstances system is set up to comply with the Taught Assessment Regulations and SC policy. The team take the regulations and policy as basis when processing applications. The service does take into consideration that online and professional programmes might have different needs and has always approached these applications with as much flexibility as possible. We have taken an approach of being available to meet with schools/deaneries to discuss any bespoke arrangements that need to be made (where resource and the regulations permit) and to always respond in a timely way to any arising queries. We will continue to do so. <i>Response from Faten Adam – Student Support Operations Manager - 14/9/2021</i>	
4	The review panel recommends that urgent attention be given by the University’s Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC) to enable greater flexibility in the 3rd year of the MSc Clinical Education programme in relation to considering the approval of alternatives to the final 60-credit project.	A paper has been produced by the Group and will be considered at the APRC January 2022 meeting	APRC has a mechanism for considering individual proposals for alternative structures to the standard, 60-credit dissertation model on traditional Master’s programmes, and has recently approved some such proposals, including 40+20 models. In January 2021, Senate Education Committee gave “in principle” support to the idea of fully-taught Master’s degrees, but noted that the issue needed to be taken to APRC for detailed consideration. No paper has been brought to APRC subsequently about this issue. APRC would be happy to consider this issue, and would recommend that the Deanery discuss with the College bringing a paper to APRC at the earliest opportunity. <i>Response from Ailsa Taylor – Academic Policy Officer, Academic Services – 23/8/2021</i>	
5	Taking into account the recent merger and the evident issues of sustainability on both programmes in terms of meeting both urgent and projected demand, the review panel recommends that College revisits its business planning models and works proactively with the Group around short and medium-term investment, with clearer information around funding streams and resourcing models.	Ongoing, with progress reported in the annual response documentation	A working group led by the Dean of Clinical Medicine and with senior representation from College Finance and Postgraduate Education is undertaking a review of the business model as recommended with a view to establishing an enhanced and integrated model to support and grow the programmes. <i>Response from Siddharthan Chandran – Dean of Clinical Medicine – 26/11/2021</i>	
6	The review panel recommends that the Group further integrates the administrative teams of ClinEd and CEP, and that an exchange of best practice is ensured, while remaining cognisant of their distinctiveness. Moving forward, efforts should be made to ensure that CEP is incorporated into quality planning processes.	Ongoing, with progress reported in the annual response documentation. A working timescale for the new structure is academic year 22/23	Conversations have started with David Kluth and Katie Urquhart (new Head of Academic Administration for Medical Education) on how all members of postgraduate administrative staff can be best supported in their roles and ensure no staff group works in isolation. An away day is planned for early 2022 to consider how best to move this forward within the challenge of hybrid working. CEP is considered within the Medical School annual quality report, challenges remain with the use of EERS as the academic provision of CEP does not currently sit within MyED channels.	
7	The review team recommends that the Group delivers an administrative structure which incorporates a team who are clear	Ongoing, with progress	As above for points 5 and 6. Moves towards a centralised administrative service, led by Katie Urquhart will address this issue providing a clear	

	on the roles and responsibilities within the Group and across the wider College. In order to support this, a business case should be created for a sustainable staffing model.	reported in the annual response	structure. Discussions are ongoing regarding business planning to ensure sustainable staffing.	
8	In order to create further benefits in the context of curriculum development, the review panel recommends that the Group clarify what the shared vision is for the programmes; their commonalities, their distinctive elements and how these fit within the amalgamation of the ClinEd and CEP programmes.	Ongoing, with progress reported in the annual response	This work is ongoing and will form the main topic of discussion at the forthcoming away day. We wish to take time to consider this fully to ensure all views are heard and considered before sharing our vision more widely. The philosophical underpinning of the ClinEd programme is already well developed and clearly articulated and Gill Aitken will work with the CEP team to develop similar work and an overarching strategy for postgraduate medical education.	
9	The review panel recommends that the Group offers an alternative form of assessment to the Year 3 CEP reflective essay, for example reflective blogs.	Paperwork to Advance HE Dec 2021. Agreement with IAD complete	Ian Lee and Maia Forrester are working with the wider group to consider how an ongoing blog could be used to assess level 3 CEP. It is planned to implement this in 2022 when the current cohort of level 3 participants will have completed their essays. Paperwork for Advance HE is complete and they have to approve the programme change as it is linked to their accreditation. The proposal has the agreement of the External Examiner.	
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	A summary of the review recommendations and commendations has been produced. To date it has been shared with the ClinEd students via the SSLC meeting structure. Discussions are ongoing as how best to share the information with CEP participants.		
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review			