Internal Periodic Review of: School of Divinity PG Provision
Date of review: 1 and 2 November 2022
Date of 14 week response: 10 May 2023
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 team had sympathy for the staff's view that the named PhD programmes provided layers of unnecessary complexity from an administrative viewpoint, potentially resulting in students being siloed within their research groupings. However, subsequent to meeting the students the team considered that before abandoning these named PhD programmes, it would be important to assess whether they were in fact functioning as an important hook in recruitment. The review team strongly **recommend** seeking further intelligence from students and applicants on how these labels were feeding into choices made before a firm decision either way was taken. It was also **recommended** that the School look at interactions between degree finder and google, as when the panel searched ''world Christianity programmes' Edinburgh came up top because it is one of the only named PhD programmes in search results.	Ongoing work on the School website is looking at this issue.	Following the IPR recommendation that we seek further intelligence from the students before simplifying our current suite of named PhD programmes we have consulted some of the existing students, who have confirmed that they value the existing structure with its specificity (6 out of 8 of the students who were surveyed valued the specificity). We also take the point that the specificity of our programmes is good for recruitment. Therefore, we have concluded that we will maintain the status quo for now (i.e. we will continue with our current suite of programme names), but will continue to monitor it in case new programmes are required. The IPR also recommended that we look at how Degree Finder interacts with Google. We will also monitor this, but our main concern is to draw enquiries to our School website rather than Degree Finder, and we have recently updated our website accordingly.	Completed, April 2023
2	The review Team considered that blended courses across UG and PGT programmes offered a flexible approach for managing delivery of provision from year to year. It was recognised that this may be a sustainable way of offering broad choice at both levels, and have many advantages for students within the room. However, having a majority of optional offerings in this format is arguably excessive. It was	Ongoing, in collaboration with PGT programme directors, who have been notified of this recommendation	The IPR recommended that we reflect on our practice of running paired level 10 and level 11 courses. Our response is that we will review this on an annual basis according to our PGT intake (which can fluctuate dramatically across individual programmes from year-to-year), and will endeavour to ensure that all PGT students can access the teaching that they were initially promised. We will also consider ways of	

		recommended that the emerging 'norm' of automatically producing a level 11 version of existing or proposed level 10 courses for some PGT programmes should be critically reflected on. So too the diversity of practice across MA programmes with regard to having separate tailored PGT sessions within UG/PGT blended courses should be monitored as student experience seems very variable across programmes.	and asked to take it into account year-on-year	making more use of level 11 courses shared across several of our PGT programmes.	
3	The Review Team noted it would be helpful if University systems could digitally facilitate more modularity across disciplines by using keywords more explicitly and promoting courses likely to have more availability as choices. It was recommended that the process for accurately co-listing courses from year-to year should be monitored.	Ongoing, and we hope to review this situation in September when the new academic year begins.	The IPR recommended that we address the problem of enrolment in courses cross-listed with us from other schools, seeking a solution from Student Systems. We will ask Programme Directors to highlight where the problems lie rather than going through Student Systems.	
4	The review team recommend that the University invest in adequate on-site IT support and a stable Wi-Fi connection throughout the building. IT issues were obviously a pressure point felt keenly by all members of the learning community in New College.	Ongoing	The IPR recommended that we investigate the patchy WiFi in New College. Current building work in the School will hopefully resolve this problem, and the WiFi is currently being investigated by specialists.	
5	The review team recommended the School go ahead with their plans to provide a multi-faith prayer space once the fire asset protection work was completed.	Ongoing	The IPR recommended that the School should provide a multi-faith prayer space. We are hopeful that this will be achieved in the coming months once our current phase of renovation and fire protection work in the building is completed.	5
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	The Final Report was distributed to all members of the School's PG Committee (which includes student representatives), and has been discussed at several meetings. The student reps were included			

		in discussions on how to address the recommendations, and an additional set of students were consulted on recommendation 1.
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review	