

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences

Postgraduate Taught provision

20- 22 February 2024

Contents

Executive summary	3
Key Commendations	3
Key recommendations	3
Commendations, recommendations and suggestions	4
Commendations	4
Recommendations	5
Suggestions	9
Section A – Introduction	10
Scope of review	10
Review Team Members	10
The Deanery	10
Physical location and summary of facilities	10
Date of previous review	11
Reflective Report.....	11
Section B – Main report	12
Contextual introduction.....	12
1 Strategic overview	12
2 Enhancing the student experience	13
2.1 The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching	13
2.2 Assessment and Feedback	14
2.3 Supporting students in their learning	15
2.4. Listening and responding to the Student Voice.....	15
2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation.....	16
2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes	16
2.7 Supporting and developing staff.....	17
2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual)	17
3 Assurance and enhancement of provision	18
3.1 Setting and maintaining academic standards.....	18
3.2 Key themes and actions taken	18
Appendices.....	20
Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review	20
Appendix 2: University remit	24
Appendix 3: Additional information considered by review team.....	25
Appendix 4: Number of students.....	25

Executive summary

This report comprises the outcomes from the internal review of postgraduate taught provision in Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Sciences.

The review team found that the Deanery has effective management of the quality of the student learning experience, academic standards, and enhancement and good practice.

The report provides commendations on the Deanery's provision, recommendations for enhancement that the Deanery will be asked to report progress on to the Senate Quality Assurance Committee and suggestions on how to support developments.

Key Commendations

The review team commended the Deanery for its cutting-edge co-creation activity which is at the forefront within the University, effective implementation of the new student support system and highly valued Student Advisers, its global reach and diverse student community, engaging alumni and providing opportunities for students including the UNCOVER programme, and the variety of dissertation options offering authentic assessment. More detail on these and further commendations are included in the report.

Key recommendations

The top three recommendations identified by the review team for the Deanery to prioritise were:

- **Strategy – postgraduate taught, staffing resources**
- **Work allocation model**
- **Culture shift on value of teaching**

Commendations, recommendations and suggestions

Commendations

Key strengths and areas of positive practice for sharing more widely across the institution.

No	Commendation	Section in report
1	The review team commends the Deanery and its programmes on their global reach and the diversity within its student community.	1
2	The review team commends the overall high student satisfaction within the Deanery.	2.1
3	The review team commends the choice of dissertation options available to students.	2.1
4	The review team commends the Deanery's teaching staff on the authentic experience for students that is provided by the SLICC, workplace-based and policy review projects available.	2.2
5	The review team identified the implementation of the new student support system as an area of good practice and commends the Student Advisers for their highly valued contribution and the positive impact they are making as very new members of the Deanery community.	2.3
6	The review team commends the exemplar pathways, co-created with students, as an area of good practice that could be shared across the Deanery.	2.3
7	The review team commends the Deanery's cutting-edge ideas in this area (co-creation) which are currently at the forefront within University practice.	2.4
8	The Deanery appointed a student co-ordinator to help with preparations for this review following a business case presented to College. The review team commends this appointment as an area of good practice and an example of the co-creation activity within the Deanery.	2.4
9	The review team commends the UNCOVER programme as an example of good practice.	2.6
10	The review team commends the Usher Masters Alumni (UMA) network and the way in which the Deanery is engaging its alumni with programme activity.	2.6
11	The review team commends the Deanery's buddy system, operated by some programmes, for mentoring tutors to match more experienced colleagues with those who are new to tutoring and marking.	2.7

12	The review team commends the Deanery's flexibility in working patterns and line management of staff, with a strong focus on staff wellbeing.	2.7
13	The review team commends the Deanery on its ambition to embrace the pedagogical potential of AI.	2.7
14	The students that the review team met were very positive about the learning support they received from staff and the review team commends the supportive teaching and learning environment for online students.	2.8
15	The review team commends the Deanery's IPR team on its engagement with and preparation for the internal review process. As noted above, the Deanery IPR team included a student co-ordinator to embed the student voice within preparations for the review.	3.1
16	The review team also commends the positive engagement by everyone they encountered during the review visit. Staff and students were consistently welcoming, positive and candid in their discussions.	3.1
17	The review team commends accreditation of the Masters of Public Health online programme by the Agency for Public Health Education Accreditation (APHEA).	3.2

Recommendations

Areas for development and enhancement – progress to be reported.

Priority	Recommendation	Section in report	Responsibility of
1	<p>Strategy development</p> <p>The review team recommends that the Deanery's senior leadership develop a postgraduate taught student recruitment strategy, taking account of business and financial modelling. Projected student numbers over five year rolling periods should be included and the strategy kept under annual review. The strategy should also consider financial and business modelling, for example differential fees and funding opportunities considering the diversity of the student cohort, with a view to encouraging uptake and reduce the current high withdrawal rate.</p>	1	Deanery Senior Leadership
	<p>The review team recommends that the Deanery senior leadership develop a resourcing strategy alongside the recruitment strategy. The aim of this should be to make staff workloads more manageable, and thereby improve staff well-being. This will, in</p>	1	Deanery Senior Leadership

	<p>turn, enable future development and growth. The review team identified concerns among staff over the imminent move to the BioQuarter and projection of increased student numbers in relation to staff retention. In developing a resource strategy, leadership should ensure that succession planning and staff retention is taken account of. During the review visit, the idea of a period of consolidation within postgraduate taught delivery was discussed and the review team supports this as being beneficial to the Deanery to ensure appropriate strategies are in place to support future planned growth. The review team also identified a need to review contract types. The review team considered that the lack of guaranteed hours contracts was limiting tutor capacity to support marking. There was evidence of slippage in the 20% allocation of teaching time in new research contracts and a lack of formal contracts for some tutors. The Deanery should also ensure tutor appointments align with the University policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators.</p>		
2	<p>Resourcing The review team recommends that the Deanery senior leadership develop an appropriate and more clearly defined Work Allocation Model (WAM) across the Deanery. Currently there is a disproportionate amount of teaching activity falling on a limited number of staff. The review team particularly noted the impact of a lack of dissertation supervisors and recommends that this, along with marking activity, should be shared across all academic staff. The Deanery senior leadership should make clear the expectation that all academic staff are involved in teaching and marking. There should be a process for implementing and monitoring this, for example, an annual review of WAM at a Deanery level, and in annual reviews between individual staff and their line managers.</p>	1	Deanery Senior Leadership
3	<p>Value of Teaching (Strategy/Resourcing) The review team recommends that the Deanery senior leadership acknowledge, and actively promote, the value of teaching and recognising the importance of teaching input to financial and business models within the Deanery. The review team noted a similar recommendation from the previous review and it appeared that little progress has been made</p>	2.1	Deanery Senior Leadership

	<p>in this respect, which was disappointing. During discussions, the review team identified a palpable tension between research and teaching within the Deanery and considered that an attitudinal culture shift needs to be progressed to bring the Institute together and to ensure the sustainability of programmes, particularly in respect of plans for future expansion. There is a clear reputational risk if programmes are not able to support the student learning and teaching experience effectively. Promotion criteria should be put in place to recognise teaching and academic staff annual reviews should include conversations on teaching as a standard element and as part of a WAM.</p>		
4	<p>Learning and teaching The review team recommends that the Deanery review overlaps between the online and campus Masters of Public Health programmes to ensure opportunities for synergy are not being missed and to ensure that the student learning experience on both programmes is optimal. Web marketing content should also be reviewed to ensure accuracy and clarity on differences between the online and campus offerings.</p>	2.1	Deanery
5	<p>Assessment and feedback The review team recommends that programme and course teams explore where more formative assessment opportunities could be introduced.</p>	2.2	Deanery programme teams
6	<p>Subject specific remit: co-creation Co-creation activity is an area of good practice and the review team recommends that the Deanery continue the good work already begun and that this is shared across the Deanery, College and University.</p>	2.4	Deanery
7	<p>Subject specific remit: academic citizenship The review team recommends that the Deanery consider expanding academic citizenship to include both <i>professional</i> and academic citizenship. Programmes should ensure that students are consistently alerted to existing employability options and graduate attribute elements in what they are already doing and encourage programme teams to think more proactively on how core skills are embedded and highlighted within core</p>	2.6	Deanery/Careers Service

	<p>courses. The Deanery should explore how to work more collaboratively with the University Careers Service to ensure more tailored advice and activity is available for online and on campus students. The review team suggests that this begins in Welcome Week and continues throughout the programmes.</p>		
8	<p>Dissertation supervision The review team recommends that the Deanery explore how to support management of different dissertation routes, for example the policy brief option needs to be properly resourced in the on-campus (MPH) programme, and there may be opportunities for learning from the online programme.</p> <p>(As part of the resourcing strategy – see recommendation 1 above) There may be opportunities to work more closely with external partners, for example, NHS Scotland, to increase dissertation supervision capacity. The Deanery should explore more formalised arrangements with external partners to facilitate this.</p>	<p>2.1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Deanery</p> <p>Deanery Senior Leadership</p>
9	<p>Resourcing</p> <p>Staff noted that current practice is that all markers are paid at the same rate and this does not reflect the expertise nor mentoring required to instil consistency. The review team recommends that the Deanery senior leadership considers developing a differential scale for more experienced staff as part of the resourcing strategy discussed and recommended in section 1.</p> <p>There was a general feeling that priority was being given to research in terms of space allocation in the new building. The review team recommends that the Deanery ensure that at least equal priority on room booking within the new building is given to teaching activity.</p>	<p>2.7</p> <p>2.8</p>	<p>Deanery Senior Leadership</p> <p>Deanery</p>
10	<p>Tutors and demonstrators The review team recommends that the Deanery review its tutor training to ensure there is a co-ordinated and consistent approach to tutor training. There should also be standardised and consistent approach to recruitment of tutors in accordance with equality, diversity, and inclusivity policies.</p>	2.7	Deanery

11	<p>Technology</p> <p>The review team commends the Deanery on its ambition to embrace the pedagogical potential of AI and recommends that the Deanery explores opportunities for internal, interdisciplinary partnerships and looks across the University for areas of expertise when thinking about adding this to their programmes.</p>	2.7	Deanery
----	--	-----	---------

Suggestions

For noting – progress reporting is not required.

No	Suggestion	Section in report
1	The review team suggests that this (value of teaching – see recommendation 3) could be supported by identifying opportunities for linking big research projects to associated research questions which could become dissertation projects, thus providing interconnected dissertation options.	2.1
2	The review team suggests that the Deanery explore opportunities to highlight co-creation activity to students at an early stage, for example, during induction and more consistently throughout the course of the programmes.	2.4
3	The review team suggests the Deanery consider extending accreditation to the on-campus MPH programme and explores opportunities for additional accreditation across its provision.	3.2

Section A – Introduction

Scope of review

Range of provision considered by the review (see Appendix 1).

The Internal Periodic Review (IPR) of Deanery of Molecular, Genetic and Population Health Science in 2023/24 consisted of:

- The University's remit for internal review (see Appendix 2)
- The subject specific remit items for the review:
 - Co-creation as a guiding principle
 - Enhanced academic citizenship of the future
- The Reflective Report and additional material provided in advance of the review
- The meeting of the review team including consideration of further material (see Appendix 3)
- The final report produced by the review team
- Action by the Deanery and others to whom recommendations were remitted following the review

Review Team Members

Convener	Dr Wendy Ugolini
External Member	Professor Peter A Bath
External Member	Dr Sarah Bennett
Internal Member	Professor Simon Riley
Student Member	Shayna Britto
Review Team Administrator	Susan Hunter (shadowed by Julie Gifford)

The Deanery

The Deanery is one of three deaneries situated within the Edinburgh Medical School, which is located in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine. The Deanery comprises two large institutes, the Usher Institute and the Institute of Genetics and Cancer, with three or four research centres within each institute.

Physical location and summary of facilities

Learning and teaching is provided within the two Institutes. Currently located in the central campus, the Usher Institute is due to move to a new building in the Edinburgh BioQuarter at Little France. The new building will offer increased lecture theatre space. The Institute of Genetics and Cancer is located at the Western General Hospital. As the majority of students are online learners, teaching is mainly supported through the virtual learning environment.

Date of previous review

30 & 31 October 2017

Reflective Report

The Reflective Report was prepared by:

- Neneh Rowa-Dewar, Director of Quality
- Yen Culley, IPR student coordinator
- Michelle Hart, Teaching Organisation Manager
- Sharon Levy, Deputy Director of Quality

Consultation and contributions from:

- All PGT Programme Leads/Directors
- Sarah Cunningham Burley, Dean
- Nynke Halbesma, Co-Director of Students
- Alison Webb and Anna Cooper, Student Advisers
- Marianne Brown, Head of Student Analytics and Student Voice Working Group
- Jeni Harden, Director of Education
- Neil Lent, Institute for Academic Development
- Michelle Evans, PGT Director
- Kyla Atkinson, Careers Service – Career Consultant
- Brittany Blankinship,
- Rosemary Porteous, PGT Team Leader

Student input was led by the Student IPR Coordinator, including:

- Survey to all Teaching Organisation students
- Individual interviews
- Focus groups
- Deanery Student Quality Committee discussion
- Recorded accounts from Student Representatives

The Deanery acknowledges that due to staff availability and time constraints at the point of gaining sign off for the Reflective Report, it was not possible to share the final draft as fully as they would have wished. This will be addressed for future reviews.

Section B – Main report

Contextual introduction

At the time of the review visit, the Deanery is experiencing a period of imminent change. The Usher Institute will be moving from the central campus to a new building in the BioQuarter within weeks. There is also an ongoing strategic governance review at College level, where the Deaneries will cease to exist and a new structure of Schools will be created. A series of 'Town Hall' meetings in January 2024 on different sites indicated the College would be restructured into six Schools. However, the impacts of this restructuring on teaching, including the Teaching Organisation from this Deanery, and whether there may be a merger with teaching organisations from other Deaneries remains unclear at this time. This change in location and the proposed restructuring is creating uncertainty and concerns among staff within the Deanery. The Deanery recognise the opportunities that these changes present whilst also appreciating the challenges and uncertainty during this period.

1 Strategic overview

The majority of postgraduate taught programmes within the Deanery are offered online, with one on campus Masters programme in Public Health. Since the previous review, there has been a significant increase in the number of online programmes offered and consequently the number of students studying online. This includes a large cohort of students studying on a part-time basis while also working full time. Around 10 percent of the students are studying full time on campus, the remainder are taught online. However, the move to the new building in the BioQuarter will provide capacity for growth of the on-campus programme and in its student numbers.

The review team **commends** the Deanery and its programmes on their global reach and the diversity within its student community. However, the review team noted a significant lack in conversion from application to joining within the application process. Recruitment for some programmes focuses on low to middle income countries and the lack of funding opportunities has an impact on recruitment from these countries. The Deanery has set up a group to look strategically at attracting external funding.

The review team heard concerns around heightened staff workload which was impacting on their ability to keep courses updated, increasing pressure around marking and dissertation supervision, and resulting in a lack of time to explore cross-fertilisation between programmes and ways of working more effectively outside of programme silos. This led to staff feeling under-appreciated and to high levels of attrition and turnover. The review team noted a lack of resource strategy and that there was no clearly defined work allocation model (WAM) within the Deanery.

The review team heard that the Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Director was undertaking a review of programmes which is a positive initiative. However, there seems to be a disconnect between the overarching plans for increasing student numbers and staff resourcing to support this. There is a clear need to consolidate PGT activity and focus on the basics of teaching delivery and appropriate staffing. The review team noted the lack of strategic business plans and modelling within the Deanery and recommends this is addressed as follows.

The review team **recommends** that the Deanery's senior leadership develop a postgraduate taught student recruitment strategy, taking account of business and

financial modelling. Projected student numbers over a rolling five-year period should be included and the strategy kept under annual review. The strategy should also consider financial and business modelling, for example differential fees and funding opportunities considering the diversity of the student cohort with a view to encouraging uptake and reduce the current high withdrawal rate

The review team **recommends** that the Deanery senior leadership develop a resourcing strategy alongside the recruitment strategy. The aim of this should be to make staff workloads more manageable, and thereby improve staff well-being. This will, in turn, enable future development and growth. The review team identified concerns among staff over the imminent move to the BioQuarter and projection of increased student numbers in relation to staff retention. In developing a resource strategy, leadership should ensure that succession planning and staff retention is taken account of. During the review visit, the idea of a period of consolidation within postgraduate taught delivery was discussed and the review team supports this as being beneficial to the Deanery to ensure appropriate strategies are in place to support future planned growth. There may be opportunities to work more closely with external partners, for example NHS Scotland, to increase dissertation supervision capacity. The Deanery should explore more formalised arrangements with external partners to facilitate this. The review team also identified a need to review contract types. There was evidence of slippage in the 20% allocation of teaching time in new research contracts and a lack of formal contracts for some tutors. The review team considered that the lack of guaranteed hours contracts was limiting tutor capacity to support marking. The Deanery should also ensure tutor appointments align with the University policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators.

The review team **recommends** that the Deanery senior leadership develop an appropriate and more clearly defined Work Allocation Model (WAM) across the Deanery. Currently there is a disproportionate amount of teaching activity falling on a limited number of staff. The review team particularly noted the impact of a lack of dissertation supervisors and recommends that this activity, along with marking, should be shared across all academic staff. The Deanery senior leadership should make clear the expectation that all academic staff are involved in teaching and marking. There should be a process for implementing and monitoring this, for example, an annual review of the WAM at a Deanery level, and in annual reviews between individual staff and their line managers. Opportunities to link dissertation supervision to research interests may be useful to explore in supporting this recommendation. A further, related recommendation regarding the value of teaching is expanded upon below (see 2.1).

2 Enhancing the student experience

2.1 The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching

The review team **commends** the overall high student satisfaction within the Deanery. This is evidenced by the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey results, particularly for online learning, and by the students the review team met.

The review team **commends** the choice of dissertation options available to students. Students the review team met were positive about the benefits of being able to choose different project types, for example Student-Led Individually Created Courses (SLICCs), work-based projects and policy brief options. However, the review team heard that students on some programmes felt the work-based project option was not accessible for all. The review team also heard that there were issues relating to

dissertation supervision, particularly in relation to the on campus Master of Public Health policy brief dissertation option where students felt less well supported. The review team **recommends** that the Deanery explore how to support management of different dissertation routes, for example the policy brief option needs to be properly resourced in the on-campus programme, and there may be opportunities for learning from the online programme.

As noted in section 1 above, there is a gap in teaching allocation responsibility which is negatively impacting on both the student and staff experience. As noted in the recommendation in section 1 above, there may be opportunities to work more closely with external partners to support dissertation supervision and there may be need to be consideration of the potential impact on students where dissertations are not marked by supervisors from within the University. The review team heard from both students and staff of the challenges associated with dissertation supervision. Some students whom the review team met, reported instances of having to find their own dissertation supervisor. There seems to be an internal culture whereby those on more intensive research contracts are able to renege on their teaching obligations, increasing the burden on teaching staff and tutors. The review team **recommends** that the Deanery senior leadership recognise, and actively promote, the value of teaching, acknowledging the importance of teaching input to financial and business models within the Deanery. The review team noted a similar recommendation from the previous review and it appeared that little progress has been made in this respect, which was disappointing. During discussions, the review team identified a palpable tension between research and teaching within the Deanery and considered that an attitudinal culture shift needs to be progressed to bring the Institute together and to ensure the sustainability of programmes, particularly in respect of plans for future expansion. There is a clear reputational risk if programmes are not able to support the student learning and teaching experience effectively. Promotion criteria should be put in place to recognise teaching and academic staff annual reviews should include conversations on teaching as a standard element and as part of a WAM. The review team suggests that this could be supported by identifying opportunities for linking large research projects to associated research questions which could become dissertation projects, thus providing interconnected dissertation options and encouraging research-led teaching.

The review team **recommends** that the Deanery review overlaps between the online and campus Masters of Public Health programmes to ensure opportunities for synergy are not being missed and to ensure that the student learning experience on both programmes is optimal. Web marketing content should also be reviewed to ensure accuracy and clarity on differences between the online and campus offerings. Students whom the review team met described a lack of consistency between expectations of the programme content advertised and their experience once they were on-programme. They particularly felt there was a lack of the applied skills advertised in the campus programme information, which had influenced their applying to Edinburgh, and that they were not developing employability skills for their future careers. (More discussion on this topic follows in section 2.6.)

2.2 Assessment and Feedback

As noted above, the review team identified the variety of dissertation project options as an area of good practice. The review team **commends** the Deanery's teaching staff on the authentic experience for students that is provided by the SLICC, workplace-based and policy review projects available.

The students whom the review team met had found the feedback they received to be helpful and online students valued the constructive feedback they received, including identifying areas for improvement, which had been important in helping them to develop. However, some students reported gaps in formative assessment and feedback opportunities. The review team **recommends** that programme and course teams explore where more formative assessment opportunities could be introduced to provide a more consistent learning experience across programmes.

2.3 Supporting students in their learning

The review team discussed the new student support system with both students and staff and heard that the new system was bedding in well. Although it is too early to comment on Academic Cohort Lead activity, which was introduced to help develop a sense of community and belonging, generally the new system is working very effectively. Both the students and staff were highly appreciative of the Student Advisers, describing the introduction of this role as a “paradigm shift” and that the new colleagues were “excellent”. The review team identified the implementation of the new student support system as an area of good practice and **commends** the Student Advisers for their highly valued contribution and the positive impact they are making as very new members of the Deanery community.

The Deanery had asked the review team to explore co-creation as a guiding principle as part of this review. The review team heard examples of co-creation activity within the Family Medicine and Data Science programmes to help guide students through elective choices in relation to their career aspirations. The review team **commends** the exemplar pathways, co-created with students, as an area of good practice that could be shared across the Deanery.

2.4. Listening and responding to the Student Voice

As mentioned above, the Deanery had asked the review team to explore co-creation as a guiding principle as part of this review. The review team noted that there were several examples of co-creation activity already happening within the Deanery, for example the Usher Masters Alumni network and UNCOVER. However, the students whom the review team met seemed to be less aware of co-creation as a concept and how they themselves were contributing to the development of programmes. The review team suggests that the Deanery explore opportunities to highlight co-creation activity to students at an early stage, for example, during induction, and more consistently throughout the course of the programmes. The review team **commends** the Deanery’s cutting-edge ideas in this area which are currently at the forefront within University practice. Co-creation activity is an area of good practice and the review team **recommends** that the Deanery continue the good work already begun and that this is shared across the Deanery, College and University.

The Deanery appointed a student co-ordinator to help with preparations for this review following a business case presented to the Dean. The review team **commends** this appointment as an area of good practice and an example of the co-creation activity within the Deanery. This area of good practice could be shared more widely across the University for future IPRs.

The Deanery has a student quality committee to ensure students can actively engage with quality processes. This was set up at the request of students.

The online students the review team met felt confident that their feedback to programme teams was taken on board. They were also positive about the connections they were making within cohorts to support their professional networks and the sense of community within their programmes.

2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation

The Deanery's online learning programmes provide an accessible route for students who may already be professional clinicians in full time work. There is a strong understanding by staff of the needs of students seeking continuing professional development and the opportunities for work-based learning. The programmes also have a broad global reach with students from many different countries able to access learning and teaching. As noted earlier in this report, the Deanery has a clear global reach which impacts positively in students' home countries.

The Deanery has an Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee which has recently recruited two PhD student members. The Committee also plans to form a sub-group to focus on EDI issues for postgraduate students. There are plans to introduce formal EDI-related training for all staff and to monitor gender pay differences and promotional opportunities where possible. The Teaching Office also has two staff on the Usher EDI Committee which they hope will promote EDI informed practice. The review team considered that as this becomes embedded into Teaching Office process it will also be a useful link in preparing for future reviews.

2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes

The review team **commends** the [UNCOVER](#) programme as an example of good practice. This network engages alumni with students and staff to review research and inform public health policy decision making. Involvement in UNCOVER projects has had a direct and positive impact in enhancing career opportunities for students. As mentioned above (section 2.4), there may be opportunities to raise the profile of UNCOVER to students at an earlier stage, for example during induction.

The review team **commends** the Usher Masters Alumni (UMA) network and the way in which the Deanery is engaging its alumni with programme activity. Students the review team met were appreciative of guest speaker activity and felt they benefited from hearing about career pathways.

As part of this review, the Deanery had asked the review team to explore enhanced academic citizenship of the future. The Deanery envisions this as building resilience, fostering innovation and creativity, and delivering positive change while harnessing developing technology. The review team considered that these aims were not limited to the academic field and were also well-aligned to the professional careers that students may already be employed in, may want to join or wish to develop. The review team also noted that students felt the information currently available from the Careers Service was generic and not specialised enough for the professions they hoped to pursue. Students the review team met also commented that they primarily learned about graduate attributes through participation in the Edinburgh Award as part of their Student Rep training, rather than through their programme. Therefore, there is a need for graduate attributes to be consistently flagged by teaching staff. Introducing graduate attributes early, provides an opportunity for students to be able to critically reflect on their personal and professional skill building from the start of the programme and learn about different ways they can engage with developing them. The review team **recommends** that the Deanery consider expanding academic

citizenship to include both professional and academic citizenship. Programmes should ensure that students are consistently alerted to existing employability options and graduate attribute elements in what they are already doing and encourage programme teams to think more proactively on how core skills are embedded and highlighted within core courses. The Deanery should explore how to work more collaboratively with the University Careers Service to ensure more tailored advice and activity is available for online and on campus students. The review team suggests that this begins in Welcome Week and continues throughout the programmes.

2.7 Supporting and developing staff

The review team met with staff supporting tutors and with tutors themselves during the review visit. The review team heard that recruitment practice, the number of tutors, and hours required varied by course. In terms of recruitment, practice was inconsistent and could be based upon interpersonal relationships. Staff also identified differences in the skills required for tutors on online and on-campus courses and whether the course was introductory or advanced. Tutors can choose whether they take part in marking assessments and course leads aim to partner inexperienced markers with more experienced colleagues. Staff noted that current practice is that all markers are paid at the same rate and this does not reflect the expertise nor mentoring required to instil consistency. The review team **recommends** that the Deanery senior leadership considers developing a differential scale for more experienced staff as part of the resourcing strategy discussed and recommended in section 1. The review team **commends** the Deanery's buddy system, operated by some programmes, for mentoring tutors to match more experienced colleagues with those who are new to tutoring and marking. The review team **recommends** that the Deanery review its tutor training to ensure there is a co-ordinated and consistent approach to tutor training. There should also be standardised and consistent approach to recruitment of tutors in accordance with equality, diversity, and inclusivity policies.

The professional services staff the review team met appreciated the supportive environment within the Deanery and the flexibility afforded through working from home and flexible working hours. The review team also heard from some academic staff that they valued the opportunities presented by part-time working as helpful to their career development. The review team **commends** the Deanery's flexibility in working patterns and supportive line management of staff, with a strong focus on staff wellbeing.

The Deanery has an interest in harnessing the opportunities presented by AI to enhance its learning and teaching provision, and in relation to its specific remit item on enhanced academic citizenship for the future. However, staff were unsure how this could be achieved and acknowledged that they lack the skills to progress in this area, especially given that this is a rapidly developing field. The review team **commends** the Deanery on its ambition to embrace the pedagogical potential of AI, recognises that there are both developments and also some anticipated institutional guidelines, and **recommends** that the Deanery explores opportunities for internal, interdisciplinary partnerships and looks across the University for areas of expertise when thinking about adding this to their programmes.

2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual)

The review team heard some concerns from staff about the move to the Learn Ultra virtual learning environment (VLE). Staff felt there had been a lack of support and training in how to use the new VLE effectively and that they needed support in making online content more interactive and engaging. The Deanery has appointed a Learning Designer but so far, they have been unable to be involved with content development support for staff due to the need to be reactive to issues; however, this situation should soon be coming to a close. In contrast, the online students the review team met with were very appreciative of the VLE. They were also very positive about the learning support they received from staff and the review team **commends** the supportive teaching and learning environment for online students.

Staff expressed some concerns about the availability of physical space once the move to the new building was complete. These included the lack of space for small group teaching and the lack of space for online activity, such as recording lectures or for facilitating synchronous online activities. There was a general feeling that priority was being given to research in terms of space allocation within the new building. The review team **recommends** that the Deanery ensure that at least equal priority on room booking within the new building is given to teaching activity.

3 Assurance and enhancement of provision

3.1 Setting and maintaining academic standards

The review team **commends** the Deanery's IPR team on its engagement with and preparation for the internal review process. As noted above, the Deanery IPR team included a student co-ordinator to embed the student voice within preparations for the review. The review team also **commends** the positive engagement by everyone they encountered during the review visit. Staff and students were consistently welcoming, positive and candid in their discussions.

The Deanery has appropriate mechanisms in place for setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards. There are well established governance structures for the development, approval, monitoring and evaluation of its programmes. The Deanery has also actively engaged in Edinburgh Learning and Design Review (ELDeR) workshops in course and programme development. Mechanisms are in place to assure quality and academic standards in alignment with the University's Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework. There are also mechanisms in place to capture the student voice, including student staff liaison committees, national student experience surveys, student reps, and opportunities to discuss assessment and feedback with tutors as well as collection of mid and end of course feedback. The College highlighted the Deanery's work to assure standards around assessment and feedback that include an annual peer audit of tutor feedback to students to enhance quality and usefulness.

3.2 Key themes and actions taken

The Deanery has appropriate mechanisms in place for gathering and responding to External Examiner reports through the University's External Examiner Reporting System (EERS). It fully engages with the annual monitoring, reviewing and reporting system for programmes and Schools.

The review team **commends** accreditation of the Masters of Public Health (MPH) online programme by the Agency for Public Health Education Accreditation (APHEA).

The review team heard from students on this programme that accreditation was a significant factor in their choosing to come to the University of Edinburgh. The review team suggests the Deanery consider extending accreditation to the on-campus MPH programme and explores opportunities for additional accreditation across its provision.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review

Programmes:

Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc) - 6 Years
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert) - 2 Years
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgDip) - 4 years
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (PG ProfDev) - 2 Years
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (MSc) - 3 years (Part-time)
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 year (Part-time)
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (PgDip) - 2 years (Part-time)
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc) - 6 Years
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert) - 2 Years
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgDip) - 4 Years
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (ICL) (PG ProfDev) - 2 Years
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (MSc) - 3 Years (Part-time)
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 Year (Part-time)
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (PgDip) - 2 Years (Part-time)
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc) - 6 Years
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert) - 2 Years
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgDip) - 4 Years
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (MSc) - 3 Years (Part-time)
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 Year (Part-time)
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (PgDip) - 2 Years (Part-time)
Family Medicine (MFM) (Online Learning) - 2 years (Part-time)
Family Medicine (MFM) (Online Learning) - 3 Years (Part-time)
Family Medicine (MFM) (Online Learning) (ICL) - 6 Years
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc)
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert)
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgDip)
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (MSc) (Part-time)
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (PgCert) (Part-time)
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (PgDip) (Part-time)
Global eHealth (Online Learning) (PG ProfDev) (ICL) - 2 years
Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert)
Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (PgCert) (Part-time)
Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (PG ProfDev)
Global Health: Non Communicable Diseases (Online Learning) (MSc)
Leading Digital Transformation in Health and Care for Scotland (MSc)
Leading Digital Transformation in Health and Care for Scotland (PgCert)
Leading Digital Transformation in Health and Care for Scotland (PgDip)
Master of Public Health (MPH) (Online Learning) - One Year (Full-Time)
Master of Public Health (MPH) (Online Learning) (Part-time)
Master of Public Health (Noncommunicable Diseases) (Online Learning) (ICL)
Master of Public Health (Online Learning) (ICL) - 6 Years
Molecular Pathology and Genomic Medicine (Online Learning) (ICL) (PG ProfDev) - 2 Years,
Molecular Pathology and Genomic Medicine (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 Year (Part-time)
Public Health (MPH) (Full Time)
Public Health (MPH) (Part Time)
Public Health (MSc) (Online Learning) (ICL)
Public Health (Noncommunicable Diseases) (PgDip) (Online Learning) (ICL) - 4 Years
Public Health (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert) - 24 Months
Public Health (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgDip) - 48 Months

Public Health (PGC) (Online Learning)
Public Health (PGD) (Online Learning) (Part-time)
Public Health (Pg ProfDev) (Online Learning) (ICL) - 24 Months

Courses:

Advanced Epidemiology
Advanced Statistics
Applied Principles of Family Medicine
Applying Evidence-Based Practice in Family Medicine
Big data analytics
Clinical Trials Foundation Course
Clinical Trials in Special Populations (20 credit)
Communicable Disease Control and Environmental Health
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Analysis of Linked Health Data MED5378
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Clinical Genomics MED5425
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Clinical Trials: Principles and Methods MED5336
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Evidence-Based Methods & Stats MED5538
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Foundations of Bioinformatics BIOL5170
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Further Epidemiology and Statistics MED5021
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Introduction to Epidemiology [20 credits] MED5027/MED5433
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Introduction to Epidemiology MED5027
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Introduction to Matlab for Biologists BIOL5284
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Introduction To Statistical Methods MED5029
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Medical Statistics MED5356
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Metagenomics BIOL5172
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Neuroinflammation in Health and Disease BIOL5291
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Omic analyses for the biomedical sciences: from genomics to m
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Omics and Systems Approaches in Biology BIOL5174
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Pharmaceutical Medicine MED5165
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] RNA-seq and Next Generation Transcriptomics BIOL5177
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Statistical Methods for Health Technology Assessment and Evid
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Statistics 1 MED5341
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Statistics 2 MED5366
Credits Awarded for Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] The Molecular Genetics of Disease BIOL5152
Credits Awarded to Taught Courses [University of Glasgow] Data Science MED5378
Data Analysis for Epidemiology
Data analysis in qualitative social research
Data analysis with R
Data-Driven Innovation (Student-Led Individually-Created Course)

Data Ethics in Health and Social Care
Data Science, Technology and Innovation Dissertation
Data Science, Technology and Innovation (Medical Informatics) Dissertation
Data security and protection in health and social care
Data standards and core technologies in health and social care
Data Types and Structures in Python and R
Data visualisation: knowledge transfer
Developing and Evaluating Complex Public Health Interventions
Digital technologies in health and social care
Dissertation (Data science for health and social care)
Dissertation (MSc Epidemiology)
Dissertation (Public Health)
Entrepreneurship and data-driven innovation
Epidemiology for Health Professionals
Epidemiology for Public Health
Epidemiology for Public Health Practice
Epidemiology of Chronic Disease
Ethical and Regulatory Considerations in Clinical Trials
Evaluating Digital Transformation
Evaluation of Global Health & Development Programmes
Evidence-based medicine
Family Medicine Approach to Maternal and Child Health
Family Medicine Approach to Non-Communicable Disease
Family Medicine Approach to Patients with Complex Needs
Family Medicine Project
Family Medicine Research Methods
Family Medicine Research Project
Fieldwork skills for qualitative social research
Foundations of Family Medicine
Foundations of software development in health and social care
Global Challenges in Healthy Ageing
Global Challenges: Integrating Sustainable Development SLICC (Health)
Global eHealth Dissertation
Global Health Challenges: An Introduction
Global Health Epidemiology
Globalisation and Non Communicable Diseases
Good Clinical Practice, Ethics and Regulatory Issues
Governance and financial management for public health projects
Health and social care delivery and organisation
Health Data Science
Health Promotion
Implementation science: putting evidence-based interventions into practice
Infectious Disease Epidemiology
Integrating public health practice
Intermediate Epidemiology
Intermediate R Programming for Data Science
Intermediate Statistics for Health and Social Care
Introduction to Biomedical Data Science
Introduction to Clinical Trials
Introduction to databases and information systems
Introduction to data science in health and social care
Introduction to Environmental and Occupational Epidemiology
Introduction to Epidemiology
Introduction to Epidemiology and Statistics
Introduction to Genetic and Molecular Epidemiology

Introduction to Global Mental Health
Introduction to Health Economics and Applied Health Economics
Introduction to Health Economics and Resource Allocation
Introduction to Health Promotion
Introduction to Public Health
Introduction to Qualitative Research
Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods
Introduction to Randomised Controlled Trials and Medical Statistics
Introduction to R for Public Health
Introduction to software development in health and social care
Introduction to Statistics
Introduction to statistics in health and social care
Introduction to Systematic Reviews
Investing in Global Health and Development
Leadership and Management in Public Health
Managing and leading data-driven innovation
Managing and leading data-driven innovation (work based)
Maternal and Child Health in a Global Context
Maternal, Newborn and Child Health in a Global Context
Medical Informatics
Methodologies to Improve Family Medicine Practice
Migration and Health
Monitoring and Audit (20 credit)
MPH (online) Dissertation
MScCT Dissertation
MSc Dissertation (Dissertation only mode)
Noncommunicable Disease in a Global Context
Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)
Pharmacovigilance
Precision Medicine Introduction
Precision Medicine Project Proposal
Principles of Clinical Trial Management
Principles of Epidemiology and Statistics
Principles of Public Health
Professionalism in Family Practice
Public Engagement and Communication of Precision Medicine
Public health approaches to declining health, dying and bereavement
Public Health Ethics
Public Policy for Health
Qualitative interviewing and data analysis for public health
Research Design for Epidemiology
Research Design for Public and Global Health
Research Design for Public Health
Research design in data science for health and social care
Research skills for public and global health
Service Transformation: People, Processes, and Technology
Societies, Reproduction and Health
Sociology of Health and Illness
Statistical Modelling
Statistical Modelling for Epidemiology
Student-Led Individually Created Course for Precision Medicine
Study Design (20 Credit)
Systematic Reviews
Systems thinking
The burden of diabetes in the developing world - epidemiology to strategic management

The Challenges of Ageing and Care
Translational Pharmacology
Trial Designs
User-driven service design in health and social care
Work-based placement (Data-Driven Innovation)
Working with data types and structures in Python and R

Appendix 2: University remit

The University remit provides consistent coverage of key elements across all of the University's internal reviews (undergraduate and postgraduate).

It covers all credit bearing provision within the scope of the review, including:

- Provision delivered in collaboration with others
- Transnational education
- Work-based provision and placements
- Online and distance learning
- Continuing Professional Development (CPD)
- Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD)
- Provision which provides only small volumes of credit
- Joint/Dual Degrees
- Massive Open Online Courses MOOCs (even if non-credit bearing)

1. Strategic overview

The strategic approach to:

- The management and resourcing of learning and teaching experience,
- The forward direction and the structures in place to support this.
- Developing business cases for new programmes and courses,
- Managing and reviewing its portfolio,
- Closing courses and programmes.

2. Enhancing the Student Experience

The approach to and effectiveness of:

- Supporting students in their learning
- Listening to and responding to the Student Voice
- Learning and Teaching
- Assessment and Feedback
- Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation
- Learning environment (physical and virtual)
- Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes
- Supporting and developing staff

3. Assurance and Enhancement of provision

The approach to and effectiveness of maintaining and enhancing academic standards and quality of provision in alignment with the University Quality Framework:

- Admissions and Recruitment
- Assessment, Progression and Achievement
- Programme and Course approval
- Annual Monitoring, Review and Reporting

- Operation of Boards of Studies, Exam Boards, Special Circumstances
- External Examining, themes and actions taken
- Alignment with SCQF (Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework) level, relevant benchmark statements, UK Quality Code
- Accreditation and Collaborative activity and relationship with Professional/Accrediting bodies (if applicable)

Appendix 3: Additional information considered by review team

Prior to the review visit:

- The Reflective Report
- External Examiner Reports
- Programme Handbooks
- School Quality Reports
- Student-Staff Liaison Committee Minutes
- Statistical Reports
- Student Experience Survey results
- Degree Programme Tables
- Subject benchmark statement
- Equality Diversity Monitoring report
- Curriculum Transformation Programme information

During the review visit

- Graduate Outcomes Survey information
- Personas and Master's information

Appendix 4: Number of students

Session Year	2023/4		2022/3		2021/2		2020/1		2019/20	
Programme Name	Entra nts	Stude nts	Entra nts	Stude nts	Entra nts	Stude nts	Entra nts	Stude nts	Entra nts	Stude nts
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc) - 6 Years				1		3			8	5
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (PG ProfDev) - 2 Years				3		5		2		2
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert) - 2 Years									2	2
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgDip) - 4 years									1	1
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (MSc) - 3 years (Part-time)	0		26	27	20	18	24	25	5	6

Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 year (Part-time)	0		4	3	11	10	5	5	1	1
Clinical Trials (Online Learning) (PgDip) - 2 years (Part-time)	0		1	1			5	5	0	
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc) - 6 Years				2						
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (ICL) (PG ProfDev) - 2 Years				8		6				
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (MSc) - 3 Years (Part-time)	0		26	24	22	22				
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 Year (Part-time)	1	1	6	6	5	5				
Data Science for Health and Social Care (Online Learning) (PgDip) - 2 Years (Part-time)	0		3	3	3	3				
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (ICL) (MSc) - 6 Years				1		4				
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (MSc) - 3 Years (Part-time)	0		16	15	24	21				
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 Year (Part-time)	0		4	4	10	9				
Epidemiology (Online Learning) (PgDip) - 2 Years (Part-time)	0		1	1	0					
Family Medicine (MFM) (Online Learning) - 3 Years (Part-time)	0		34	32	21	20	30	30	28	28
Family Medicine (MFM) (Online Learning) (ICL) - 6 Years	0		4	6	1	2	1	1	1	1

Global eHealth (Online Learning) (MSc) (Part-time)									0	
Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (ICL) (PgCert)	0				1	1				1
Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (PG ProfDev)						3				
Global Health Challenges (Online Learning) (PgCert) (Part-time)	0		1	1	6	5	4	4	1	
Leading Digital Transformation in Health and Care for Scotland (MSc)			0	48						
Master of Public Health (MPH) (Online Learning) - One Year (Full-Time)					27	28	40	40		
Master of Public Health (MPH) (Online Learning) (Part-time)	1		39	34	51	50	59	55	39	35
Master of Public Health (Online Learning) (ICL) - 6 Years		1		6		2		4		6
Molecular Pathology and Genomic Medicine (Online Learning) (PgCert) - 1 Year (Part-time)							0		8	10
Public Health (MPH) (Full Time)	41	41	52	53	0		0		77	77
Public Health (MPH) (Part Time)	0		4	4	0		0		3	3
Public Health (Pg ProfDev) (Online Learning) (ICL) - 24 Months				1				3		
Public Health (PGC) (Online Learning)	0		4	2	4	2	3	2	2	1
Public Health (PGD) (Online Learning) (Part-time)	0		1	1	2	2	1	1	1	