

The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

School of Social and Political Science

All Undergraduate provision and

Master of Social Work and Advanced Professional Studies

(Mental Health Officer Award) (PgCert) provision

19 and 20 March 2024

Contents

Executive summary	3
Key Commendations	3
Key recommendations	3
Commendations, recommendations and suggestions	4
Commendations	4
Recommendations	5
Suggestions	10
Section A – Introduction	11
Scope of review	11
Review Team Members	11
The School	11
Physical location and summary of facilities	11
Dates of previous reviews	11
Reflective Report	12
Section B – Main report	13
1 Strategic overview	13
2 Enhancing the student experience	14
2.1 The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching	14
2.2 Assessment and Feedback	15
2.3 Supporting students in their learning	16
2.4 Listening and responding to the Student Voice	17
2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation	19
2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes	19
2.7 Supporting and developing staff	20
2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual)	20
3 Assurance and enhancement of provision	21
Appendices	22
Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review	22
Appendix 2: University remit	28
Appendix 3: Additional information considered by review team	29
Appendix 4: Number of students	30

Executive summary

This report comprises the outcomes from the internal review of all undergraduate provision and postgraduate taught provision in Master of Social Work and Advanced Professional Studies (Mental Health Officer Award) (PgCert) in the School of Social and Political Science.

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

The report provides commendations on the School's provision and recommendations for enhancement that the School will be asked to report progress on to the Senate Quality Assurance Committee. Some suggestions on how to support developments are also included, however the School is not required to report on progress in relation to these.

Key Commendations

The review team commended the School for its proactive recognition, prior to commencement of the review process, of the value to the student experience of enhancing materially and strategically central elements of current learning and teaching practice and provision; potentially transferable models and instances of student partnership working, particularly in the area of Widening Participation; potentially extendable existing local pockets of innovative assessment practice; an already-developing creation and implementation of standard, School-wide grade descriptors and marking rubrics. Further detail on these and additional commendations are included in the following report.

Key recommendations

The three most immediately important recommendations identified by the review team for the School to prioritise were:

- **Assessment and feedback:** establishing consistent feedback turnaround expectations aligning with the three-week period set out in the University's Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities
- **Postgraduate research (PGR) and guaranteed hours (GH) tutors and demonstrators:** continue to develop, publicise and further extend use of early forms of PGR tutor recruitment, training, and performance management already in proactive development within the School
- **Resources and staffing:** School leadership should be supported by College HR and Finance colleagues to develop a business case around alternative staffing models capable of reforming the School's current structural dependence on a very high number of PGR and other GH tutors; this will help facilitate successful achievement of main recommendations 1 and 2 directly above.

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 School's recognition of the opportunities that the current University Curriculum Transformation Project offers in reviewing courses and programmes.	2.1
2	The review team commends the School's existing recognition of the value of enhancing learning and teaching through the instigation of a strategic, enhancement-related, fixed-term working group and small projects culture.	2.1
3	The review team heard that this (School Student Development Office-led Widening Participation (WP)) working group had included student participation from the WP demographic and colleagues acknowledged the sound evidence-base this inclusion had provided for the small group's subsequent decision-making and actions taken to support WP students. The review team commends this as a potentially transferrable and extendable area of good practice.	2.1
4	The review team commends the potentially transferrable pockets of innovative assessment practice already developed within the School; for example, the Sustainable Development programme's use of policy brief-based assessment tasks.	2.2
5	The review team commends the existing, early-stage School-wide introduction of standard grade descriptors and rubrics and student feedback templates for use by all academic staff engaged in assessment and feedback.	2.2
6	The review team commends the School's Student Development Office (SDO)-led widening participation and PGR tutor training initiatives, both of which are potentially transferable examples of student partnership-led enhancement in the areas of student experience, sense of community and assessment and feedback.	2.3
7	The review team commends the existence of pockets of innovative and potentially transferable community-building initiatives within the School, for example, Sustainable Development's weekly student briefing communication.	2.3
8	The review team commends the School's undergraduate student community's engagement in the review visit process, especially their ideas around proposed definitions and understandings of community. For example, the opportunities for staff-student engagement, how smaller cohort sizes and cohort bubbles can enhance the student experience, and their appreciation of academic families as a model to support community building.	2.4

9	The review team commends the Widening Participation internships and working group as an area of good practice and an excellent example of student partnership working.	2.5
10	The review team commends the consistently evident School-wide culture of collaborative working relationships between academic and professional services staff.	2.7
11	The review team commends the School's recognition and early implementation, in place prior to commencement of the review, of various early-stage enhanced forms of PGR and GH tutor and demonstrator recruitment, recruitment, training, and related support.	2.7

Recommendations

Areas for development and enhancement – progress to be reported.

Priority	Recommendation	Section in report	Responsibility of
Assessment and feedback (specific remit item 1)			
1	The review team recommends that the School must address the student experience and perception of widespread delays in the return of assessment and feedback. The three-week assessment and feedback return dates should be more consistently and visibly advertised and communicated (primarily, albeit not necessarily exclusively, at individual course level) to students than is currently the case. The number of individual instances in which assessment and feedback is not completed and returned to students within three weeks must be significantly reduced, with an aspiration to eradicate these completely. In all circumstances where the three-week turnaround cannot be met, students must be informed of the delay and given a new deadline for return of marks; this should happen prior to the expiry of the standard three-week deadline for return of marks. The communication protocols and processes referred to above must be adopted and implemented on a School-wide basis.	2.2	School
	The review team recommends that the School commits to achieving enhanced strategic oversight and planning ability regarding choreography and confirmed sequencing of course assessment	2.2	School

	<p>deadline planning across its large portfolio of courses. This recommendation is made in significant part to support the achievement of another of this review's recommendations regarding maximisation of School-wide compliance with returning feedback within three weeks of assessment submission, as set out in the University's Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities. Such support will stem from enhanced ability to pre-emptively identify potential staff assessment and feedback bottlenecks, most especially, for PGR and GH tutors and demonstrators.</p> <p>The review team commends the existing, early-stage School-wide introduction of standard grade descriptors and rubrics and student feedback templates for use by all academic staff engaged in assessment and feedback. The review team recommends that the School should build on this by implementing and formally monitoring progress towards fully comprehensive and consistent use of standardised grade descriptor and rubric tools in assessment and feedback by all markers and across all subject areas. In addition to the pedagogical rationale for this recommendation, it is also made in significant part to support the achievement of the recommendation above regarding maximisation of School-wide compliance with three-week assessment and feedback turnaround. Such support will stem from standardisation and streamlining of staff assessment and feedback effort hours. Introducing a more systematic approach will support consistency and should also enhance training for GH tutors.</p>	2.2	School
Tutors and demonstrators			
2	The review team was of the opinion that the current School recruitment and contracting, line management and staff mentoring and development processes for PGR tutors for the duration of their programme of study may be	2.7	School/College

	<p>contributing to the above-noted issues regarding scope for enhancement of assessment and feedback processes and student experience of these. The review team recommends that the School leadership should be supported by College to continue to implement and expand the School's already-existing and productive early-stage enhancements of internal processes relating to PGR tutor recruitment, training and mentoring, and performance management.</p> <p>The review team recommends that the School leadership should be supported by College HR and Finance colleagues to develop a business case around alternative staffing models capable of reforming the School's current structural dependence on a number of PGR and GH tutors and demonstrators so extensive as to potentially complicate successful achievement of the review's priority 1 recommendations on Assessment and Feedback set out within the table of recommendations above.</p>	1	College/School leadership
Resources and staffing			
3	The review team recommends that the College Management Group should support the School to liaise and cooperate with the relevant partner Schools (most of which sit within the College or Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences) to plan and resource support for cohort and community-building initiatives and events specifically targeted at joint degree students. This recommendation would also support the School's chosen subject-specific remit item on community and belonging.	1	College Management Group
Student voice (related to specific remit item 2)			
4	The review team commends the School's existing recognition of the value of enhancing learning and teaching through the instigation of a strategic, enhancement-related, fixed-term working group and small projects culture. This relatively recent addition to School working culture also provides	2.1	School

	<p>opportunities for staff professional development and career progression. The review team recommends that the School should build further on this by designing student voice and partnership-led working groups and small project initiatives that recruit and involve student members from the outset. There may also be opportunities for student internships to support this, similar to the structure of the School's Student Development Office (SDO)-convened Widening Participation (WP) group discussed later in this report.</p> <p>The review team also heard about and discussed with colleagues other, comparably laudable and important small project and working group initiatives where student voice was either absent or was included later in the process, such as recent EDI and decolonising the curriculum-related activities. The review team recommends that students are involved within all School Learning and Teaching-related fixed-term small project and working group initiatives from the outset in future, to ensure that the student voice is integral to discussion and ultimate decision-making within such initiatives. The review team also noted that the Student Development Office are currently seeking opportunities for student-led activity and for directing students to ongoing initiatives: the School is encouraged to actively promote these facts and opportunities to all staff and students, both in the period immediately following this report's publication and also longer term.</p>	2.4	School
Curriculum and employability			
5	<p>The School is encouraged to ensure students understand the skills they are gaining throughout their programme of study. The review team recommends that the School reviews its portfolio of core courses across all subject areas. Most specifically, in relation to student feedback received during the review team visit, the portfolio review should</p>	2.1	School

	<p>focus on potential ways to ensure and enhance effective explanation and communication of the relevance of all core and compulsory courses to the students taking these. In order to establish a more comprehensively shared understanding between students and staff of programme structure there needs to be explicit communication of the intended learning outcomes, graduate attributes and skills students will gain all from core and compulsory components of their programmes.</p>		
Student voice (closing the feedback loop)			
6	<p>The review team recommends that the School implements both existing and, where necessary, new enhanced mechanisms to ensure clear and widely visible communication and explanation, to students and staff alike, of where specific enhancement-related action has been taken in response to student feedback received through mechanisms such as (but not exclusively limited to) course evaluation surveys and student-staff liaison committees. The same point applies to all future instances where the School, or a component part of it, deems that specific enhancement-related actions are unnecessary, undesirable and/or impossible to implement. Design and implementation of a School-wide standardised approach to such communications may support ensuring consistency and effectiveness across all subject areas. Such enhanced closing of the feedback loop could support both increased levels and enhanced forms of student engagement with feedback processes and mechanisms.</p>	2.4	School
Student support			
7	<p>The review team recommends that the School undertakes a systematic sense-check (between academic staff, professional services staff and students) regarding those different communities' sometimes divergent respective senses of how successful implementation of the new student</p>	2.3	School/Head of School/SQAC

	support model and academic cohort lead systems has so far proved to be within the School. The School should, for example, be well-placed to input to the forthcoming Senate Quality Assurance Committee evaluation of the new student support model, to share learning and good practice at the appropriate time, through the Head of School.		
--	---	--	--

Suggestions

For noting – progress reporting is not required.

No	Suggestion	Section in report
1	The review team suggests that the School checks that where there are two parts to a course these are being delivered in the intended order implied by current course naming conventions or alternatively renamed/redesigned for coherent delivery. (Related to Recommendation 5.)	2.1
2	The review team suggests that the School may wish to consider expanding the use of innovative assessment design, both for reasons of pedagogical principle and also as a pragmatic response to pressures on staff working time in relation to three-week assessment and feedback turnaround. (Related to Recommendation 1.)	2.2
3	The review team suggests that the School should also consider initiating a student partnership-informed small project or working group on this specific goal. (Related to Recommendation 1, consistent use of standardised grade descriptor and rubric tools in assessment and feedback.)	2.2
4	On a closely related note, the review team suggests that the School consider introducing a standardised orientation session for delivery to all students early on in their degree studies that aims to enhance students' understanding and confidence in reading and interpreting staff feedback on assessed work, particularly as regards standardised, School-wide approaches to grade descriptors and marking rubrics. (Related to Recommendation 1.)	2.2
5	As an example of potential enhancement to communication, the review team suggests that students are advised, at the point of publication, when student-staff liaison committee (SSLC) minutes are available. The review team also suggests that the School compare current subject area-level approaches to formatting, content and dissemination of SSLC minutes, in order to identify a single, best-practice model for use across all of the School's SSLCs (Related to Recommendation 6.)	2.4

Section A – Introduction

Scope of review

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

The Internal Periodic Review (IPR) of the School of Social and Political Science in 2023/24 consisted of:

- The University's remit for internal review (see Appendix 2)
- The School's two chosen subject-specific remit items for the review:
 - Assessment and Feedback
 - Community and Belonging
- 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 School and others to whom recommendations were remitted following the review.

Review Team Members

Dr Jonathan Murray	Convener
Professor Rachel Fyson	External review team member (University of Nottingham)
Professor Anne Kerr	External review team member (University of Glasgow)
Professor Gurå Bergkvist	Internal review team member
Ananthajith Rajesh	Student review team member
Susan Hunter	Review team administrator

The School

The School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS) is one of twelve within the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. It comprises seven subject areas: Centre of African Studies; Politics and International Relations; Science Technology and Innovation Studies; Social Anthropology; Social Policy; Social Work; and Sociology. The School also hosts the Q-Step Centre, which offers quantitative social science training.

Physical location and summary of facilities

The School is located in the Central Campus with teaching facilities in George Square and High School Yards.

Dates of previous reviews

Social Work: 20 & 21 February 2017; Social Anthropology: 1 & 2 November 2017; Sociology and Sustainable Development: 12 & 13 February 2018; Politics and International Relations: 3 & 4 February 2020; Social Policy: 10 & 11 February 2020.

Reflective Report

The report was written by:

- Dr Andrea Birdsall, IPR Academic Lead

With input and assistance from (but not limited to):

- Dr John Harries, Deputy Head of School and Director of Learning and Teaching
- Professor John Devaney, Head of School
- Claire Moggie, IPR Administrator and Quality Assurance and Portfolio Officer
- Dr Gerhard Anders, SPS Director of Student Experience and Engagement
- Dr Andrew Bowman, SPS Director of Postgraduate Teaching
- Dr Richard Brodie, SPS Director of Student Development
- Catriona Elder, Head of Student Support and Enhancement
- Karen Marriott, Teaching Services Manager
- Dr George Palattiyil, Head of Social Work
- Jennifer Steven, Careers Consultant, Careers Service
- Neil Willet, Director of Professional Services

Summary of the review dissemination/consultation phase and student input

The two subject-specific remit items for this IPR were decided by the School with involvement of its subject areas, Learning & Teaching Directorate, and students. The School's choice of these two items was also informed by current University strategy, including University Strategy 2030 and the Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities, as well as available data, as outlined immediately below.

The SPS IPR team reached out to students to gather views on possible remit items but did not receive any direct responses from student representatives. The team therefore used minutes of previous years' staff-student-liaison committee (SSLC) meetings to identify common, ongoing threads within student experience and feedback regarding their experience. The chosen two remit items directly reflect and speak to those common threads. The first remit item (assessment and feedback) is an existing and ongoing priority for the University and School as a result of repeated low NSS scores in this area; the latter fact also makes it clear in turn that this is an item of concern for the School's students, too.

Section B – Main report

1 Strategic overview

Leadership of learning and teaching within the School of Social and Political Sciences (SPS) sits with the School Learning and Teaching Directorate. The School also has a combined undergraduate and postgraduate Education Committee which discusses strategic matters. These two groups report directly to the School Management Committee, which has overall responsibility for all aspects of School governance.

The School owns and offers multiple large undergraduate courses and also hosts many students from other Schools across the University on many of its courses. For reasons of scale, therefore, delivery of the School's course-based teaching is heavily reliant on guaranteed hours (GH) contract tutors, the majority of which are postgraduate research (PGR) students. The School is currently considering its staffing model and the potential to introduce a Teaching Associate role. This role could be staff on part-time or fractional contracts, who would be assigned to specific courses. The review team encourages this as a positive step in the School's evolving approach to managing resources for teaching. Given the large number of tutors currently used to deliver the School's teaching requirements, the review team considered that the School leadership should be supported in developing a business case to ensure that staffing structures underpinning future delivery of its teaching portfolio are sustainable and manageable, in terms of overseeing and ensuring quality of student experience and staff performance, mentoring and professional development. The review team **recommends** that the School leadership should be supported by College HR and Finance colleagues to develop a business case around alternative staffing models capable of reforming the School's current structural dependence on a number of PGR and GH tutors and demonstrators so extensive as to potentially complicate successful achievement of the review's priority 1 recommendations on Assessment and Feedback set out within the table of recommendations above.

The School's programme portfolio includes a large number of joint degrees. These include joint degree programmes within the School hosted between its seven subject areas and also joint degree programmes with partner Schools across the University. These partners are mainly, although not exclusively, located alongside the School within the College of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences. The review team considered that for joint degrees within the School, structural and staff-based forms of investment in existing disciplinary boundaries may be perpetuating certain problems (for example, confusion for students around loci of community and belonging and varying experience of teaching, assessment and feedback between different internal subject areas). Community and belonging are discussed in more detail in section 2.4 of this report. A more standardised and strategic approach to School-wide processes would help to ensure consistency of student experience.

The review team also heard evidence from students and staff of some issues in working across School boundaries, for example, in terms of resource allocation for cohort events for joint degree students where the School was not first-named degree owner. There were related challenges in identifying students for invitation to and inclusion within events and with course enrolments across School boundaries. Existing support for such provision seemed to the review team to be reliant, to a significant degree, on informal arrangements between professional services staff who identify and build relationships with their counterparts in other Schools, resulting in some overly manual (and also specific colleague-dependent) processes. The review

team **recommends** that the College Management Group should support the School to liaise and cooperate with the relevant partner Schools (most of which sit within the College or Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences) to plan and resource support for cohort and community-building initiatives and events specifically targeted at joint degree students. This recommendation should also support the School's chosen subject-specific remit item on community and belonging.

2 Enhancing the student experience

2.1 The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching

Academic staff the review team met with acknowledged that significant amounts of activity around curriculum development and reviewing the portfolio of courses and programmes offered within the School had been paused as a result of the University's Curriculum Transformation Project. At the time of this review, it was unclear when the University project would be fully defined, then implemented, but the School had already identified some currently advertised and agreed aspects of the project that would be useful in reviewing its current provision. The review team **commends** the School's recognition of the opportunities that the current University Curriculum Transformation Project offers in reviewing courses and programmes. However, as full Curriculum Transformation implementation is likely to take time, the School should proceed with any and all necessary reviewing of that portfolio at the current moment in time.

The review team anticipates that such internal self-reviewing will involve elements of potential change as well as continuity. For example, the review team heard from pre-Honours students that they valued the existing flexibility and diversity of course choices available to them. However, some students reported having received Part II of a course before Part I (the latter only being available to them in Semester 2), thus rendering it impossible to take the courses in the intended order implied by the current naming conventions used. This fuelled dissatisfaction and the perception of disorganisation. In addition, some students reported that the content of some core courses was not sufficiently challenging to them. These students acknowledged that it would depend on any given individual student's previous experience/background whether the courses were challenging, and that for a proportion of the cohort these core courses were effectively pitched. The review team also heard evidence that students were unclear on the value of some of the data skills that were taught. While they appreciated the current levels of flexibility in course choice, many students said they would be willing to sacrifice some of that for a more consistent sense and experience of structure across all course-based components parts of their programme of study.

The School is encouraged to ensure students understand the skills they are gaining throughout their programme of study. The review team **recommends** that the School reviews its portfolio of core courses across all subject areas. Most specifically, in relation to student feedback received during the review team visit, the portfolio review should focus on potential ways to ensure and enhance effective explanation and communication of the relevance of all core and compulsory courses to the students taking these. In order to establish a more comprehensively shared understanding between students and staff of programme structure there needs to be explicit communication of the intended learning outcomes, graduate attributes and skills students will gain all from core and compulsory components of their programmes. The review team suggests that the School checks that where there are two parts to a course these are being delivered in the intended order implied by current course naming conventions or alternatively renamed/redesigned for coherent delivery.

The School has recently launched a Small Projects Scheme, which enables academic and professional services staff to work in partnership on leading small-scale, fixed-term projects related to enhancing specifically defined aspects of School learning and teaching culture and practice, and/or student experience. The review team **commends** the School's existing recognition of the value of enhancing learning and teaching through the instigation of a strategic, enhancement-related, fixed-term working group and small projects culture. This relatively recent addition to School working culture also provides opportunities for staff professional development and career progression. The review team **recommends** that the School should build further on this by designing student voice and partnership-led working groups, and small project initiatives that recruit and involve student members from the outset. There may also be opportunities for student internships to support this, similar to the structure of the School's Student Development Office (SDO)-convened Widening Participation (WP) group discussed later in this report. The review team heard that this working group had included student participation from the WP demographic and colleagues acknowledged the sound evidence-base this inclusion had provided for the small group's subsequent decision-making and actions taken to support WP students. The review team **commends** this as a potentially transferrable and extendable area of good practice.

Conversely, the review team also heard about and discussed with colleagues other, comparably laudable and important small project and working group initiatives where the student voice was either absent or was included later in the process, and this is discussed further in section 2.4 of this report.

2.2 Assessment and Feedback

The School had asked the review team to focus on assessment and feedback as one of its two chosen subject-specific remit items within this review, particularly in the areas of marking rubrics and feedback to students on assessed work.

The review team recognises and welcomes the fact that the School has already developed more standardised marking rubrics and grade descriptors and the team also noted the existence of a variety of assessment methods in use throughout the School. However, essays remain the most common form of assessment in the majority of courses. The review team heard from both staff and students that there were often clusters of assessment deadlines, leading to bottlenecks and pressure on staff time for marking. The recent increase in students being granted coursework extensions (a University-wide rather than School-specific phenomenon) was also identified as a contributory factor in managing the timely return of assessment and feedback.

The review team **commends** the potentially transferrable pockets of innovative assessment practice already developed within the School; for example, the Sustainable Development programme's use of policy brief-based assessment tasks. The review team **recommends** that the School commits to achieving enhanced strategic oversight and planning ability regarding choreography and confirmed sequencing of course assessment deadline planning across its large portfolio of courses. This recommendation is made in significant part to support the achievement of another of this review's recommendations regarding maximisation of School-wide compliance with returning feedback within three weeks of assessment submission, as set out in the University's Assessment and Feedback Principles and Priorities (discussed below). Such support will stem from enhanced ability to pre-

emptively identify potential staff assessment and feedback bottlenecks, most especially, for PGR and GH tutors and demonstrators. On a closely related note, the review team suggests that the School may wish to consider expanding the use of innovative assessment design, both for reasons of pedagogical principle and also as a pragmatic response to pressures on staff working time in relation to three-week assessment and feedback turnaround. Examples of assessments which are less time-intensive to mark include: group presentations; more structured work and forms of assessment which build employability skills may include writing reports, blogs and exec-style evidence summaries rather than academic essays.

The review team **recommends** that the School must address the student experience and perception of widespread delays in the return of assessment and feedback. The three-week assessment and feedback return dates should be more consistently and visibly advertised and communicated (primarily, albeit not necessarily exclusively, at individual course level) to students than is currently the case. The number of individual instances in which assessment and feedback is not completed and returned to students within three weeks must be significantly reduced, with an aspiration to eradicate these completely. In all circumstances where the three-week turnaround cannot be met, students must be informed of the delay and given a new deadline for return of marks; this should happen prior to the expiry of the standard three-week deadline for return of marks. The communication protocols and processes referred to above must be adopted and implemented on a School-wide basis.

The review team **commends** the existing, early-stage School-wide introduction of standard grade descriptors and rubrics and student feedback templates for use by all academic staff engaged in assessment and feedback. The review team **recommends** that the School should build on this by implementing and formally monitoring progress towards fully comprehensive and consistent use of standardised grade descriptor and rubric tools in assessment and feedback by all markers and across all subject areas. In addition to the pedagogical rationale for this recommendation, it is also made in significant part to support the achievement of the recommendation above regarding maximisation of School-wide compliance with three-week assessment and feedback turnaround. Such support will stem from standardisation and streamlining of staff assessment and feedback effort hours. Introducing a more systematic approach will support consistency and should also enhance training for GH tutors. The review team suggests that the School should also consider initiating a student partnership-informed small project or working group on this specific goal. On a closely related note, the review team also suggests that the School consider introducing a standardised orientation session for delivery to all students early on in their degree studies. That session should aim to enhance students' understanding and confidence in reading and interpreting staff feedback on assessed work, particularly as regards standardised, School-wide approaches to grade descriptors and marking rubrics.

2.3 Supporting students in their learning

The School has a well-established Student Development Office (SDO) which supports a range of activity including, but not limited to, cohort events and recruitment and training of GH tutors. Students are aware and appreciative of the support available to them from the SDO. The SDO has developed some academic skills material which they feel would benefit from being included in a greater number of core courses within the School's various programmes, however they have to date

had limited success in agreeing and implementing adoption of that material across the School's subject areas.

The review team **commends** the School's Student Development Office (SDO)-led widening participation and PGR tutor training initiatives, both of which are potentially transferable examples of student partnership-led enhancement in the areas of student experience, sense of community and assessment and feedback.

The review team **commends** the existence of pockets of innovative and potentially transferable community-building initiatives within the School, for example, Sustainable Development's weekly student briefing communication.

The review team met with groups of pre-Honours and Honours undergraduate students during the review visit and with postgraduate taught Social Work students following the visit (the latter student group were on placement during the review visit). Pre-Honours students were very appreciative of academic staff and described their lectures as engaging and delivered by experienced and passionate experts in the field. They did, however, report a more varied experience of tutorials. Perhaps related to this, GH tutors, who the review team met with separately from students, identified a gap in training on how to structure and manage tutorials – discussed in more detail in section 2.7 below.

Students also reported a mixed experience of the new student support model. Pre-Honours students the review team met with were very appreciative of the support they received, particularly for Widening Participation students, and felt part of a community. The School recognises that the experience for Honours years students is different, in that they may feel they have lost something in the change from the previous personal tutor system: the Honours students the review team met with, for example, reported confusion around who to contact for support with academic and other matters. The review team **recommends** that the School undertakes a systematic sense-check (between academic staff, professional services staff and students) regarding those different communities' sometimes divergent respective senses of how successful implementation of the new student support model and academic cohort lead systems has so far proved to be within the School. The School should, for example, be well-placed to input to the forthcoming Senate Quality Assurance Committee evaluation of the new student support model, to share learning and good practice at the appropriate time, through the Head of School.

2.4. Listening and responding to the Student Voice

The School asked the review team to focus on community and belonging as the School's second chosen subject-specific remit item within this review. Although the review team has not made specific recommendations in relation to this subject-specific remit item, the recommendations relating to partnership working and communication provided later in this section of the report (and the recommendation on resourcing for cohort and community-building initiatives in section 1) are intended to support the School in this area.

Community within the School is mainly experienced by both staff and students at subject area. The School has identified issues for joint degree students in this respect as they may belong to several communities – or, alternatively, to none. There was also uncertainty among joint degree students about what they were entitled to, or should attend, in relation to cohort events. Students the review team met suggested there may be opportunities for smaller cohorts, or cohort bubbles, which

would improve the student experience in programme-specific instances where there are large student cohorts.

As noted above, the pre-Honours years students the review team met had a sense of belonging to a community. However, the Honours and postgraduate taught students the review team met with reported feeling disengaged from the School and that they lacked the same sense of community experienced by the pre-Honours students. The review team also noted an overarching disconnect, discernible within several differently-themed review visit meetings, between the community of staff and the community of students and therefore consider that there exists both a need and opportunities to better connect these two groups into communities of practice through better and more extensive embedding of the student voice within the School's enhancement-related activities and priorities. There were existing examples of partnership working with students within the School that could be built upon and extended, as well as opportunities for closing the feedback loop and re-engaging students with feedback opportunities, discussed further below.

The review team **commends** the School's undergraduate student community's engagement in the review visit process, especially their ideas around proposed definitions and understandings of community. For example, the opportunities for staff-student engagement, how smaller cohort sizes and cohort bubbles can enhance the student experience, and their appreciation of academic families as a model to support community building.

The review team heard that the School's Widening Participation working group had included student participation from the WP demographic and colleagues acknowledged the sound evidence-base this inclusion had provided for the small group's subsequent decision-making and actions taken to support Widening Participation students. This specific instance of student partnership-led enhancement work is commended in section 2.1 of this report as an area of good practice (see also section 2.5 below).

Conversely, the review team also heard about and discussed with colleagues other, comparably laudable and important small project and working group initiatives where the student voice was either absent or was included later in the process, such as recent EDI and decolonising the curriculum-related activities. The review team **recommends** that students are involved within all School Learning and Teaching-related fixed-term small project and working group initiatives from the outset in future, to ensure that the student voice is integral to discussion and ultimate decision-making within such initiatives. The review team also noted that the Student Development Office are currently seeking opportunities for student-led activity and for directing students to ongoing initiatives: the School is encouraged to actively promote these facts and opportunities to all staff and students, both in the period immediately following this report's publication and also longer term.

All groups of students the review team met expressed a clear opinion that their feedback was not responded to. They were unsure what happened to their feedback and did not know if or how action was taken in response. Indeed, Honours-level students particularly expressed the view that they were disengaged from completing feedback surveys specifically because they saw no evidence of action being taken as a result. The review team **recommends** that the School implements both existing and, where necessary, new enhanced mechanisms to ensure clear and widely visible communication and explanation, to students and staff alike, of where specific enhancement-related action has been taken in response to student feedback received through mechanisms such as (but not exclusively limited to) course

evaluation surveys and student-staff liaison committees. The same point applies to all future instances where the School, or a component part of it, deems that specific enhancement-related actions are unnecessary, undesirable and/or impossible to implement. Design and implementation of a School-wide standardised approach to such communications may support ensuring consistency and effectiveness across all subject areas. Such enhanced closing of the feedback loop could support both increased levels and enhanced forms of student engagement with feedback processes and mechanisms. As noted above, the review panel heard from students that they feel disinclined to participate in these when they do not consistently and clearly see evidence of action (or explicitly rationalised inaction) in response to their feedback. As an example of potential enhancement to communication, the review team suggests that students are advised, at the point of publication, when student-staff liaison committee minutes are available. The review team also suggests that the School compare current subject area-level approaches to formatting, content and dissemination of SSLC minutes, in order to identify a single, best-practice model for use across all of the School's SSLCs.

2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation

The School's Student Development Office engaged two Widening Participation (WP) student interns who produced a report during summer 2023. As a result, the School's Widening Participation working group, an initiative led by the Student Development Office, has implemented additional induction activity focused on first-year WP students. These events have been very successful, with growing numbers attending the regular lunches organised for students. The review team **commends** the Widening Participation internships and working group as an area of good practice and an excellent example of student partnership working.

The School has an EDI (equality, diversity and inclusion) committee which is responsible for ensuring alignment with University strategy and the College EDI action plan. The EDI committee ran a project on decolonising the curriculum during 2022/23. This project surveyed staff and held discussions with key staff in each of the subject areas as well as running a showcase event at which staff from all subject areas were represented. The project is in the process of finalising its report and recommendations for action across the School. The review team noted that the student voice was not included as part of this initiative, which it perceived as a missed opportunity.

2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes

Some of the Honours years students the review team met with felt that they were not gaining some of the skills they would need for their future careers, for example, in terms of the School's over-reliance – as perceived by this group of students – on traditional assessment forms such as the essay. Students were aware of support available to them from the Careers Service, however, they felt that some of this was too generic and they would appreciate more tailored resources. The School is encouraged to ensure students understand the skills they are gaining throughout their programme of study, as discussed in section 2.1 above, and to establish a clearer, more comprehensive and consistently communicated shared understanding between staff and students of employability and graduate attributes that students gain through successful participation and progression within their programme of study.

The BSc Social Work programme has current accreditation from the SSSC (Scottish Social Services Council). The Masters of Social Work (MSW) programme includes a large proportion of placement learning and although there may be some uncertainty for students in the placement allocation process, the support from placement educators and on-placement experience appeared to be positive.

2.7 Supporting and developing staff

The School Small Projects scheme (also discussed in section 2.1 above), offers a highly valuable route for academic and professional services staff to demonstrate leadership in learning and teaching to support career development.

The review team **commends** the consistently evident School-wide culture of collaborative working relationships between academic and professional services staff. The review team heard from professional services staff that they felt their input was valued by colleagues.

The review team **commends** the School's recognition and early implementation, in place prior to commencement of the review, of various early-stage enhanced forms of PGR and GH tutor and demonstrator recruitment, training, and related support. The Student Development Office supported the development of a bespoke credit-bearing course, Principles and Practices of Higher Education, for PGR students. This is designed to equip them with the skills and techniques they need to be a University educator. The School is also committed to providing up to 18 hours annually of paid continuous professional development support for its tutors.

As noted earlier in this report, the School is structurally reliant on PGR tutors to deliver its current portfolio of courses. The review team heard from students that their experience of tutorials was variable, as was their experience of PGR tutor feedback on their work. As part of training and support for PGR tutors, Course Organisers are expected to observe their teaching at least once per academic year. However, the tutors who the review team met with advised that there was no systematic mechanism in place to monitor this, nor consistently visible and consciously experienced quality monitoring in relation to tutor performance. These tutors were not aware of their teaching being observed, nor that Course Organisers were necessarily aware of this requirement. They also identified some gaps in the training they had received, although there was acknowledgement that for some that training had taken place some time ago. They felt there was a current lack of guidance on how to structure and manage tutorials, and in managing difficult situations during tutorials. The review team was of the opinion that the current School recruitment and contracting, line management and staff mentoring and development processes for PGR tutors for the duration of their programme of study may be contributing to the above-noted issues regarding scope for enhancement of assessment and feedback processes and student experience of these. The review team **recommends** that the School leadership should be supported by College to continue to implement and expand the School's already-existing and productive early-stage enhancements of internal processes relating to PGR tutor recruitment, training and mentoring, and performance management.

2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual)

The majority of School teaching takes place in the central campus buildings and the majority of School FTE staff are located within the Crystal Macmillan Building. However, the School does not have a dedicated large lecture theatre and there is

only one central campus space that can accommodate its largest pre-Honours courses. The School has a practice suite in the Crystal Macmillan Building which is used for workshops and for student-organised events. This is also a venue for WP student activities.

The School was an early adopter in the move to Learn Ultra as the virtual learning environment. This appears to be working well and no issues were raised during the review visit. The School uses lecture recording although there are some opt-outs in place for some courses. Several of the students who the review team met with reported experience of inconsistent provision of lecture recordings across different individual courses as a source of frustration and confusion. These students strongly advocate for the provision of lecture recordings across all courses.

3 Assurance and enhancement of provision

The School 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. 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 for responding to external examiner reports through the University's external examiner reporting system.

The School has appropriate mechanisms in place for capturing the student voice, including student staff liaison committees, national student experience surveys, the Edinburgh University Students Association (EUSA)-supported student representative system, and opportunities to collect mid and end of course feedback. However, there would be significant value in developing more effective, extensive and consistently applied School-wide mechanisms for closing the feedback loop on action taken in response to student feedback, as discussed in section 2.4 above.

The School's Social Work programme is accredited by the Scottish Social Services Council and has mechanisms in place for responding to recommendations raised by the professional body.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review

Programmes

Advanced Professional Studies (Mental Health Officer Award) (PgCert)
Anthropology and Sociology of Medicine (BMedSci Hons) - 1 Year (Intercalation)
BMedSci (Hons) Anthropology and Sociology of Medicine (External Intercalation)
Global Health Policy (BMedSci Hons)
Global Health Policy (BMedSci Hons) (External Intercalation)
Government, Policy and Society MA(Hons)
Government, Policy and Society with Quantitative Methods MA (Hons)
International Relations and International Law (MA Hons)
International Relations and Law (MA Hons)
International Relations (MA Hons)
International Relations with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)
Politics and Economic and Social History (MA Hons)
Politics (MA Hons)
Politics, Philosophy and Economics MA (Hons)
Politics with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)
Social Anthropology and Politics (MA Hons)
Social Anthropology and Social Policy (MA Hons)
Social Anthropology (MA Hons)
Social Anthropology with Development (MA Hons)
Social Anthropology with Social History (MA Hons)
Social Policy and Economics (MA Hons)
Social Policy and Law (MA Hons)
Social Policy and Politics (MA Hons)
Social Policy and Social and Economic History (MA Hons)
Social Policy and Sociology (MA Hons)
Social Policy with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)
Social Policy with Social and Political Studies (MA Hons)
Social Work (BSc Hons)
Social Work (MSW)
Sociology and Politics (MA Hons)
Sociology and Psychology (MA Hons)
Sociology and Social and Economic History (MA Hons)
Sociology and Social Anthropology (MA Hons)
Sociology (MA Hons)
Sociology with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)
Sociology with South Asian Studies (MA Hons)
Sustainable Development MA (Hons)

Courses

Data Literacy
Statistical Literacy
Africa in the Contemporary World
British Politics - Beginning of the End?
Comparative Politics in a Globalized World
Comparative Social Policy: Global Perspectives
Creative Social Work and the Arts
Data, Design and the City
Doing Social Research with Statistics
Empires

Environmentalism: past and present
 Ethnography: Theory and Practice
 European Social Policy
 Evidence, Politics and Policy
 From Research into Practice: Landmarks in Social Work Research
 History of Medicine 1
 History of Science 1
 History of Western Medicine
 Human Rights and Social Justice: social work and the law
 International Cooperation in Europe and Beyond
 International Development, Aid and Humanitarianism
 International Political Economy
 Introduction to British Politics
 Introduction to Political Data Analysis
 Introduction to Politics and International Relations
 Introduction to Social Anthropology
 Introduction to Statistics for Social Science
 Introductory Swahili Language and Culture 1A
 Introductory Swahili Language and Culture 1B
 Investigating Science in Society
 Mathematics for Social Science
 Political Thinkers
 Politics and International Relations 1A: Concepts and Debates
 Politics and International Relations 1B: The Global Dimension
 Politics in a Changing World: An Introduction for non-specialists
 Politics of the Welfare State
 Research Skills for Social Policy
 Rethinking Economics and the Financial Crisis
 Rethinking the Financial Crisis
 Science and Society 1A
 Science and Society 1b: Nature and Environment
 Science, Nature and Environment
 Social Anthropology 1A: The Life Course
 Social Anthropology 1B: Anthropology Matters
 Social Anthropology 2: Key Concepts
 Social life and climate change
 Social Policy and Society
 Social Work: Making A Difference
 Social Work: Policy and Legal Frameworks
 Sociology 1A: The Sociological Imagination: Individuals and Society
 Sociology 1B: The Sociological Imagination: Private Troubles, Public Problems
 Sociology 2a: Thinking Sociologically
 Sociology 2b: Researching Social Life
 South Asia in the World
 Sustainable Development 1a: Introducing Sustainable Development
 Sustainable Development 2a: Perspectives on Sustainable Development
 Technology in Society
 The future of our university: an interdisciplinary experiment in cooperative learning
 Themes and Perspectives in the History of Science
 Theories of International Relations
 Understanding Gender in the Contemporary World
 Understanding Gender in the Contemporary World: Key Concepts, Controversies and Challenges
 Understanding Public Policy
 Understanding Race and Colonialism

Working and Relating: Developing Your People Skills
Advanced Issues in the Making of Contemporary Africa
Advanced Issues in the Political Economy of Development
Advanced Topics in Global Security
Africa in World Politics
Analysing and communicating Social Policy
Analysing Social Networks with Statistics
Analytical Perspectives in Social Policy
Anthropological Theory
Anthropologists Read the News
Anthropology and Africa
Anthropology and Environment
Anthropology and Sociology of Medicine Dissertation
Anthropology of Christianity
Anthropology of Displacement and Migration
Anthropology of East Asia
Anthropology of Health and Healing
Anthropology of Health and Migration
Anthropology of Sex and Reproduction
Anticolonial Political Thought
Applied Demographic Analysis
Approaches to Politics and International Relations
Armed Force and Society
Bargaining and Negotiation in International Relations
Bayesian Statistics for Social Scientists
British Government
Cases in Sustainable Development
Causal Inference for Social Sciences
Children's Rights
China's Contemporary Transformations
Chinese Politics
Climate Justice
Collaborative Anthropology
Comparative Politics of Secession
Comparing Scottish Devolution
Consumption, Exchange, Technology
Contagion
Contemporary Feminist Debates
Contemporary Issues in International Development
Contemporary Issues in International Relations
Contemporary Issues in Political Science
Contemporary Issues in Political Theory
Contemporary Issues in Social Anthropology
Contemporary Issues in Sociology
Contemporary Russian Politics
Controversies in Medicine, Technology and the Environment
Core Texts in Political Theory
Corporate Lobbying and Policymaking in the Global Economy
Critical Theory and Cinema
Culture and Power
Democracy and contemporary capitalism
Democracy and its Discontents
Demystifying Money
Designing and Doing Social Research
Designing and Implementing Experiments in Political Science

Digesting Food Policy
Digital Culture
Digital Global Development
Dissertation in Sustainable Development, SPS
Dissertation (MA International Relations)
Dissertation (MA Politics)
Dissertation (MA Social Anthropology)
Dissertation (MA Social Policy)
Diversities: Canada and Beyond
Doing Survey Research
Eastminster: Decolonisation and State-Building in Asia
Economic Sociology: Theories and Enquiries
Educational Politics and Policy
Education and Social Justice
Elite and Mass Political Behaviour
Emerging Powers
Energy Policy and Sustainability
Environmental Politics
Environmental Politics in Europe
Ethnographies of the United States
EU as Global Actor
Europe and International Migration
Europe in the World
Finance and Society
Foundations in Global Security
Freedom and Slavery in Political Thought
Gender and Environment
Gender, Marginality and Social Change
Gender, Peace and Security
Gender, Power and Representation
Generation and Inheritance: Anthropological Concepts
Genetics, Nature and Society
Geopolitics
Global and Transnational Feminisms
Global Food Politics
Globalization
Global Justice and Citizenship
Global Politics of Public Health
Global Politics Of Sex And Gender
Global Security
Governing The Social
Government and Politics in the United Kingdom (S1)
Government and Politics in the United Kingdom (S2)
Happiness: Cross-Cultural Perspectives
Health Systems Analysis
Health Systems: Strengthening and Reform
Himalayan Ethnography
Human Rights in International Relations
Humans and Other Species
Indigenous Peoples of Lowland South America
Infectious Disease and Global Governance
International Political Economy
International Politics of Money
International Public Health Policy Project
International Relations of the Asia Pacific

Intimate Relationships
Investigating Energy Consumption & Policy
Kinship: Structure and Process
Knowledge, Expertise and Policy
Labour Market Policy in Europe
Latin American Anthropology
Law, Violence, and Humanity
Magic, Science and Healing
Majoritarian Nationalism, Populism and Ethnic Conflict in South Asia
Medical Sociology
Migration: social origins and social consequences
Model United Nations
Multi-Level Modelling in Social Science
Nations and Nationalism
Neuropolitics
Parliamentary Placement: Research Project (S1)
Parliamentary Placement: Research Project (S2)
Parliamentary Studies
Party Politics and Welfare States in Democratic Capitalism
Perspectives on Digital Capitalism
Pictures: The Anthropology of Images and Mediation
Political and Cultural Summer Programme: Research Project
Political and Cultural Summer Programme: Scottish Politics
Political and cultural Summer Programme: Scottish Society & Culture
Political Behaviour: Opinions, Choices and Movements
Political Economy of Latin America
Political Economy of Work and Welfare
Political Internship: Research Project (S1)
Political Internship: Research Project (S2)
Political Islam
Political Parties in the 21st Century
Political Work
Politics and Public Policy
Politics of Oil
Politics of the Middle East
Politics Year Abroad Assessment
Popular Music, Technology and Society
Population Health and Health Policy
Populism: Pathology or Panacea?
Practising Action Research for Sustainability
Professional Practice in Social Work 1 (UG)
Professional Practice in Social Work 2 (UG)
Public participation in democracy and governance
Public Policy: Agenda-Setting
Public Policy In Scotland (S1)
Public Policy In Scotland (S2)
Qualitative Research: Principles and Practicalities for Social Policy
Race And Ethnicity
Race, Power, and Social Policy
Refugees and Humanitarianism
Religion and Society
Research Design for Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (STIS)
Research Design in Politics and International Relations
Researching Contemporary Britain using Longitudinal Data
Responding to sustainability challenges: critical debates

Ritual and Religion
 Russia's Foreign and Security Policy
 Scottish Politics (S1)
 Scottish Politics (S2)
 Scottish Society & Culture (S1)
 Scottish Society & Culture (S2)
 Screening Social Policy
 Social and Political Science in Practice
 Social Anthropology Year Abroad Assessment
 Social Demography
 Social Determinants of Health and Public Policy
 Social Development
 Social Inequality and the Life Course
 Social Movements and Collective Action in the Middle East
 Social Policy Year Abroad Assessment
 Social & Political Movements: Theory and Practice
 Social Theory
 Social Work Dissertation (UG)
 Social Work in Communities (UG)
 Social Work with Individuals and Families
 Sociology of Emotions
 Sociology of Freedom
 Sociology of Illicit Markets and Criminal Organisations
 Sociology of Intoxication
 Sociology of Medicine
 Sociology of the Arts
 Sociology of the Environment and Risk
 Sociology Project
 South Asia: Culture, Politics and the Economy
 South Asian Public Culture: Keywords
 Southeast Asia
 Special Study in Politics and International Relations
 Statistical Modelling
 Strategic Studies and its Critics
 Technology, Politics and Government
 Terrorism and Counterterrorism
 The Anthropology of Africa
 The Anthropology of Death
 The Anthropology of Energy in the Global South
 The Anthropology of Food
 The Anthropology of Games and Play
 The Anthropology of Language
 The Anthropology of Monsters: Demons, witches, cyborgs and other fabulous creatures
 The Anthropology of the Body: Contemporary Issues
 The future of our university: an interdisciplinary experiment in cooperative learning (Honours)
 The Internet and Society
 The Invention of History
 The Middle Eastern State: Histories and Theories
 The Modern Self and Art
 Theories of International Relations
 The Persian Gulf in International Relations
 The Political Psychology of World Leaders
 The Politics of the End of Empire
 The Politics of the UK Constitution
 The Project Presentation

The Responsible Researcher
 The social life of food
 The Sociology of Sex Work
 Topics in Social Theory
 Topics in the History of Modern Science and Medicine
 Understanding Care and Control in Social Work (UG)
 Understanding Indian Politics
 Understanding Medicine: Social Science Perspectives
 Understanding sustainable welfare and eco-social policy
 Urban Anthropology
 US Foreign Policy
 US Government
 Using pre-existing data for your own research
 Utopia
 War and Justice
 War and Peace: Anthropological Perspectives
 War and the Politics of Victory
 Waste: Anthropologies of Pollution and Repair
 What's Wrong with Inequality?
 Working with Risk, trust and Complexity (UG)
 Working with Self & Others: Skills Theories & Methods (UG)
 Zimbabwe: Politics of a Post-Colonial State
 Assessment and Management of Need, Care and Risk in relation to the MHO role
 Culture and Mental Health in a Global Perspective
 Dissertation (MSW)
 Doing Social Work Research
 Mental Wellbeing and Mental Disorder
 Mental Well being and the MHO Role in relation to adults: working across and between the relevant legislation
 Professional Social Work Practice 1
 Professional Social Work Practice 2
 Social Work in Communities
 Social Work with Individuals and Families
 SSPS Masters Dissertation (Social Work)
 Understanding Care and Control in Social Work (PG)
 Working with mentally disordered persons within the criminal justice system
 Working with Risk, trust and Complexity (PG)
 Working with Self & Others: Skills Theories & Methods

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:

- External Examiners Reports
- Previous Review Reports
- School Quality Reports
- Student Staff Liaison Committee Minutes
- Statistical Reports
- NSS and PTES Survey Data and School Responses
- Study and Work Away reports
- Degree programme tables
- Subject benchmark statements
- University Curriculum Transformation Project information


- University student EDI report for the School
- University quality, student voice and student representation information
- Board of Studies paperwork
- Course level feedback questions
- School tutor training Learn information
- School standard rubric and feedback studio coversheet
- School Widening Participation Project information
- School Decolonisation of the Curriculum Project summary

During the review visit

- Additional information on student numbers
- Postgraduate research student number information

Appendix 4: Number of students

Undergraduate programmes:



INTERNAL PERIODIC REVIEW
ENTRANTS FOR SELECTED PROGRAMMES

The number of students who enter on to the selected programmes each year.

Session Year Programme Name	2023/4		2022/3		2021/2		2020/1		2019/20	
	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students
Anthropology and Sociology of Medicine (BMedSci Hons) - 1 Year (Intercalation)			4	4	5	5	1	2	1	1
BMedSci (Hons) Anthropology and Sociology of Medicine (External Intercalation)	2	2					1			
Global Health Policy (BMedSci Hons)			5	5	3	3	3	2		
Global Health Policy (BMedSci Hons) (External Intercalation)	0									
International Relations (MA Hons)	32	32	74	75	76	75	112	111	89	85
International Relations and International Law (MA Hons)	13	13	21	20	25	25	36	37	28	28
International Relations with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)	3	3	1	1	4	3	5	5	5	5
Politics (MA Hons)	29	29	49	50	62	58	75	74	56	60
Politics and Economic and Social History (MA Hons)									0	
Politics with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)	0		0		1	1	1	1	1	1
Politics, Philosophy and Economics MA (Hons)	0		23	24	38	38	37	37		
Social Anthropology (MA Hons)	8	8	28	28	41	40	29	32	28	27
Social Anthropology and Politics (MA Hons)	8	8	21	21	17	17	14	14	8	9
Social Anthropology and Social Policy (MA Hons)	0		2	2	4	3	2	2	1	
Social Anthropology with Development (MA Hons)	3	3	5	5	4	4	9	9	4	4
Social Anthropology with Social History (MA Hons)									0	
Social Policy and Economics (MA Hons)	4	4	11	11	11	10	5	5	6	6
Social Policy and Law (MA Hons)	1	1	5	4	2	2	1	1	1	
Social Policy and Politics (MA Hons)	3	3	14	15	18	17	12	14	14	14
Social Policy and Sociology (MA Hons)	4	4	10	10	19	19	13	13	7	8
Social Policy with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)	0		4	4	3	4	0		1	1
Social Policy with Social and Political Studies (MA Hons)						1				
Social Work (BSc Hons)	0		14	15	24	24	58	58	20	22
Sociology (MA Hons)	4	4	36	36	58	57	38	38	37	42
Sociology and Politics (MA Hons)	7	7	21	21	23	23	31	31	24	22
Sociology and Psychology (MA Hons)	2	2	26	26	34	34	9	9	14	13
Sociology and Social Anthropology (MA Hons)	2	2	8	8	13	14	13	13	14	15
Sociology with Quantitative Methods (MA Hons) (Full-time)	0		6	6	3	3	1	1	0	
Sustainable Development MA (Hons)	14	14	31	33	34	33	31	30	30	30

Social Work postgraduate taught programmes:



INTERNAL PERIODIC REVIEW
ENTRANTS FOR SELECTED PROGRAMMES

The number of students who enter on to the selected programmes each year.

Session Year Programme Name	2023/4		2022/3		2021/2		2020/1		2019/20	
	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students
Advanced Professional Studies (Mental Health Officer Award) (PgCert)					0		17		16	18
Social Work (MSW)	21		20	20	52	52	27	27	30	30