<p style="text-align:center">The University of Edinburgh
Internal Periodic Review
Year On Response Report</p>

Internal Periodic Review of: UEBS Postgraduate Provision
Date of review: 06 and 07 February 2023
Date of 14-week response: 23 November 2023
Date of year on response: 24 May 2024

The School/Subject Area is responsible for reporting on progress with all recommendations, including those remitted to other areas of the University for action.
If any recommendation has been fully addressed please record the action taken and date completed.   Any barriers to progress should be highlighted on this report.

No	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The review team **recommends** that the School explores and adopt a broader range of assessment types, drawing on its connections with business and industry, to ensure that it continues to strike an appropriate balance between academic and practical assessments.	Practical assessment: Ongoing and especially in relation to the Curriculum Transformation Programme	There are two parts to this recommendation, that of the variety of assessments and that of assessments including application of knowledge in practice. We have 20 credit and 10 credit courses and the number of pieces of assessment carefully relate to the credits in each course. The timing of this IPR allowed us to add an additional element to our Annual Programme Reviews (APR) undertaken in May/June 2023 where Programme Directors were asked to provide an overview of assessment for each course in their programme. This evidenced that there is a wide diversity of assessment across the PGT portfolio. The Review Team's impression that assessments lack diversity may have been driven by the view of one student representing a programme where assessment by essay is more widespread than in other programmes but by no means dominating. Notwithstanding, we continue to monitor the complement of assessment for each programme via the APR and when changes to assessment or new courses are proposed. Given the Benchmark Statements for Business and Management programmes as well as our own stated Graduate Competency Framework, we are conscious of the importance of modes of assessment that invite the application of knowledge in practice and modes of assessment include consultancy to	Diversity of assessment: Completed (All actions for this recommendation were completed prior to 23/11/2023, but we include it here for ease of reference.)

			external organisations at course level, and company sponsored dissertations. This is something we will continue to explore in future programme reviews and especially in the context of the ongoing Curriculum Transformation Programme.	
2	The review team **recommends** the School develops a formative feedback/forward strategy at programme and course level for each student. The strategy should ensure that students have the chance to prepare for summative assessment, whilst also being given the opportunity to gauge how well they are doing. This could also involve fostering assessment and feedback literacy through peer and self-feedback and assessment. Feedback could be in the form of written or recorded audio feedback and consideration should be given to mapping when students can expect to receive feedback.	Taking into account timescales for implementing programme and course changes, by April 2025 to coincide with the publication of DPTs for the following academic year	For each course, dates for assessments and formative/ summative feedback are confirmed in the course handbook on Learn, thereby making this information available to students in advance. In Boards of Studies, we check the formal plan for feedback both for new courses and for changes to existing courses to ensure the model meet the feedforward needs. We will continue to monitor this. We remind all Course Organisers at the beginning of semesters and in Boards of Studies to pay more attention to feedforward and to communicate to students using the specific words "forward feedback". There is a dialogue with students, so that students recognise what feedback is and when, where and how they receive this. Programme Directors also remind students in Town Hall meetings what feedback is. We will review these processes to ensure they are fit for purpose via the Programme Directors' Forum early next year. As mentioned above, we ensure that the number of pieces of assessment relate to the credits in each course. We have completed a review of assessment and feedback at UG level and we are now taking forward insights from this review to PGT level. We are currently developing a set of guidelines for models of assessment and feedback, in line with the forthcoming CAHSS Minimum Standards for Assessment Guidance and Feedback. In consultation with relevant Programme Directors and Course Organisers, the School has redesigned a number of 10-credit courses to be delivered over 10 weeks instead of 5 weeks. This change allows students in this course more time to digest the materials. Two MSc programmes will pilot weekly 'Feedback and Assessment Support' drop-in sessions in 2025/26. These	

			sessions will provide more opportunity for students to obtain feedback from the course organisers. If successful, these will be mainstreamed across all programmes.	
3	The review team **recommends** that the School implements a support framework for postgraduate research students. This systematic approach should include a formal process for recording meetings between postgraduate research students and supervisors. Students should be required to write-up a brief summary note after each meeting, covering key points of discussion and any agreed actions, which is then checked by the supervisor before it is uploaded to EUCLID. An informal 10 week progression review from the start of the PhD should be held as standard to ensure that students have settled-in and established good working relationships with the supervisory team. The meeting also gives an early academic "check point" to ensure that the student has an appropriate understanding of the project and of what is required of them. The School should also review the operation of PhD progression board meetings to formally include provision of a "safe space" in which the student can discuss the relationship with the supervisors.		The School already regularly reminds Supervisors to add engagement points for student meetings but Supervisors do not do this consistently, which could leave us open to appeal or complaint. During the Annual Programme Review process, the Director of the PGR provision will discuss with the Director of Faculty how this issue can be dealt with. The School has also discussed asking students to write up a brief summary of each supervisory meeting, which Supervisors upload to EUCLID. There are concerns over Supervisor workload and this needs to be taken into consideration and we are consulting with the Director of Faculty about workload and also working with Heads of Subject Groups, the Director of Research and the Director of Quality to ensure that this system works consistently and that proper support is put in place. First year students have been advised it is good practice to summarise key points from advisor meeting and email this to their advisors following a meeting.

The School is currently discussing the implementation of the informal progression review for first year students with the Director of Faculty. Initial discussion has supported this endeavour to be positive, however further discussion is needed on the timing of this informal review given the shift for most programmes to being integrated (therefore a review at 10 weeks will in large cover experience with taught courses). The school are considering conducting this review mid-semester 2, where students will be working on their 'revised proposal'. We anticipate an informal progression review will be implemented in spring 2025.

After the 2017 PG IPR we implemented model whereby a PGR students could meet with the Academic Subject Group representative from another group to discuss any concerns related to their supervision. The issue of the 2-to-1 progression meetings has been discussed and we have worked with Academic Subject Group Representatives to plan how this could be introduced. It has been communicated to representatives | Spring 2025 |

			and students, that student or staff can request for extra members of staff to be present in a progression review. Often this has been the PGR Director and Academic Subject Group representatives. Students have also been reminded that any issues they have with regards to their progression or general study should be communicated with a group representative or the PGR Director.	
4	The review team **recommends** that the University (in particular the central Student Experience related areas in partnership with Communications and Marketing) consults Schools and Colleges on the timing and tone of general central communications to students in order to ensure that information is accurate and relevant. Furthermore, consideration should be given to a standardised schedule of regular University-wide communications linked to, and considerate of, local School and College requirements and the option of allowing local areas to adapt and then cascade central communications to local student cohorts.		**Comment from Communications and Marketing, University of Edinburgh:** Communications and Marketing works closely with College communications leads and colleagues across the University to support the timely and coordinated local cascade and dissemination of communications to students in tandem with centrally-issued messages such as emails, newsletters and social media posts via our Corporate and Student platforms. Internal Communications manages communications to students and staff throughout the academic year, and coordinates this with colleagues across the University. We chair a weekly meeting of College and Professional Services communications leads where we discuss recent and upcoming communications priorities and any bulk communications to students are previewed to this group as well as senior staff from local areas, such as Heads of School/College, Directors of Academic Affairs and Directors of Professional Services. We also share messages and provide professional communications advice and guidance to colleagues on current issues, such as industrial action or RAAC, via College communications leads and our 400-strong University-wide network of communications, marketing and student recruitment professionals. In addition, we collate a digest of key communications for heads and leaders to cascade to students and staff in their area which is sent out each month to the same list that sees previews of student emails. We have recently created an internal communications action plan, which aims to improve our internal communications, leadership communications and cascade supported by new, dedicated Internal Communications managers for Strategic	Ongoing Audit: December 2024

			Change and the Provost's Office. As part of this, we are currently undertaking a comprehensive audit of all our student and staff communications, which reviews the effectiveness of our current channels and content and gathers feedback on preferences and options. The audit is underway and we have project planned its timelines, for its various strands. We recently held two workshops with colleagues from across Colleges, Student Experience, EUSA and other teams to review aspects of our student communications and where they can be improved in a coordinated way.	
5	The review team **recommends** that the School communicates the opportunities and funding available to research students to attend national and international conferences and actively encourages them to participate.		This is now embedded and systematised. An email was sent to all PGR students informing them of the funding available to them. Funding information has also been clearly signposted on the PGR SharePoint site and is included in the bi-weekly email newsletter sent to all PGR students.	Completed August 2023
6	The review team **recommends** that the School provides more regular opportunities for research students to hear about the latest research interests of academic staff and also opportunities to contribute to this work.		All Subject Groups have been asked to include research students in their meetings and to inform them of any research seminars or workshops. We will continue to monitor this as the work is shared across areas. As a beneficial off-shoot, all research seminars are now advertised to all Faculty by the University of Edinburgh Business School Communications Manager instead of as before only to the Subject Group and associated PGR students. This supports cross-disciplinary working and insight.	Completed May 2024
7	The review team **recommends** that the School signposts the different pathways for TAs to gain teaching accreditation with Advance HE (EdTA, PGCAP, direct accreditation) and offers practical support. Whilst this may not suit all TAs, teaching accreditation provides value to their contribution to the School and has become an important factor for future employment.		Information about Advance HE has been included in the Training Needs Analysis form sent to all PGR students. The School's Teaching Allocation Leader works with students to help ensure time is kept free for this kind of personal development. We will continue to monitor this as the work is shared across different areas.	Completed September 2023

Suggestions are discussed overleaf/

No	Suggestion	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	The review team **suggests** the School considers ways to encourage Business students to take course options outside the School and to allow non-Business students the opportunity to access School courses.		The School has tried this approach and it is now more widespread. We have noted that when taking outside courses, some students express dissatisfaction in terms of the differences in level of support compared to our in-house courses. Additionally, Programme Directors and the Teaching Operations team have less control over what can be done where there are issues. We need to maintain an awareness of this, also in the context of the MSc FTP programme, delivered via the EFI. Most of our options are open to all other students, but the School needs to constrain numbers, where courses have prerequisites, and to take into account the severe space constraints. We will monitor the outcomes of the Curriculum Transformation Programme in relation to this aspect of the PGR experience.	
2	The review team **suggests** that the School focuses its 20 credit courses in Semester 1 (to allow a better spread of workload for students to adjust to in their first semester) and its 10 credit courses in Semester 2 (where the students have adjusted to the requirements of their programmes).		Only in some programmes, e.g. Marketing student feedback is that they prefer to have more options. It varies. UEBS makes efforts to keep the content of 10 credit courses and 20 credit courses appropriate to the number of credits and we continue to review the mix of 10/20 credits at the programme level. Student effort is commensurate with the number of credits and we ensure that we have the right number and type of assessments for the credit value. A recent action point from the May and June 2024 Annual Programme Reviews is that our PG Directors Forum will discuss the new assessment models and how they work for us.	
3	The review team **suggests** the School develops marking guidance (including exemplars for each grade descriptor) to help ensure that feedback is clear and understandable to all students.		Setting clear marking criteria in advance is part of the Taught Assessment Regulations. Owing to the wide variety of subject areas, we do not envisage one School-wide template but subject specific templates may be possible. (This will be discussed via the PG Directors Forum) The main issue is to ensure colleagues use the standard descriptors in the Common Marking Scheme.	

No	Suggestion	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
			In line with the forthcoming CAHSS Minimum Standards for Assessment Guidance and Feedback, the School will provide training in the busics of assessment, marking and moderation (including making available training materials developed by IAD).	
4	The review team **suggests** the School ensures that specific course requirements, in particular any prerequisite knowledge or skills, are communicated clearly to applicants prior to entry. If certain skills (for example Python programming skills) are recommended (or desired) but not a barrier to entry, the School should provide additional development opportunities to allow students to develop their competency to the appropriate level.		Our Director of Marketing and Business Development covered this during the Annual Programme Review meetings. We publish the entry requirements and prerequisites on the website. For example for MSc Business Analytics, we mention that a background of courses in/experience with linear algebra, calculus, probability is necessary: https://www.business-school.ed.ac.uk/index.php/msc/business-analytics/entry-requirements All Programme Directors (PDs) send joining information to applicants with offers in advance of the programme starting. For the MSc programmes, a link to the Joining Information pages is sent out to applicants with offers, as part of our pre-arrival communications. MBA and PGR programmes have similar arrangements. Within the Joining Information pages for the MSc programmes, there is a PD welcome, Information on Programme Structure and Option Courses and also, for most programmes, a link to "Useful Reading". This is sent out to applicants with offers at end of July / early August.	
5	The review team **suggests** that the School share good practice on Town Hall Meetings (THM) timings/frequency to encourage more consistent practice across programmes and improve experience for all students.		The timing and frequency of Town Hall Meetings were discussed with Programme Directors at the annual programme planning meetings. The programme directors are aware that consistency in terms of timing and frequency can improve the student experience. However, it was noted that the timing of the Town Halls need to accommodate other activities e.g. course assessments, workshops. For instance, a programme may want to time their Town Hall before a workshop to brief students on how to prepare. This could lead to some deviation across programmes.	

No	Suggestion	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
			The Teaching Operations team drives the scheduling of Town Hall meetings. This helps ensure the frequency is consistent across programmes. The timing still depends on availability of rooms/colleagues/Student Reps but is not too dissimilar.	
6	The review team encourages the School to build on its initiatives to decolonise the curriculum and **suggests** that it seeks opportunities to engage with related University level activities (including consideration of female perspectives and scholars) in order to share experience and learn from other initiatives across the institution.		The School has continued to build on initiatives to decolonise course curricula, by establishing cross-School working group and hosting a seminar with an external International Business Professor, specialising in the area. Across teaching/research groups, we have been sharing news of 4 courses (some UG, some PG) that have made efforts to decolonise their materials and approaches. We are seeking more course leaders to volunteer to undertake decolonisation activities with EDI champions. We will continue to work with more course leaders on an annual basis, refining our approaches. At University level, we have worked with the Main Library and Information Services to compile an online Resource List for wider use (including links between decolonisation, gender equality and sustainability). We have also been working with the University's central Institute for Academic Development (IAD) to exchange and disseminate further resources and updates on decolonisation. On gender and race, our School staff have been increasingly engaged with sharing teaching, research and event updates across the university-wide hubs 'GENDER.ED' and 'RACE.ED'. The School EDI Director is part of cross-University, and national, Athena Swann networks for keeping informed and contributing to university-wide and sector-wide updates on gender equality and making a difference. In March a seminar on Women in Finance was held and the School recently held a panel event on LGBT+ Identities at Work.	
7	The review team **suggests** that the School explore ways of tracking/monitoring that new PGR supervisors complete the required online training course available on LEARN and that experienced supervisors regularly update their training at least every 5 years as per University requirements.		We will include this in the discussion about use of feedback, recommendation 2.	

No	Suggestion	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
8	The review team **suggests** that the School consider options for providing TAs with a formal feedback mechanism in relation to Course Organisers.		Teaching Assistants can go to the Senior Teaching Assistant Coordinator to express their concerns, or go to a Subject Group PGR Representative or to the Director of PG Taught Programmes. This year, via the Teaching Assistants Representative, we asked the Teaching Assistants to feedback on the timing of the meetings they had with the Course Organisers and if they had any concerns. A survey was issued for Semester 1 and for Semester 2. The survey was submitted via the Teaching Assistants Representative, giving more likelihood that issues would be disclosed, due to anonymity. The Teaching Assistant Representative fed back the response. Our School was a case study at College AHSS for shaping the College Teaching Assistant strategy. This helped us with our review of Teaching Assistant support.	
9	The review team **suggests** that the School continues to work with the College to seek new opportunities to access teaching and social space across the University estate.		The School is working in partnership with the College to develop a business case for further space for our PGT community. This is likely to conclude over the next 12 months as the University's 2025 - 2030 Capital Plan is agreed. Until we have further clarity here, the School is unable to realise its ambitions to grow and diversify its MSc portfolio. With the refurbishment of 40 GSQ taking place in 2025, this has led to an opportunity to rehouse our PGR community in better and more suitable accommodation. It has recently been agreed that we will develop a PhD Hub at 15 South College St, that will bring all of our PhD community together in the one place and allow them to develop a strong, in-person community. We have also developed a small capital bid for 24/25 that will, amongst other things, refurbish and develop some of our PGT student social and study space within 29 Buccleuch Place. This is currently going through the small capital approval process.	
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review	At the time students took part in the review meetings and we invited the student taking part in meetings to come to the final feedback session. With the Review Team's permission, we recorded this session and this has subsequently been shared with all PG students during Spring 2023. We have shared the 14 week response with students and will share the year on response too.		
	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review?	• Concerning Recommendation number 2, 'Feedback and assessment support' drop-in sessions. (Two MSc programmes will pilot weekly 'Feedback and Assessment Support' drop-in sessions in		

No	Suggestion	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
			2025/26) also our Director of PGT Programmes spoke to our Director UG Programmes and UG is also considering trialing something similar. • Research seminars being advertised more broadly - They're now on the screens around the School so not only PGR students but PGT/UG students can also attend these seminars if they are interested.	