The University of Edinburgh Internal Periodic Review 14 week response report

Internal Periodic Review of Undergraduate Medicine Date of review: 7-8/3/2024 Date of 14 week response: 26/9/2024 Date of year on response:

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

Recommendation no	Recommendation	Timescale for completion	Comment on progress towards completion and/or identify barriers to completion	Completion date
1	NHS staffing and ACT funding Given the lack of resolution of [a] recommendation from the previous IPR report, the review team recommend that the College assists in supporting a mediation process between the NHS Education Scotland (NES), Regional ACT Groups, NHS Boards and the University, in order to ensure that there is transparency and accountability for ACT funding provided to the NHS for teaching undergraduate medical students.	12 months	A meeting is planned with our main NHS partner to discuss how we the use of ACT funding to support teaching. We have also discussed with NHS Education Scotland how we can use the Quality Review process to more effectively support programme improvements. The main barrier is that we have no direct control or accountability over the funding. ACT funds pass directly from NHS Education Scotland to Health Boards, as such our leverage remains limited.	
2	University staffing and resourcing The review team recommend that the College works with the School to formalise agreements and determine appropriate resourcing whereby staff within the College are appointed to teach, and that this includes succession planning in order to ensure the resilience and continuity of the programmes.	18 months	 Formalise Agreements Between College and School: Establish Clear Roles and Responsibilities: Develop agreements that delineate the responsibilities of both the College and the School regarding staffing and resource allocation. This clarity will ensure both entities are aligned and can collaborate effectively. Resource Allocation Model: Create a model that outlines how resources are allocated based on programme needs, projected enrolments, and strategic directions of the College. Succession Planning: Identify Key Positions and Risk Assessment: Outline key positions essential for programme continuity and perform a risk assessment to determine potential vulnerabilities in case of staff turnover. 	

			 Development of Talent Pool: Create strategies for talent development that encourage existing staff to develop skills necessary for future key roles, thus ensuring a prepared pool of candidates for these positions. Mentoring Programmes: Establish mentoring programs that facilitate knowledge transfer and prepare junior faculty for future roles, enhancing resilience in programme delivery. Enhance Resilience and Continuity of Programmes: Continuous Professional Development: Promote and support continuous professional development for staff to enhance teaching skills and adapt to changing educational environments. This will help ensure staff are available to take on teaching roles as programme evolves. Reporting and Accountability: Develop a system for reporting on the implementation of agreements concerning staffing and resourcing, ensuring 	
3	Staff appointments The review team recommend that the School, with support from the College, proceed to fill the current staff vacancies and appoint the Deputy Year Directors as soon as possible.	6 months	accountability and continuous improvement.We have appointed all the Deputy Year Directors by June 2024. We have appointed a Director Electives and Lead for Year 6 medicine and assistantship. We have also appointed a new Year 5 Director.We are awaiting to fill vacanacies for Director of Student Support and Experience, Lead for the Curriculum, Anatomy Teaching Fellow and Lead for EDI.	
4	Support and supervision on placements The review team recommend that the School review student feedback on placements and put measures in place to provide consistency of support and supervision across placement settings.	12 months	We have implemented a comprehensive review of our staff- student liaison processes to ensure feedback can be gathered in real time (see also our response to Recommendation 8). To enhance the consistency of support and supervision across all placement settings, we have updated the information provided to clinical supervisors to ensure clarity on the expectations around induction, support, and supervision. In collaboration with our NHS placement providers, we have developed a clear guidance document outlining best practices for student support and supervision during placements. This document has been communicated to all relevant stakeholders, including students, to ensure transparency and understanding. To monitor compliance with these new standards, we have drafted and will implement a survey tool to collect feedback from both students and supervisors throughout the year. We have also worked with Lothian MED to develop appropriate site level inductions.	

			This will help us identify areas for continuous improvement and ensure alignment with our support expectations. Additionally, we are in the process of updating portfolio requirements to reflect these new standards, ensuring that the support and supervision of students is effectively integrated into their clinical education. To further strengthen these efforts, we will also introduce additional training for supervisors to equip them with the necessary skills and knowledge to provide consistent and high-quality support across all placements.	
5	Early years The review team recommend that, as part of the curriculum development plan, the School consult with students to consider further opportunities for clinical exposure, tailored to the students' level, to be incorporated into the early (currently non-clinical) years.	24 months	We have clinical experience already embedded in Year 2 Knowledge to Clinical Practice with teaching sessions with patients in General Practice. We have also enhanced our clinical communication teaching to give students confidence in history taking. We have set up student curriculum forum with representation from all years which are discussing proposals for changes in the curriculum as part of curriculum transformation. This includes review of clinical opportunities in the early years. These proposals will have to managed around capacity constraints due to increase in student numbers and proposals to enhance clinical experience in years 4 to 6. A new curriculum is planned for academic year 27/28.	
6	Formative feedback The review team recommend that the School ensures that there is a shared understanding between students and staff regarding the use and purpose of formative assessments and feedback, as well as further clarity for students on when to expect feedback.	12 months	We have updated the induction sessions for all years of the programme outlining feedback they will receive from assessments, including formative exams. We have provided extensive practice material with feedback to each year and also looking at which plaform within the University is most appropriate. We are reviewing the current feedback for clinical exams (OSCEs) to help give students a better idea of areas for improvement. We will use our staff student liaison meetings to get further insights around improvements to feedback within the clinical portfolio.	
7	Promotion and recognition The review team recommend that the College improves communication to staff regarding how teaching is used for promotion criteria up to and including Grade 10.	12 months	There is a University-wide overhaul of the promotions process, alongside clearer guidance on promotions. Within the college, promotion workshops are available at each of the College Schools and Institutes. A clear narrative from college leadership on the importance of teaching in promotions process is now continually articulated. We also expect this to be part of the annual review process for all academics on university contracts.	
8	Student voice The review team recommend consulting with students regarding how to best communicate to students the	12 months	Our strategy aims to enhance the educational experience, address student concerns, and foster a supportive learning environment. 1. Establish Clear Communication Channels 1.1. Dedicated Liaison Officers	

	ation on how the School has responded to	Utilise Deputy Year Directors as liaison officers. These
studer	nt feedback, i.e. how to close the feedback loop.	individuals will act as primary points of contact for
		communication between staff and students for each year.
		1.2. Digital Communication
		 Continue to use Teams for communication but add a
		specific section relating to student feedback.
		Create a section on the Student Hub which is called Your
		Medical School, where we reply on "Your Feedback, Our Actions".
		 Create a feedback newsletter delivered at least once per semester.
		2. Regular Meetings and Feedback Sessions
		 Form an SSLC for each year (including HCP-MED): Include
		student representatives, faculty members, and
		administrative staff. Hold meetings twice per semester.
		This will include year representatives from Medical
		Students Council and other students who will nominate
		themselves for the position. An advert has been circulated
		to all year groups.
		Open Forums
		We will have an open forum for each year delivered via Teams live
		event which will be open to all. We will ask for questions in
		advance as well as discussing current teaching provision and
		organisation.
		3 Surveys and Questionnaires
		Review current ACT surveys and questions especially in
		Year 1 and 2.
		Establish Feedback Survey Response Timelines: For each
		feedback report there should be named person to address
		each section, provide a response and any proposed actions
		plans. These should be provided to students via SharePoint
		site. We should also review the timing of these surveys to
		optimise quality improvement.
		 Annual Program Feedback: Each year should provide a thematic analysis of issues raised and areas for
		celebration. This should lead to an ongoing quality
		improvement action plan. This should form the basis of
		annual School Quality report.
		4. Transparency
		 Publish Guidelines: Make all policies, procedures, and
		expectations accessible to students and staff via Student
		Hub.

9	Learning outcomes The review team recommend that the School audit whether or not individual topics within courses have detailed learning outcomes that are shared clearly with students.	12 months	 Induction Sessions: We have conducted induction sessions for students to explain the updated communication strategy and available support systems. 5. Annual Strategy Review: Conduct annual reviews of the communication strategy to assess its effectiveness and make necessary adjustments. We have commenced a comprehensive review of current curriculum mapping and presentation of Learning outcomes. This will include a review of how we use our VLE. We aim to appoint a curriculum lead to take this work forward. The main barrier is that the software we currently have to provide a curriculum map does 	
			not have all the functionality we would wish to have. However current funding constraints means that procurement of software is not a priority.	
10	Review and update of course materials The review team recommend that the School consider approaches to auditing how frequently course video materials are updated, e.g. by including a statement on when the materials were last reviewed, even if not updated.	12 months	 We have set up the following action plan: Policy Development: Establish a Review Policy: Develop clear guidelines on how often different types of course materials, including video content, should be reviewed and potentially updated. Mandatory Update Statements: Implement a mandatory practice of including a "last reviewed" or "last updated" statement on all course video materials. This ensures transparency and helps both students and instructors gauge the currency of the material. Regular Reviews: This Year committee will have a standing item to discuss and advise on update of course material. This will include a confirmation from teaching staff that all material has been reviewed before the beginning of the year or semester. We will develop a sustainable system for ensuring regular review of content and ensuring they remain current. Faculty Engagement: Instructor Responsibilities: Ensure that all instructors are aware of their responsibilities to update and review their course materials regularly. Training and Support: Provide necessary training and support for instructors on how to update their materials effectively, focusing on technical aspects for creating or modifying video content. 	

			 Review how current University platforms can facilitate easy updating of video materials, including quick edits and integration of new information. Feedback Mechanisms: Student and Peer Feedback: Regularly collect feedback from students and peer reviewers regarding the relevance and effectiveness of course materials. This will form part of our staff student liaison and include in our student feedback surveys. Regular Reporting: Each year committee will provide a report outlining which materials have been reviewed, which have been updated, and upcoming materials due for review. At the end of each academic year, the year director will provide a review the effectiveness of the audit process.
11	Early exit award The review team recommend that the School and College work with Academic Services to agree on a viable route for an early exit award at honours degree level from the MBChB programme following the intercalated year.	6 months	We have drafted a proposal for an early exit award that will be discussed at the medical schools learning and teaching committee before progressing to College Undergraduate Learning and Teaching Committee.
12	Placement software The review team recommend that the College support the investment in software tools for managing student portfolios that will save time for teaching staff as well as enhance the student experience.	12 months	We have started the process with IS to detail the business case for an update of our portfolio software. The aim is to have a product that will be used across the college and avoid divergence and reducing efficiencies.
	Please report on steps taken to feedback to students on the outcomes of the review		(included above)
For Year on response only	Any examples of a positive change as a result of the review		