The University of Edinburgh

Internal Periodic Review

School of Social and Political Science

Postgraduate Research Provision

26 – 27 March 2025

Contents

Executive summary

This report comprises the outcomes from the internal review of postgraduate research (PGR) provision 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 and suggestions on how to support developments.

Key Commendations

The review team commends the School for student support mechanisms, for example positive supervision experience, introducing a Postgraduate Adviser role, funding scheme for fieldwork and conferences; good practice in community building through 1st year weekly seminars and student-led New Directions conference; and efforts to support employability for non-academic careers. Further commendations are included in the report.

Key recommendations

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

- **Student support (annual progression reviews):** the School to consider how annual progression reviews can be enhanced to ensure a shared understanding of a more robust requirement in every year of study, not just in 1st year. The School should consider developing key milestones to apply in all subject areas, and expectations on a written submission (including minimum word count) for each annual progression review.
- **Student support (supervision):** the School to review its student support arrangements for PGR students. Given the current model of student support, there is a risk of the supervisor becoming a single point of failure. A lot of responsibility is being channelled back to supervisors in terms of student support, both academic and pastoral. The School should ensure awareness and clarity of expectations of supervision for both staff and students and explore opportunities for enhancing or expanding the PGA role.
- **Employability:** recognising the current HE climate, the School to consider where there are opportunities to share practice across all subject areas to proactively prepare students for non-academic careers.

The above recommendations are intended to support the School's subject specific remit item: Supporting PGR student journey and success. Further recommendations are included in the report.

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 on attracting a high quality, diverse student population.	1
2	The review team **commends** the writing up workshops which were particularly appreciated by students. [Student support]	2.1
3	The review team **commends** the 1st Year weekly PGR seminar as an example of good practice for building cohort identity. There were also examples of good practice in student-led activity, such as the New Directions Conference in Sociology which brings together staff and students to discuss the latest research and thinking. [Community]	2.1
4	The review team **commends** the supervisors; students were very positive about their supervisors/supervisory teams and appreciated the support they received from them. [Student support]	2.3
5	The review team **commends** the School on the third supervisor model as a development opportunity for ECRs (early career staff). [Student support]	2.3
6	The review team **commends** the School on the PGA (Postgraduate Adviser) role as a positive development in supporting supervision arrangements. [Student support]	2.3
7	The review team **commends** the availability of the PGR Support Fund which is still generous compared to other institutions, despite the recent changes. [Student support]	2.3
8	The review team **commends** the professional services staff who are engaged with and committed to supporting PGR students and their experience. [Student support]	2.3
9	The review team **commends** the School on improvements in PRES (Postgraduate Research Experience Survey) results which, although not yet at pre-pandemic levels of satisfaction, have seen an approximate 10% increase in overall satisfaction on the previous survey and are therefore moving in a positive direction. [Student voice]	2.4
10	The review team **commends** the School's efforts to provide suitable space and ensuring provision for students with learning adjustments. [EDI]	2.5
11	The review team **commends** the clear existing employer links within the School and the School's efforts on supporting students into non-academic careers. [Employability]	2.6

Recommendations
Areas for development and enhancement – progress to be reported.

Priority	Recommendation	Section in report	Responsibility of
1	**Student support (annual progression review) (relates to Subject specific remit: Supporting PGR student journey and success)** The review team **recommends** that the School considers how annual progression reviews can be enhanced to ensure a shared understanding of a more robust requirement in every year of study, not just in 1st year. The School should consider developing key milestones to apply in all subject areas, and expectations on a written submission (including minimum word count) for each annual progression review.	2.2	School
2	**Student support (supervision) (relates to Subject specific remit: Supporting PGR student journey and success)** The review team **recommends** the School reviews its student support arrangements. Given the current model of student support, there is a risk of the supervisor becoming a single point of failure. A lot of responsibility is being channelled back to supervisors in terms of student support, both academic and pastoral. The School should ensure awareness and clarity of expectations of supervision for both staff and students and explore opportunities for enhancing or expanding the PGA role.	2.3	School
3	**Employability (relates to Subject specific remit: Supporting PGR journey and success)** The review team **recommends** that, recognising the current HE climate, the School considers where there are opportunities to share practice across all subject areas to proactively prepare students for non-academic careers.	2.6	School
4	**Tutors and demonstrators** The review team **recommends** that the School considers reintroducing consistent observation of teaching by staff and peer shadowing opportunities. Staff observation of Guaranteed Hours tutoring should be implemented to ensure there is at least one opportunity for tutors to be observed during	2.7	School

	their first year. This would support both the student and tutor experience. Furthermore, the School should consider setting consistent expectations on guidance available to tutors from Course Organisers.		
5	**Subject specific remit: Research culture and community** The review team **recommends** the School considers opportunities to build on existing good practice within the School such as extending research group events and introducing standardised mechanisms so students can identify what research areas and activities staff are involved with.	2.1	School
6	**Communication** The review team **recommends** the School considers the need for coherent, transparent and clear communications for both students and staff. The review team identified a positive move in the Communications Team developing the newsletter, however there may be opportunities for continued dialogue with students on what they need or would want to see in terms of communication (for example a calendar of events). The review team heard differing interpretations from staff on the reasons behind recent changes to Guaranteed Hours tutor allocations and considers that clearer communication would aid understanding of why these and future decisions are taken.	2.1	School
	The review team **recommends** that the School communicates to staff to ensure they are aware of the option to include publications in a PhD thesis, and how this works.	2.2	School
7	**Student support (relates to subject specific remit: Supporting PGR student journey and success)** The review team **recommends** that the School and College consider how gaps in student pastoral support can be bridged; as noted above there appears to be a reliance on voluntary effort from professional services staff and a lack of clarity around mechanisms in place if the student-supervisor relationship breaks down.	2.3	School/College

8	**Student voice** The review team **recommends** that the School considers appropriate ways of closing the feedback loop for students, for example "you said we did", to ensure students are aware of how their feedback has been addressed. The School should consider mechanisms for increasing the visibility and communication of action taken in response to student feedback.	2.4	School
9	The review team **recommends** that the Doctoral College explores how socio-economic data relating to PGRs can be captured. The review team considers that demographic data collected for PGR students should ideally, for the purpose of widening access, mirror that collected on undergraduate students. Enhanced data would support the School and the University in strategic planning to support widening access to postgraduate research study.	2.5	Doctoral College

Suggestions

For noting – progress reporting is not required.

No	Suggestion	Section in report
1	The review team suggests that in subject areas with a fieldwork component, a reflective piece on the fieldwork experience (for example what worked well or did not work well) could form a written submission at annual progression review. Other options could include an oral presentation, in addition to the written submission, and there may be value in adding an external panel member as a standard part of annual reviews in all subject areas. (Intended to support recommendation 1 above.)	2.2

Section A – Introduction
Scope of review

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

The Internal Periodic Review of Social and Political Science in 2024/25 consisted of:

- The University's remit for internal review (see Appendix 2)

- The subject specific remit items for the review:

    o Supporting Postgraduate Research (PGR) Student Journey and Success
    o Research Culture and Community

- 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

Convener	Professor Stephen Bowd, School of History, Classics and Archaeology
External Member	Professor Karen West, University of Bristol
External Member	Professor Jonathan Scourfield, Cardiff University
Internal Member	Professor Margaret Graham, School of GeoSciences
Student	Aishwarya Subbaraman, Biomedical Sciences
Review Team Administrator	Susan Hunter, Academic Quality and Standards
Shadow Internal Member	Dr Kitty Shaw, Business School (unable to attend review visit)

The School

The School is one of 11 within the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. It comprises seven subject areas: Centre for African Studies, Politics and International Relations, Science Technology and Innovation Studies (STIS), Social Anthropology, Social Policy, Social Work and Sociology,

Physical location and summary of facilities
The School is located in the central campus with the majority of activity situated in the Chrystal Macmillan Building, including a fifth-floor common room for postgraduate research students. There is additional postgraduate research space in 27/28 George Square.

Date of previous review
7 – 8 November 2019

Reflective Report

The Reflective Report was prepared by Professor Andrew Neal, Director of Postgraduate Research Programmes

Consultation and dissemination included:
- One consultation with PGR student reps via PGR Student Staff Liaison Committee (SSLC)
- One consultation with PGR Committee consisting of subject area Postgraduate Advisors (PGAs) and relevant professional services staff
- Consultations with SPS Research Directors and SPS Research Training Centre (RTC) Director.
- Consultations with SPS Learning and Teaching Directorate
- Consultations with Heads of Subject Area (HoSAs)
- Consultations with Head of School

Section B – Main report

1   Strategic overview

Since the previous internal periodic review, the School has restructured the governance and organisation of its postgraduate research (PGR) provision. This is now situated within the School Learning and Teaching Directorate, supported by the Teaching and Student Services team, which includes two dedicated PGR Operations team members. The Student Development Office also supports some PGR activity, such as fieldwork and conference funding. This reorganisation means that the 'Graduate School' no longer exists as a separate identifiable entity. The decision to situate PGR within the Learning and Teaching Directorate was a deliberate choice to ensure PGR students are in the scope of service delivery and support, and to enable coordination with taught courses such as research training. The School considers that the new structure offers effective governance but that there is scope for more to be done in relation to the quality of PGR student support.

The majority (90%) of PGR students within the School are self-funded, that is self-funded or funded through external funding not administered by the School. Some students are funded by ESRC, including a recognised 1+3 route with a structured MSc training programme and an accredited ESRC MSc by Research in Science Technology and Innovation Studies (STIS). The student population includes a diverse international profile, although there has been a significant decline in EU students since 'Brexit'. The School also identifies diversity in the complexity of student needs, for example in coming from different educational settings but also in terms of inclusivity considerations such as students' external circumstances. The review team **commends** the School on attracting a high quality, diverse student population.

The School offers 14 PhD programmes, two MSc by Research programmes, and nine PhD programmes jointly delivered with international partners in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America. In addition, the School partners with the Scottish Graduate School of Social Science and the Scottish Graduate School of Arts and Humanities.

2   Enhancing the student experience

2.1   The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching

As noted above, the School has a number of joint programmes with international partners and in January 2025 launched a new online Sustainable African Futures programme with the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg with funding from the Mastercard Foundation.

The School's Research Training Centre (RTC) provides tailored core research methods training for postgraduate students and, specifically for PGR students, a research design course. Following a recent School wide portfolio review, the RTC closed its Advanced Methods Workshop offering due to low enrolment, with the aim of freeing up resources to fill a gap in qualitative methods teaching. There are plans for a further review of RTC provision this academic year (2024/25).

In addition, the School's research centres provide a variety of seminars and workshops, including writing and publishing workshops. Some areas also have activity specifically oriented towards fieldwork and careers. The review team

commends the writing up workshops which were particularly appreciated by students. The review team **commends** the 1st Year weekly PGR seminar as an example of good practice for building cohort identity. There were also examples of good practice in student-led activity, such as the New Directions Conference in Sociology which brings together staff and students to discuss the latest research and thinking.

The School had asked the review team to focus on research culture and community as a specific remit item for this review. Both staff and students appreciate the inter- and multi-disciplinary nature of the subject areas within the School. Therefore, PGR students' intellectual home may sit outside their subject area or research centre. Staff the review team met with reported that there was variable engagement with research seminars and events across the School. Students the review team met with said that it was difficult to find out about relevant events; they were aware of the weekly School newsletter but were unlikely to read it as they perceived it to be repetitive and more focused on logistical tasks. Students would also appreciate being able to find out more about staff research interests to help them in finding their intellectual home. The review team **recommends** the School considers opportunities to build on existing good practice within the School such as extending research group events and introducing standardised mechanisms so students can identify what research areas and activities staff are involved with.

The review team **recommends** the School considers the need for coherent, transparent and clear communications for both students and staff. The review team identified a positive move in the Communications Team developing the newsletter, however there may be opportunities for continued dialogue with students on what they need or would want to see in terms of communication (for example a calendar of events). The review team heard differing interpretations from staff on the reasons behind recent changes to Guaranteed Hours tutor allocations and considers that clearer communication would aid understanding of why these and future decisions are taken.

2.2   Assessment and Feedback

Key formal assessment and feedback points for PGR students occur at annual progression reviews. Currently, the School has a robust system in place for the first year annual progression review which includes an in-person meeting with the supervisory team and one or two colleagues external to the supervisory team – this may include the Postgraduate Adviser (PGA). In subsequent years however, the review is more akin to a supervisory meeting and, unless specific problems are identified and a repeat review is undertaken, there is unlikely to be any external representation.

The School had asked the review team to focus on supporting the PGR student journey and success as a specific remit item in this review. In the Reflective Report, the School had identified a large number of extension requests from PGR students and that around 90% do not complete within four years. This results in a number of challenges such as additional resourcing implications as there is no provision in the work allocation model for supervision beyond 4th year. There are also implications for students who go beyond four years in terms of funding, and visa implications for international students. There may also be missed opportunities within current annual progression review practice for checking on student progress and whether the supervisory relationship is working effectively.

The review team **recommends** that the School considers how annual progression reviews can be enhanced to ensure a shared understanding of a more robust requirement in every year of study, not just in 1st year. The School should consider developing key milestones to apply in all subject areas, and expectations on a written submission (including minimum word count) for each annual progression review. The review team considers this will help with completion times, support the PGR journey and evidence skills being gained through doing the PhD. The review team also considers that enhancements to annual progression review practice should be developed as part of a wider review of student support.

The review team suggests that in subject areas with a fieldwork component, a reflective piece on the fieldwork experience (for example what worked well or did not work well) could form a written submission at annual progression review. Other options could include an oral presentation, in addition to the written submission, and there may be value in adding an external panel member as a standard part of annual reviews in all subject areas.

The review team found that there appeared to be a lack of awareness among both staff and students about the option to include publications in a PhD thesis. Some students the review team met with recognised the importance of publishing articles in addition to the thesis in terms of employability, but were unsure whether they could include publications in their theses. The review team also heard that there were instances where supervisors had discouraged students from pursuing this option. The review team **recommends** that the School communicates to staff to ensure they are aware of the option to include publications in a PhD thesis, and how this works.

2.3   Supporting students in their learning

The key academic relationship for PGR students is with their supervisory team. Students the review team met with during the review visit were very positive about their experience of supervision. Supervisors the review team met with also reported that they enjoyed supervising students as a highlight of what they do. The review team **commends** the supervisors; students were very positive about their supervisors/supervisory teams and appreciated the support they received from them. The School has introduced a model whereby early career (ECR) staff can become involved as a third supervisor within existing supervisory teams. The review team **commends** the School on the third supervisor model as a development opportunity for ECRs.

Each subject area within the School has at least one Postgraduate Adviser (PGA), with two in larger subject areas. The PGA role was created to have oversight and support of supervisory arrangements. The PGA can also offer additional support for concerns around these arrangements, however limited resources can also mean that in practice this is a challenge, particularly in larger subject areas. The School has identified a lack of clarity around this role and plans to review this within the short-term. The review team **commends** the School on the PGA role as a positive development in supporting supervision arrangements.

The Student Development Office offers a PGR Support Fund to which students can apply for funding for fieldwork or to attend conferences. The review team heard that the fund had recently be reduced, and there may have been some issues with communicating this change. The review team **commends** the availability of the PGR Support Fund which is still generous compared to other institutions, despite the recent changes.

The review team heard some concerns from staff relating to student support structures, particularly in relation to the pastoral support available to PGR students. As the supervisory relationship is the key point of contact for PGR students, there was significant responsibility on supervisors as students were generally referred back to the supervisor as the source for any type of advice and support. Professional services staff were clearly engaged with and supportive of the PGR student experience, but expressed concerns that there was overreliance on voluntary effort to provide pastoral support and advice. There was clear evidence that the Head of Student Services was offering support beyond their remit for both students and supervisors.

The review team **commends** the professional services staff who are engaged with and committed to supporting PGR students and their experience. The review team **recommends** the School reviews its student support arrangements. Given the current model of student support, there is a risk of the supervisor becoming a single point of failure. A lot of responsibility is being channelled back to supervisors in terms of student support, both academic and pastoral. The School should ensure awareness and clarity of expectations of supervision for both staff and students and explore opportunities for enhancing or expanding the PGA role.

The review team **recommends** that the School and College consider how gaps in student pastoral support can be bridged; as noted above there appears to be a reliance on voluntary effort from professional services staff and a lack of clarity around mechanisms in place if the student-supervisor relationship breaks down. These recommendations are also intended to support the School's specific remit item on supporting the PGR journey. Developing student support systems is also linked to the recommendation on enhancing annual progression review practice as noted above in 2.2.

2.4. Listening and responding to the Student Voice

The review team met with PGR students from across subject areas and years during the review visit. Students were aware of the mechanisms available for them to provide feedback, however engagement with these dropped after the first or second year. Students explained that as they did not see any evidence of their feedback being acted upon, they felt that their voice was not heard, or was disregarded, and they were therefore disinclined to reengage. The review team heard from staff that SSLC minutes, where some feedback discussions are recorded, are published online; however students may not be accessing these.

The review team **commends** the School on improvements in PRES (Postgraduate Research Experience Survey) results which, although not yet at pre-pandemic levels of satisfaction, have seen an approximate 10% increase in overall satisfaction on the previous survey and are therefore moving in a positive direction.

The review team **recommends** that the School considers appropriate ways of closing the feedback loop for students, for example "you said we did", to ensure students are aware of how their feedback has been addressed. The School should consider mechanisms for increasing the visibility and communication of action taken in response to student feedback. This should in turn help to encourage students to engage with feedback mechanisms in future.

2.5   Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation

As noted above, the School has a diverse PGR student population. The School is also aware of potential challenges in relation to widening participation in PGR study, such as funding and scholarship availability. The review team noted that there is a lack of data in relation to widening participation at PGR level. The review team **recommends** that the Doctoral College explores how socio-economic data relating to PGRs can be captured. The review team considers that demographic data collected for PGR students should ideally, for the purpose of widening access, mirror that collected on undergraduate students. Enhanced data would support the School and the University in strategic planning to support widening access to postgraduate research study.

The School's EDI strategy is still under development and is intended to include elements specific to PGR. At the time of this review the strategy was still to be presented for approval by the management committee. The School is also introducing EDI training for PGR tutors from March 2025.

The School has dedicated space for PGR students with both hot desking and allocated desks in later years and for students with a recognised learning adjustment. The review team **commends** the School's efforts to provide suitable space and ensuring provision for students with learning adjustments.

2.6   Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes

The review team noted that the current higher education (HE) landscape is rapidly changing with the resulting impact on the availability of academic careers. Therefore, it is increasingly important for students to be able to evidence skills for alternative employment routes. Students the review team met with also recognised that they were facing an increasingly competitive job market, particularly in North America, where, for example, evidence of publication in addition to the thesis was perceived as essential. Raising awareness of the option of including publications in a PhD thesis is recommended earlier in this report.

The review team **commends** the clear existing employer links within the School and the School's efforts on supporting students into non-academic careers. Some subject areas are able to offer internships and there were examples of sessions for students where alumni come along to speak about their roles in, for example, NHS and Scottish Government. This type of activity supports student and staff awareness of non-academic career options. The review team **recommends** that, recognising the current HE climate, the School considers where there are opportunities to share practice across all subject areas to proactively prepare students for non-academic careers.

2.7   Supporting and developing staff

As commended above, the School has introduced a model to include a third supervisor in the supervisory team as a development opportunity for early career staff. Online supervisor training is available from the Institution for Academic Development and the School's PGR Director provides bi-annual in-person training sessions.

The review team met with staff supporting PGR students who are also employed as Guaranteed Hours tutors and a small number of Guaranteed Hours tutors during the

review visit. The School provides compulsory training for all new Guaranteed Hours tutors and there are a variety of optional training activities available from the Institute for Academic Development, the School and at subject area. Guaranteed Hours tutors can claim for 18 hours paid training per semester. The School had a system in place to provide for peer observation of tutoring several years ago, but this was currently dormant. Similarly a lack of resources for routine observation of tutoring by staff has curtailed activity. The Guaranteed Hours tutors the review team met with were aware that some informal peer observation of tutoring may be happening, but would value a more systematic approach particularly to observation by staff. There were also some informal opportunities to shadow more experienced Guaranteed Hours tutors which had been very helpful. The tutors felt that a more systematic approach to observation and shadowing would support their development as teachers and enhance the student experience of teaching.

Guidance provided in relation to courses appeared to vary and Guaranteed Hours tutors felt that it could be too generic. Specific guidance on the expected time for tasks such as marking and feedback would be appreciated. Guaranteed Hours tutors recognised the importance of feedback quality but were also aware of time constraints relating to marking and feedback. The review team heard evidence that Guaranteed Hours tutors may be unclear on what could be included in the paid allocation of time for preparation and considers that more consistent direction in course guidance would be beneficial. There also appeared to be a lack of clarity around student expectations of pastoral support from tutors. and further guidance to set expectations for both students and tutors may be useful.

The review team **recommends** that the School considers reintroducing consistent observation of teaching by staff and peer shadowing opportunities. Staff observation of Guaranteed Hours tutoring should be implemented to ensure there is at least one opportunity for tutors to be observed during their first year. This would support both the student and tutor experience. Furthermore, the School should consider setting consistent expectations on guidance available to tutors from Course Organisers.

2.8   Learning environment (physical and virtual)

The review team had a tour of the facilities during the review visit and was impressed by the physical space available to PGR students. This includes both work and social space with hot desking available to available to all SPS PhD students in the 'West Wing' and dedicated space for 3rd year FTE and above in 27/28 George Square. As commended in 2.5 above, the School ensures desk space is available for students with learning adjustments.

3   Assurance and enhancement of provision

The School has appropriate mechanisms in place for setting, reviewing and maintaining academic standards across PGR provision There is a well-structured governance and quality assurance framework, ensuring continuous improvement through PGR committee oversight, annual monitoring processes, student feedback mechanisms and alignment with national academic frameworks. There are appropriate collaborative agreements in place to support joint programmes.

Standards are maintained through annual programme reviews and quality reports incorporating student progression data and completion rates, and PRES survey results. SSLC findings inform ongoing quality enhancement processes in relation to PGR provision.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review

Programmes:
African Studies (ANTHUSIA) (PhD) (UoE lead) - 3 Years (Full-time)
African Studies (ANTHUSIA) with University of Aarhus (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-Time)
African Studies (ANTHUSIA) with University of Oslo (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-Time)
African Studies (MPhil) (Full-time)
African Studies (MPhil) (Part-time)
African Studies (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
African Studies (PhD) - 4 Years
African Studies (PhD) (Full-time)
African Studies (PhD) (Part-time)
African Studies (PhD) with Aarhus University (non-UoE Lead) - 3 Years
African Studies (PhD) with Aarhus University (UoE Lead) - 3 Years
Canadian Studies (MPhil) (Full-time)
Canadian Studies (MPhil) (Part-time)
Canadian Studies (PhD) (Full-time)
Canadian Studies (PhD) (Part-time)
EU External Action (Joint with UoC - UoE Lead) (PHD)
EU External Action (Joint with UoC - UoE not Lead) (PhD)
EU External Action (Joint with UoC - UoE not Lead) (PhD)
European Doctorate in Law and Development (EDOLAD) with Tilburg University (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-Time)
Global Health Policy (MSc)(R) - 1 Year
Global Health Policy (MSc)(R) - 2 Years (Part-time)
Global Health Policy (PHD)
Global Health Policy (PHD) - 6 Years (Part-time)
International Development (ESRC) (PhD)
International Development (PHD) (Full-Time)
International Development (PHD) (Part-Time)
International Public Health Policy (PhD) (Full-time)
International Public Health Policy (PhD) (Part-time)
Medical Anthropology (MSC)(R) (Full-time)
Medical Anthropology (MSC)(R) (Part-time)
Multi-level and Regional Politics (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Politics - Joint with Leuven (UoE Lead) (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-time)
Politics (MPhil) (Full-time)
Politics (MPhil) (Part-time)
Politics (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Politics (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Politics (PhD) (Full-time)
Politics (PhD) (Part-time)
Politics with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Politics with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Politics with Internship (ESRC) (PhD) - 4 Years (Full time)
Public Health Policy (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Public Health Policy (MSc by Research) (Part-time)- 2 Years
Public Health Policy (MSc by Research) (Part-time)- 3 Years
Science and Technology Studies (ESRC) (PhD)
Science and Technology Studies (MPhil)
Science and Technology Studies (MPhil) - Part-time
Science and Technology Studies (MSc by Research) (Full-time)

Science and Technology Studies (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Science and Technology Studies (Online Learning) (PhD) - 3 Years
Science and Technology Studies (Online Learning) (PhD) - 6 Years (Part-time)
Science and Technology Studies (PhD) (Full-time)
Science and Technology Studies (PhD) (Part-time)
Science and Technology Studies with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Science and Technology Studies with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Joint with KU Leuven) (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-time)
Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Joint with NUS - UoE Lead) (PhD)
Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Joint with NUS - UoE Lead) (PhD) PT
Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Joint with NUS - UoE Not Lead) (PhD)
Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Joint with NUS - UoE Not Lead) (PhD) PT
Social and Political Science (MPhil) - 2 years (Full-Time)
Social and Political Science (MSc)(R) - 1 Year (Full-Time)
Social and Political Science (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-Time)
Social and Political Science (PhD) - 6 Years (Part-Time)
Social and Political Science with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social and Political Science with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social and Political Sciences (MSc)(R) - 1 Year (Full-time)
Social and Political Sciences (MSc)(R) - 2 Years (Part-time)
Social and Political Sciences (MScR)
Social and Political Sciences (MScR)
Social Anthropology - Full Time (ESRC) (PhD) - 3.5 Years
Social Anthropology (Joint with KUL) (UNA Europa) (PHD)
Social Anthropology (Joint with PUC) (PhD)
Social Anthropology (MPhil)
Social Anthropology (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Social Anthropology (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Social Anthropology (PhD) (Full-time)
Social Anthropology (PhD) (Part-time)
Social Anthropology with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Anthropology with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Policy (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Policy (MPhil) (Full-time)
Social Policy (MPhil) (Part-time)
Social Policy (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Social Policy (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Social Policy (PhD) (Full-time)
Social Policy (PhD) (Part-time) - 6 Years
Social Policy with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Policy with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Work - Full Time (ESRC) (PhD) - 3 Years 3 Months
Social Work (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Work (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Social Work (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Social Work (PhD) (Full-time)
Social Work (PhD) (Part-time) - 6 Years
Social Work with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Social Work with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Socio-Cultural Studies (ESRC) (PhD)
Socio-Cultural Studies (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Socio-Cultural Studies (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Socio-Cultural Studies (PhD) (Full-time)
Socio-Cultural Studies (PhD) (Part-time)

Sociology - Full TIme (ESRC) (PhD) - 3.5 Years
Sociology (MPhil) (Full-time)
Sociology (MPhil) (Part-time)
Sociology (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
Sociology (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Sociology (PhD) (Full-time)
Sociology (PhD) (Part-time)
Sociology and Anthropology of Health and Illness (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
Sociology with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
Sociology with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)
South Asian Studies (MPhil) (Full-time)
South Asian Studies (MPhil) (Part-time)
South Asian Studies (MSc by Research) (Full-time)
South Asian Studies (MSc by Research) (Part-time)
South Asian Studies (PhD) (Full-time)
South Asian Studies (PhD) (Part-time)
Sustainable African Futures (MSC)(R)
Sustainable African Futures (PgCert)

Courses:
Sociology Postgraduate Research Seminar

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:

- Reflective Report
- PGR data report including applications, entrants, withdrawal and completion, demographics
- School annual quality reports
- Student staff liaison committee minutes
- Careers Service and Graduate Outcomes
- Degree programme tables
- Programme handbooks
- Supervisor information
- Research Training Centre information
- PRES student survey results and free text comments
- School external partnership information
- PGR progression and outcome data
- SPS PGR Strategy Review

During the review visit

- Internship information

Appendix 4: Number of students

Entrants for selected Programmes
(The number of students who enter on to the selected programmes each year.)

Programme	2024/25		2023/24		2022/23		2021/22		2020/21	
	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students	Entrants	Students
African Studies (PhD) (Full-time)	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	1	4	4
Global Health Policy (PHD)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0		2	2
Global Health Policy (PHD) - 6 Years (Part-time)	1	1	0				0		0	
International Development (ESRC) (PhD)			2	2						
International Development (PHD) (Full-Time)	6	6	1	1	6	6	2	2	4	4
Politics - Joint with Leuven (UoE Lead) (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-time)								1		
Politics (PhD) (Full-time)	16	15	10	10	15	15	20	18	15	15
Politics (PhD) (Part-time)	3	3	0		3	3	1	2	1	1
Politics with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)		1								
Politics with Internship (ESRC) (PhD) - 4 Years (Full time)	1	1								
Science and Technology Studies (ESRC) (PhD)			1	1	1	2				1
Science and Technology Studies (MSc by Research) (Full-time)	3	3	2	2	1	1	6	6	4	4
Science and Technology Studies (MSc by Research) (Part-time)							1	1	1	1
Science and Technology Studies (PhD) (Full-time)	2	2	2	2	3	2	6	5	4	3
Science, Technology and Innovation Studies (Joint with KU Leuven) (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-time)								1		
Social and Political Science (PhD) - 3 Years (Full-Time)	0		0		1	1	4	4	1	1
Social and Political Sciences (MSc)(R) - 1 Year (Full-time)	0		3	3	1	1	3	3	11	11
Social and Political Sciences (MSc)(R) - 2 Years (Part-time)					0		1	1	3	3
Social Anthropology (PhD) (Full-time)	4	4	2	2	8	8	15	15	10	10
Social Anthropology (PhD) (Part-time)	0						0		1	1
Social Policy (ESRC) (PhD)										1
Social Policy (PhD) (Full-time)	5	5	7	7	1	1	4	4	3	2
Social Policy (PhD) (Part-time) - 6 Years	0				1	1	2	2	1	1
Social Work (ESRC) (PhD)			1	1						2
Social Work (PhD) (Full-time)	3	3	2	2	1	1	4	4	4	2
Social Work (PhD) (Part-time) - 6 Years			1	1			1	1	0	
Socio-Cultural Studies (PhD) (Full-time)	0		0		0		1	1	1	1
Sociology (PhD) (Full-time)	12	12	9	9	7	7	10	10	18	18
Sociology (PhD) (Part-time)					1	1			1	1
Sociology with Internship (ESRC) (PhD)		1								
South Asian Studies (PhD) (Full-time)	2	2	3	3	2	2	0		1	1
South Asian Studies (PhD) (Part-time)	0		0				1	1		
Sustainable African Futures (MSC)(R)			48	48						
Total	**61**	**62**	**97**	**97**	**56**	**56**	**83**	**83**	**90**	**90**