

**The University of Edinburgh**

**Internal Periodic Review**

**School of History, Classics and Archaeology**

**Undergraduate provision**

**29 March – 1 April 2022**

## Contents

Executive summary.....	3
Key Commendations .....	3
Key recommendations .....	3
Commendations, recommendations and suggestions .....	4
Section A – Introduction .....	8
Section B – Main report .....	10
1 Strategic overview.....	10
2 Enhancing the student experience .....	11
3 Assurance and enhancement of provision .....	17
Appendix: Range of provision considered by the review.....	18

## Executive summary

This report comprises the outcomes from the internal review of undergraduate provision in the School of History, Classics and Archaeology.

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, 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 commended the School for its attentive and responsive approach to the student voice and for maintaining a sense of community under challenging circumstances during the pandemic. The review team was also impressed by the HCA Writing Centre initiative and the School's online learning resources, in particular HCA LEARN (encompassing programme handbook information). Detailed commendations are included in the report.

## Key Recommendations

The key recommendations identified by the review team for the School to prioritise are:

- **Consistency** – to ensure that students across the three subject areas have an equitable experience the School should:
  - establish set of baseline expectations and guidelines for key processes (such as marking, feedback, and staff training) across the three subject areas, monitor adherence to these standards, and enhance collaboration between the different subject areas at all levels (more shared teaching, research etc.).
  - appoint a dedicated School Deputy Head to support the Head of School and help drive forward change and monitor consistency of the student lifecycle across the subject areas.
  - ensure that all pre-Hons tutors have appropriate feedback training, that a more systematic feedback mechanism be implemented (e.g. using a standard structured template or cover sheet), and that they are all equally monitored and supported through the marking process.
  - undertake a strategic review of the type and volume of assessment being used across the three subject areas to replace the traditional examination.

## 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 <b>commends</b> the School for maintaining a sense of community under challenging circumstances.	1
2	The review team <b>commends</b> the School on the innovation of the CQA team, and the CQA team (and specifically Vicky Swann) for its systematic approach and 'game-changing' workload allocation spreadsheet.	1
3	The review team <b>commends</b> the School on its attentive and responsive approach to the student voice.	2.4
4	The review team <b>commends</b> Classics (and specifically Dr Lilah Grace) for insisting that, when invited to speak at a private school, children from the local state school are also invited to attend.	2.5
5	The review team <b>commends</b> the School on the HCA Writing Centre initiative.	2.5
6	The review panel <b>commends</b> the School on the Athena Swan Silver Award.	2.5
7	The review team <b>commends</b> the School, and in particular Anne Brockington the Tutor and Demonstrator Co-ordinator, for implementing a more consistent and systematic approach to supporting tutors and demonstrators.	2.7
8	The review team <b>commends</b> the School on its online learning resources, in particular HCA LEARN (encompassing programme handbook information).	2.8

### Recommendations:

Areas for development and enhancement (progress to be reported).

No	Recommendation	Section in report	Responsibility of
1	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the University prioritise good quality student social space for all students during the design stages of estates projects.	1	Space Strategy Group

2	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the CTP invites and encourages schools to share their proposals for how the future Edinburgh curriculum will be implemented locally.	1	Curriculum Transformation Programme
3	The Review team <b>recommends</b> that a dedicated School Deputy Head be appointed to support the Head of School and help drive forward change and monitor consistency of the student lifecycle across the subject areas.	1	School
4	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School establish a set of baseline expectations and guidelines for key processes (such as marking, feedback, and staff training) across the three subject areas, monitor adherence to these standards, and enhance collaboration between the different subject areas at all levels (more shared teaching, research, outreach activities etc.).	1, 2.2	School
5	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School undertake a strategic review of the type and volume of assessment being used across the three subject areas to replace the traditional examination.	2.2	School
6	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School ensure that all pre-Hons tutors have appropriate feedback training, that a more systematic feedback mechanism be implemented (e.g. using a standard structured template or cover sheet), and that they are all equally monitored and supported through the marking process.	2.2	School
7	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the University provides schools with clear and regular communication regarding the new Student Support system, particularly in regard to how the new system will be implemented and appropriately resourced.	2.3	Deputy Secretary Student Experience
8	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School explore ways of proactively involving students at all levels at key strategic stages in the decision making process.	2.4	School
9	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School sets out its WP aspirations and then	2.5	School

	asks Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA) and the University WP team to support the School to fulfil these aspirations.		
10	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the University support schools in addressing attainment gaps by setting institutional baseline expectations and sharing good practice.	2.5	University Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC)
11	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School encourages and supports tutors and demonstrators to gain accreditation by applying for Associate Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (HEA).	2.7	School
12	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School establish a forum or annual event where staff supporting PGR students can discuss issues and share good practice.	2.7	School
13	The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School works with the University to make more confidential spaces available to allow staff to meet students individually.	2.8	School

### Suggestions:

For noting (progress reporting is not required).

No	Suggestion	Section in report
1	The review team <b>suggests</b> that the School be more proactive in its interaction with the CTP by seeking to propose its vision for how the future HCA curricula will align with the preferred model.	1
2	The review team <b>suggests</b> that the School directly involve the SSLC to consult with students on decolonising the curriculum.	2.1
3	The review team <b>suggests</b> that the School host a Decolonise the Curriculum event to galvanise discussion and provide the initiative with momentum.	2.1
4	The review team <b>suggests</b> that the School proactively monitors the functionality of the lifts next to the quiet library and Common Room in the Old Medical Building and ensures that students are made aware (via clear and prominent	2.8

	signage and communication) of how the toilets next to these social spaces can be assessed.	
--	--	--

## Section A – Introduction

### Scope of review

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

The Internal Periodic Review of the School of History, Classics and Archaeology in 2021-22 consisted of:

- The University's remit for internal review
- The subject specific remit items for the review:
  - Decolonising the Curriculum
  - Widening Participation
- The Reflective Report and additional material provided in advance of the review
- 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: **Dr Inger Seiferheld**, Business School

External Member: **Professor Anna Leone**, Durham University

External Member: **Professor Kendrick Oliver**, University of Southampton

Internal Member: **Dr Michael Daw**, Deanery of Biomedical Sciences

Student Member: **Julian Mashingaidze**, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies

Review Administrator: **Brian Connolly**, Academic Services

### The School

The School of History, Classics and Archaeology is one of 11 schools in the College of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences (CAHSS). The School is divided into three departments – History, Classics, and Archaeology – each with its own head and Director of Teaching (History has two Directors of Teaching, one each for pre-honours and honours, and a Deputy Head). The budget is held by the School and most of the financial operations take place at that level, with small operational budgets for the departments.

### Physical location and summary of facilities

The School is located in the West Wing of the Grade A-listed Old Medical Building, in the Central Campus area. The interior of the West Wing was completely refurbished (at a cost of £14 million) between March 2009 and August 2010. New additions include several archaeology labs, high-tech lecture theatres, dedicated study areas with fold-away workstations and housing School book collections.

### Dates of previous reviews

Teaching Programme Review (TPR) Classics 14 & 15 November 2018

Teaching Programme Review (TPR) Archaeology 29 & 30 January 2015  
Teaching Programme Review (TPR) History 6 & 7 November 2014

### **Reflective Report**

The report was prepared by Professor Ewen Cameron (Head of School and Academic Lead).

## Section B – Main report

### 1 Strategic overview

Student numbers have gone through a period of substantial growth across the University in recent years. This was exacerbated by the effects of the pandemic on UK secondary school qualifications which led to a much higher proportion of applicants with conditional offers meeting those conditions and gaining entry in 2021. This context has placed significant pressure on the School's learning and teaching resources, in particular staffing (with nine new open-ended lectureships recruited) and the estate (now divided across three locations in the Central Area). However, the students that the review team met were appreciative of the approachable, responsive and dedicated academic and professional services staff across the School. The review team **commends** the School for maintaining a sense of community under challenging circumstances.

The review team noted concerns from students and staff that the Old Medical Building is not particularly conducive to fostering a sense of community. The review team noted that whilst the University has made a commitment to implement effective planning and monitoring of student numbers there remains a need for good quality communal spaces to help foster a sense of community. The review team **recommends** that the University prioritise good quality student social space for all students during the design stages of estates projects.

The School has increased the level of coordination between its three professional services teams, with the key innovation seemingly the establishment of the Curriculum and Quality Assurance (CQA) team. The CQA team has worked with the heads of department and their teaching directors to strategically plan the equitable distribution of workload across the School. To facilitate this process the CQA constructed a workload-projection spreadsheet (based on student numbers) to determine how many teaching hours and courses will be required in future years. The granular data analysis provided by the CQA team was central to the School's bids for the new teaching posts. The review team **commends** the School on the innovation of the CQA team, and the CQA team (and specifically Vicky Swann) for its systematic approach and 'game-changing' workload allocation spreadsheet.

The School noted concern that the University's Curriculum Transformation Programme (CTP) had effectively imposed a blight on the planning of new programmes due to insufficient detail regarding the eventual structure that will be imposed on subject areas. The School acknowledged that there has been extensive opportunities to contribute during the consultation stage of the CTP and that a preferred model (focused on fewer bespoke programmes and a greater concentration of major/minor programmes) had started to emerge. However, there remains a degree of frustration with the irregular and seemingly vague communications from the CTP project team and concerns as to the concrete implications of the preferred model on the School's curricula. The review team **suggests** that the School be more proactive in its interaction with the CTP by seeking to propose its vision for how the future HCA curricula will align with the preferred model. The review team **recommends** that the CTP invites and encourages schools to share their proposals for how the future Edinburgh curriculum will be implemented locally.

The review team noted that the School seems to operate as three significantly independent departments and that results in inconsistency and possibly duplicated effort. The review team was in agreement that there needs to be more collaboration between subject areas, with more sharing of teaching to balance out differences in student numbers and to provide a more diverse experience to students. The review team noted that the new cross-school research Centre for Late Antique, Byzantine and Islamic Studies is a good step towards this direction.

The students who the review team met also raised concerns about the inconsistencies of their experience of processes and procedures (see section 2.2 Assessment and Feedback) across the three subject areas of the School. The review team **recommends** that the School establish a set of baseline expectations and guidelines for key processes (such as marking, feedback, and staff training) across the three subject areas, monitor adherence to these standards, and enhance collaboration between the different subject areas at all levels (more shared teaching, research, outreach activities etc.). Within these expectations/guidelines there should be sufficient flexibility for each subject area to interpret and adapt as appropriate to the context of the discipline. However, students across the School must have an equitable experience of the processes/procedures governed by these expectations/guidelines.

The review team **recommends** that a dedicated School Deputy Head be appointed to support the Head of School and help drive forward change and monitor consistency of the student lifecycle across the subject areas. This role would be independent of subject level commitments, as opposed to the current approach with Subject Area Heads operating as de facto deputies, and be from a different subject area to the serving Head to help develop a more collaborative environment within the School. Additional resource for this role should be sought (possibly linked to the CTP) as opposed to drawing a staff member away from teaching duties. A key aspect of this role could be to ensure appropriate support is in place across the school for student transition to university, transition from pre-honours to honours, honours dissertation work, and into 'life after university' (see section 2.3).

## **2 Enhancing the student experience**

### **2.1 The approach to enhancing learning and teaching**

The review team was invited to consider the moves the School has made to decolonise the curriculum and suggest ways to take this initiative forward.

The School has made new appointments to posts in 'Gender History', 'History of Labour' and 'Black British History' in an attempt to broaden the curriculum and make it recognisable to as wide a constituency as possible. A working group has been established to analyse the work that other institutions have undertaken on the theme of decolonisation and seek to involve students and staff in the discussion across the School. The pre-Honours students that spoke to the review team seemed to have limited knowledge of the issues driving moves to decolonise the curriculum, while the Honours years students felt that they were not given enough room to explore topics outside the European sphere of influence. The students who met the review team noted that they had not been consulted but

would welcome initiatives to diversify viewpoints across the School. In particular they would appreciate opportunities to explore areas of interest to them without fearing the onus of academic risk if not aligned with faculty research interests or specialisms. Students want authentic engagement with decolonisation issues and would like academic staff to be prepared to cede control, feel challenged, and possibly uncomfortable. The review team **suggests** that the School directly involve the SSLC to consult with students on decolonising the curriculum.

The review team was in agreement that the School needs a strategic vision of where it aspires to be in order to provide this initiative with direction and drive. There is a once in a generation opportunity to align with the aspirations and resources of the CTP to ensure that the HCA, and University, curriculum is ready to meet the changing needs of the global student and economy over the next 15-25 years. The initiative should comprise not just the curriculum but also the delivery of the curriculum, as it will be essential to identify and consider underlying assumptions. The review team **suggests** that the School host a Decolonise the Curriculum event to galvanise discussion and provide the initiative with momentum. The event should draw on key external speakers, for a fresh perspective, and should seek to engage the student body from the planning stage through to driving forward any post-event initiatives.

## **2.2 Assessment and Feedback**

The School has a very diverse approach to assessment and feedback across the three subject areas.

Since the previous review there has been a noticeable move away from exams as the paramount form of assessment, which has been accelerated by the pandemic. Whilst celebrating the increased diversity of assessment the School acknowledges that it has taken a piecemeal approach and the implications of the shift away from exams should be considered in a more structured way. There are indications that the volume of essay assessments being used to replace exams is becoming unmanageable due to the dual constraints of staff time to mark and University calendar time needed to process the marks.

The review team **recommends** that the School undertake a strategic review of the type and volume of assessment being used across the three subject areas to replace the traditional examination. In particular the School should review the impact on student and staff workload, including clustering of workload, and on mark distributions resulting from any shift away from examinations. The School should seek to align this review with the ongoing CTP (to avoid any duplication of work) and share the outcome of the review with the CTP and, if appropriate, make proposals to the CTP for implementation. Consideration should be given to a range of assessment types beyond exam and essay such as oral presentations and collaborative group work (and the potential linkages between assessment design and the School's widening participation aspirations). While students, and staff, may not be used to these new assessment structures, exposure to assessments types other than essays and exams earlier in their academic life could enhance their skill-set and make it easier for them in the future.

The students who met the review team also reported concerns regarding the consistency of marking/moderation and feedback which they had experienced across the three disciplines. Inconsistency in marking is a significant student concern, with some students noting that they had been deterred from or inclined to certain courses due to the marking reputation of particular members of academic staff. The students also expressed a desire for timely and useful feedback structured to help them identify their strengths and weaknesses and improve their work. They felt that there had been a distinct difference between the inconsistent feedback that they had experienced in pre-Hons years compared to the quality of the feedback in the Hons years. At present the quality of the student experience seems to depend too much on the dedication of individual members of staff.

The review team was in agreement that the School needs a more consistent approach to marking/moderation and feedback across the three subject areas. The School must establish a set of baseline expectations and guidelines for key processes across the three subject areas and monitor adherence to these standards. Within these expectations/guidelines there should be sufficient flexibility for each area to interpret and adapt as appropriate to the context of the discipline. However, students across the School must have an equitable experience of the processes/procedures governed by these expectations/guidelines. The review team **recommends** that the School ensure that all pre-Hons tutors have appropriate feedback training, that a more systematic feedback mechanism be implemented (e.g. using a standard structured template or cover sheet), and that they are all equally monitored and supported through the marking process. The review team **recommends** that the School establish a set of baseline expectations and guidelines for key marking and feedback processes across the three subject areas and monitor adherence to these standards.

## 2.3 Supporting students in their learning

The School will be one of the pilots for the new system of student support replacing the current Personal Tutor (PT) system from the start of the 2022-23. In the new system pastoral support will be undertaken by expanded Professional Services teams and PTs will be replaced by new roles providing named-contact relationships for students.

The School expressed concern at the tight timescales for the implementation of the new system. In particular the short notification from the central project team of the key role descriptors of Cohort Lead and Programme Director (replacing the PT role) which came after the School's workload allocation planning for the forthcoming academic year. The School also noted concerns regarding the withdrawal of the PT role for new students (and with it the direct point-of-contact support link between student and academic), the potential for the new system to complicate student pathways to academic and pastoral support, and the extent to which the School's Student Support Office (SSO) team and the new Wellbeing Advisors will be prepared for the new system. For these reasons, the School proposes to retain PT support for the next academic year while working towards ensuring the basic level of support envisaged for the Cohort Lead and Programme Director roles. The review team noted student and staff concerns regarding current, and potential future, inconsistencies in student support across the School. The review team agreed that a key aspect of the recommended Deputy Head of School (see section 1) could be to provide strategic oversight of each part of the student lifecycle and experience at the School. This would entail ensuring that appropriate support is in place across the School for student transition to university, transition from pre-honours to honours, honours dissertation work, and into 'life after university'.

The review team noted that the PT is a key figure for students beyond university life, as the person they go to for references and advice, and therefore a mechanism would be required to allow students to have some direct links with members of the academic staff. The review team **recommends** that the University provides schools with clear and regular communication regarding the new Student Support system, particularly in regard to how the new system will be implemented and appropriately resourced.

## 2.4 Listening to and responding to the Student Voice

The School has a very attentive and responsive approach to issues when raised by students which seems to be working well at an operational level and is much valued by students. For example, in response to student feeling that advice about teaching and learning was rather scattered across the HCA website, the School introduced a Learn site ('UG Students in HCA') that gathers together everything students need to know about studying at the School, which is relevant to all students, whether they are taking one course or a HCA programme. The review team **commends** the School on its attentive and responsive approach to the student voice.

The students who spoke to the review team were aware of the Staff-Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) and the School's other formal mechanisms for student representation and agreed that they operated effectively. However, they

also expressed a desire to be more actively involved in the School's strategic decision making processes and were unaware of the new Student Voice Policy. The review team encourages the School to take a more proactive and expansive approach to SSLCs and academic student societies as consultative bodies for School initiatives. Furthermore, involving students during strategic decision making stages may help to build consensus and drive initiatives forward (for example, with the implementation of the Student Voice Policy or decolonising the curriculum). The review team **recommends** that the School explore ways of proactively involving students at all levels at key strategic stages in the decision making process.

## 2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation

The School recognises that its student body is much less diverse than it would like it to be and that there is much work to do at University level to admit students from more diverse backgrounds. The School points to contributory factors such as constraints imposed by the University policy on admission and unintended consequences of the 'free tuition' policy of the Scottish Government, which do not always serve to maximise the opportunities for students of Scottish domicile from state schools. The School also notes that current methodology, based on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) is a blunt tool for the essential objective of widening access to the Scottish universities.

There have been a number of initiatives within the subject areas aimed at Widening Participation (WP). In particular, the review team **commends** Classics (and specifically Dr Lilah Grace) for insisting that, when invited to speak at a private school, children from the local state school are also invited to attend. The review team **recommends** that the School sets out its WP aspirations and then asks Student Recruitment and Admissions (SRA) and the University WP team to support the School to fulfil these aspirations. The SIMD is a blunt tool, so instead the School should reach out directly to state schools in deprived areas across the Lothian region, Scotland and the UK (for example, by attending undergraduate student fairs) and convince them that HCA is where they should be.

The School recognises that all students who are admitted must have an equal opportunity to succeed. It is important that their support needs are understood (as these may be different from the School's traditional intake) and that these are systematically met during their time at the School (working in partnership with the central support services). The School has taken a number of initiatives to support a wider intake of students and the review team **commends** the School on the HCA Writing Centre initiative. Furthermore, the School is seeking to diversify its staff with the new teaching appointments (see section 1.2) and work towards Athena Swan awards. The review panel **commends** the School on the Athena Swan Silver Award.

The School acknowledges that there is currently an attainment gap for students of Scottish origin. The review team noted that the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity Committee (EDIC) and Senate Quality Assurance Committee were working to understand the underlying causes of awarding gaps and to share good practice with schools to address the issues. The review team **recommends** that the University support schools in addressing attainment gaps by setting institutional baseline expectations and sharing good practice.

## 2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes

The School has carried out extensive work in this area as graduate level employment figures were consistently lower than those of peer schools in the College and the University average. The School was successful in securing money from the Principal's Teaching Award Scheme (PTAS) for a project to address this issue by researching the needs of both students and employers in order to produce a better alignment between the HCA degree, research evidence from education and the workplace.

The School has also sought to overcome the perceived tension between academic rigour and the needs of employers. The HCA Careers Board was established to structure contact with the Careers Service and employability is embedded into the course approval process (for example History have included the "Skills Toolkit" in the curriculum to inculcate transferrable, work-based skills). The HCA mentoring programme has been particularly successful, with over 100 students matched up to mentors since 2016 drawn from a wide variety of sectors: museums, the media, the UK civil service, business and finance.

## 2.7 Supporting and developing staff

Many of the School's PhD students also have staff roles as tutors and demonstrators and the University has a dedicated [policy for the recruitment, support and development of tutors and demonstrators](#) (introduced in 2017) intended to ensure consistency in their experience. Currently schools are responsible for ensuring the delivery of training to postgraduate students who teach, with some support from the Institute for Academic Development (IAD). This provision is overseen by the Colleges via their researcher training committees and teaching and learning committees.

The tutors and demonstrators who spoke to the review team recognise the career development benefits of these teaching opportunities and welcome both the experience and financial support provided by the work. However, they also reported varying experiences in terms of the support (e.g. how to engage students; how to mark, grade, and feedback on work; and how to respond to pastoral needs of pre-Hons students) and the feedback (particularly in relation to their marking) that they received. The tutors and demonstrators noted that they are not particularly encouraged to obtain accreditation in teaching, although they are aware of avenues available to do so via the IAD training programme. The review team **recommends** that the School encourages and supports tutors and demonstrators to gain accreditation by applying for Associate Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (HEA). The School should provide students with advice on accreditation routes and ensure that students are encouraged and supported (e.g. allocated sufficient time) by their PhD supervisors. The review team noted that some schools have also supported internal cohorts for the Edinburgh Teaching Award (EdTA) scheme.

The review team **commends** the School, and in particular Anne Brockington the Tutor and Demonstrator Co-ordinator, for implementing a more consistent and systematic approach to supporting tutors and demonstrators. However, this good start should be built on by monitoring how effectively this support is being

delivered and by providing opportunities for staff to discuss and share good practice. The review team **recommends** that the School establish a forum or annual event where staff supporting PGR students can discuss issues and share good practice.

## **2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual)**

The review team **commends** the School on its online learning resources, in particular HCA LEARN (encompassing programme handbook information). The review team noted that there had been an ongoing debate within the School about the merits of lecture recording. However, the students that the review team spoke to were very positive about the School's move to lecture recording during the pandemic and would like this accessible approach to be maintained post-pandemic.

The School raised concerns that the dispersal of teaching space across campus hampers attempts to build a sense of identity within the subject areas and across the School. As noted above (see section 1) students noted concerns that the Old Medical Building is not particularly conducive to fostering a sense of community but they did value the School's dedicated social spaces, the quiet library and the bustle of the Common Room. However, some students noted concerns about the reliability of the lift and the accessibility of toilets near the dedicated social spaces. Whilst the School reported that both areas are fully compliant and accessible, the review team **suggests** that the School proactively monitors the functionality of the lifts next to the quiet library and Common Room in the Old Medical Building and ensures that students are made aware (via clear and prominent signage and communication) of how the toilets next to these social spaces can be assessed. Staff supporting students also noted concern that the School had a limited number of rooms that could be used to meet students for confidential discussions. The review team **recommends** that the School works with the University to make more confidential spaces available to allow staff to meet students individually.

## **3. Assurance and enhancement of provision**

The School operates within the University's Quality Framework and the review team is confident that academic standards are high. The School's approach to setting, maintaining and reviewing academic standards is appropriate. Standards are continually reviewed through External Examiner reports, student feedback and annual monitoring.

## **Appendix: Range of provision considered by the review**

Reflective Report

List of programmes and courses

Previous report & response

Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Subject Benchmark Statement:

- History
- Classics
- Archaeology

Personal Tutors statement

Academic Standards comments

Student Voice arrangements

Student Representation arrangements

Quality Assurance arrangements

School Quality Assurance Reports:

- 2020-2021
- 2019-2020
- 2018-2019

External Examiners summary reports:

- 2017-2021

School Organisation chart

School staff information

Programme Handbooks:

- Archaeology Honours
- Archaeology Pre-Honours
- Classics Honours
- Classics Pre-Honours
- History

Programme Specification Information

Applications, progression and performance data:

- Statistical reports
- Students Studying Abroad Figures
- Equality and Diversity Student Report
- School Graduate Outcomes Data

National Student Survey (NSS) 2021 results

Student Staff Liaison Committee meeting minutes (previous academic year):

- October 2020
- November 2020
- February 2021
- March 2021
- Archaeology - November 2020 & March 2021
- Classics November 2020 & March 2021
- History November 2020 & March 2021

University of Edinburgh Standard Remit 2021/22

Subject Specific Remit

Any comments received from external bodies/institutions/other Schools