

**The University of Edinburgh**

**Internal Periodic Review  
Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies  
(Undergraduate provision)**

26<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> April 2022

# Contents

The University of Edinburgh .....	1
<b>Internal Periodic Review</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Executive summary .....	3
Key Commendations .....	3
Key recommendations .....	3
Commendations, recommendations and suggestions .....	3
Commendations .....	3
Recommendations .....	4
Suggestions .....	5
Section A – Introduction .....	7
Scope of review .....	7
Review Team Members .....	7
The School .....	7
Physical location and summary of facilities .....	7
Date of previous review .....	7
Reflective Report .....	8
Section B – Main report .....	9
1 Strategic overview .....	9
2 Enhancing the student experience .....	9
2.1 The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching .....	9
2.2 Assessment and Feedback .....	11
2.3 Supporting students in their learning .....	11
2.4 Listening and responding to the Student Voice .....	12
2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation .....	13
2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes .....	13
2.7 Supporting and developing staff .....	14
2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual) .....	14
3 Assurance and enhancement of provision .....	15
Appendices .....	16
Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review .....	16
Appendix 2 – University remit .....	16
Appendix 3 Additional information considered by review team .....	17

## Executive summary

This report comprises the outcomes from the internal review of undergraduate provision in The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies.

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
- **suggestions** on how to support developments

The School will be asked to report progress on the recommendations to the Senate Quality Assurance Committee.

### Key Commendations

The review team commends the School for their proactive approach to improvement and excellence, the varied and extensive supports and resources in place that enhance the student experience and the sense of community and cohesion, which is intrinsic within the School. Further commendations are included in the report.

### Key recommendations

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

- **Hybrid approach to learning:** retain the advantages of online learning but ensure there is flexibility in the system to the benefit of students and to carefully manage the communication to staff and students on the transition to hybrid teaching.
- **Student Voice (SV) policy:** promote further awareness and understanding of the importance of the Student Voice in future educational developments amongst staff and students.
- **Redesigning assessment:** the School should continue to review assessment methods and implement suitable practices, with a keen focus on ensuring the quality and consistency of feedback. The review team recommends the Student Voice be involved throughout the process.

## 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 on its proactive approach to improvement and excellence in its provision.	1
2	The review team <b>commends</b> the School for its active monitoring of the curriculum and its strategic approach to combining knowledge, skills and professional attributes.	2.6

3	The review team <b>commends</b> the School for its response to the pandemic and its ability to provide an effective learning experience and support to the students throughout challenging times.	2.1
4	The review team <b>commends</b> the Student Support System in place within R(D)SVS and the commitment to the Personal Tutor role. The Support System is working effectively to support students throughout their time at the Dick Vet School.	2.3
5	The review team <b>commends</b> the sense of community that is evident at the School. The students valued and enjoyed the sense of community within R(D)SVS, including during the pandemic when virtual learning and virtual social events were imposed by restrictions.	2.1
6	The review team <b>commends</b> the cohesion between academic and professional services staff within the school, which enhances the overall operations of the School and underpins the student experience.	2.7
7	The review team <b>commends</b> the School's strong performance in recruiting and retaining staff.	2.7
8	The review team <b>commends</b> the School for its clear support and encouragement to both staff and students in obtaining a teaching accreditation.	2.7
9	The review team <b>commends</b> the School on the Digital Education Unit for its work in supporting staff and students.	2.8
10	The review team <b>commends</b> the work of the newly established Teaching and Learning Executive as it promotes good practice and encourages communication throughout the school.	2.3
11	The review team <b>commends</b> the role of Year Director appointed to each year of students within the school, and particularly the appointment of two Year Directors for final year students.	2.3
12	The review team <b>commends</b> the approach for re-evaluating assessment (a remit item for this review) which has shown consideration for students and is well thought out.	2.2

## Recommendations

Areas for development and enhancement – progress to be reported.

Priority	Recommendation	Section in report	Responsibility of
1	<p><b>Redesigning assessment (remit item):</b> The review team <b>recommends</b> that the school continues to explore ways to redesign assessment and is supportive of the proposed move to pass/fail assessment results.</p> <p>The review team also <b>recommends</b> that reflective practice as a form of assessment is introduced formally to students from first year.</p>	2.2	School
2	<p><b>Student Voice policy:</b> The review team recommends that the School further enhances the mechanisms to communicate to students on how</p>	2.4	School

	<p>their feedback is used and the reasons for when no action was taken.</p> <p>The school should work to increase student and staff understanding of the SV process.</p>		
3	<p><b>Return to campus (communication):</b> The School has progressed with its plans and strategies for their approach and the review team supports the decision to return to campus with face-to-face teaching and learning from academic year commencing 2022/23.</p> <p>The review team <b>recommends</b> that flexibility is incorporated into this approach to retain the advantages of online learning, and that communication on this topic, particularly with students, is carefully managed to address the reasoning and expectations for return to campus.</p>	2.1	School
4	<p><b>Return to campus (logistics):</b></p> <p>The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School ensures it is operating at full capacity if students are required to be present on campus for most/all their learning.</p>	2.1	School
5	<p><b>Support for Postgraduate Tutors and Demonstrators:</b></p> <p>The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School explores mechanisms to formalise the feedback loop between academic staff and Postgraduate Tutors and Demonstrators.</p>	2.7	School
6	<p><b>Wider community:</b></p> <p>The review team <b>recommends</b> that the School explores ways to build relationships with the wider University for the benefit of the student experience.</p>	2.1	School
7	<p><b>Central University:</b></p> <p>The review team <b>recommends</b> that a policy issued from the central University around hybrid learning and working would support the School as they progress with their plans for their return to campus.</p> <p>The review team <b>recommends</b> that the central University engages with the School with the aim of ensuring that the resources are most appropriate for the School and its needs.</p>	2.2	Senate Education Committee
		2.8	College

### Suggestions

For noting – progress reporting is not required.

No	Suggestion	Section in report
1	<p><b>Signposting of information:</b> The review team is confident that the School has useful and relevant documentation available for the benefit of students. The review team <b>suggests</b> that the School reviews the signposting for this information and the timeliness of when it is shared with students.</p>	2.3
2	<p><b>GAAFS:</b> The review team <b>suggests</b> that the School continues to explore ways in which the GAAFS programmes can be offered as electives elsewhere in the School, or in collaboration with other partners.</p>	1
3	<p><b>Technicians:</b> The review team <b>suggests</b> that there is continued progress and development of the “Technicians Commitment” within the University of Edinburgh to define a career pathway for this cohort.</p>	2.7
4	<p><b>Travel support:</b> The review team <b>suggests</b> the School explore ways to support students who do not benefit from a Young Scot travel pass with their travel costs.</p>	2.5

## Section A – Introduction

### Scope of review

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

The Internal Periodic Review of Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (Undergraduate Provision) in 2021/22 consisted of:

- The University's remit for internal review (see Appendix 2)
- The subject specific remit items for the review:
  - Hybrid approaches to teaching moving forward - getting the balance right
  - Redesigning assessment
- 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	Dr Celine Caquineau
External Member	Associate Professor Sue Rackard
External Member	Dr Freda Scott-Park
Internal Member	Dr Deborah Holt
Student Member	Alana Pradhan
Review Team Administrator	Sinéad Docherty

### The School

The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (R(D)SVS) sits within the College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine.

### Physical location and summary of facilities

The School is located at the Easter Bush Campus although this IPR took place online over Microsoft Teams.

### Date of previous review

3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016

## Reflective Report

Prepared and written by:

Susan Rhind (Director of Teaching – BVM&S)

Susan Jarvis (Director of Teaching – GAAFS)

Alex Seguino (School QA Director)

Lindsay Dalziel (Head of VTO)

Cat Eastwood (Deputy Head of School - Operations)

Gurpreet Grewal Kang/ Guraa Bergvist/ Geraldine Giannopoulos (Recruitment/ Admissions)

Claire Phillips (College QA Director)

Bernadine Cardoza, Sian Lexmond (Dick Vet Students Union/ DVSU presidents)

Calum MacIntyre (Association of Veterinary Students (AVS) Senior Vice President)

## Section B – Main report

### 1 Strategic overview

The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies (R(D)SVS) sits within the College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine and offers undergraduate degrees in BVM&S veterinary degree programme (5 year undergraduate programme as well as a 4 year graduate entry programme) and the BSc programmes run through the Global Academy of Agriculture and Food Security (GAAFS). Through the educational, research and clinical facilities, the School aims to improve the health and welfare of animals and humans, and to develop solutions to challenges relating to planetary health and food security.

Following the IPR, the review team **commends** the School on its proactive approach to excellence in its provision and improvement across the school. The School is in a solid position from which it can continue to build, and throughout the review has demonstrated its commitment to monitoring its provision and retaining its position as a top Veterinary School globally. The School is well resourced having made a number of new appointments and has upgraded its many of its facilities and systems since the last review. The largest revenue stream for the School comes from the students, and the School is continuing to invest in recruitment to attract the desired students. Over half of the students enrolled are from the EU or elsewhere overseas.

The current curriculum review cycle for BVM&S was delayed by the pandemic, but the implementation of the reviewed and updated curriculum is scheduled for 2023/24, and the review team has confidence in the School's infrastructure and expertise to successfully deliver this.

The School is concluding the GAAFS programmes; this decision was based on the difficulties around recruitment, SFC funding and the decision in 2020 by Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) to withdraw its collaboration in the programmes. More interest was shown towards the postgraduate offering and the School can focus on the PG course as well as intercalating across the wider university. The review team notes the value and expertise offered by GAAFS and supports the decision to retain the content. Indeed, the programmes may be offered again in future if the appropriate opportunities arise and the review team **suggests** that this is something the School should pursue.

### 2 Enhancing the student experience

#### 2.1 The approach to enhancing Learning and Teaching

As detailed in section 1, the review team commends the School for its approach to ensuring excellence in teaching and learning, and further **commends** the School for its response to the challenges of the pandemic, while providing support to students. The efforts made to transition to online teaching, to continue to engage with the students virtually and to accommodate in-person practical sessions as much as was permitted contributed to an effective learning experience in challenging circumstances.

The overall student experience has evidently been a focus of the remit item "Hybrid approaches to teaching moving forward - getting the balance right" and the review team is supportive of the School's decision to encourage a return of students and staff to campus. In addition to the practical skills, demonstrations and clinical work that students need to experience, the School promotes the value of the campus as a place to interact, communicate and benefit from peer-to-peer learning. The School's

commitment to a vibrant campus will enhance the student experience and afford opportunities for a better balance between curricular and extra-curricular activities.

The review team recognises that there may well be conflict and different expectations around hybrid teaching, and that after 2 years of studying and working from home (to varying degrees), there will be some unease around the expectation to return to campus. The review team **recommends** that some flexibility is incorporated into the planned return to campus to retain some of the advantages of online learning, particularly access to lectures online, which allow students to absorb information at their own pace. The review team **recommends** that communication to students and staff about the return to campus during this transition is carefully managed. Staff and students need to be aware of the expectations of the School and the reasons for the return to a physical presence on campus. The School should avoid undermining the message around hybrid teaching as face-to-face instruction is re-adopted.

Whilst the transition to online was necessitated by the pandemic, staff and students engaged positively with the School and its objectives over the last 2 years, no doubt recognising the tremendous efforts made to ensure that students were able to continue their education in unprecedented circumstances. The review team cautions the School against undermining this support when it conveys the need to return to on-campus attendance. It is suggested that the School should state that they recognise that students have developed an ability and an appetite for hybrid learning and the provision of post-delivery recorded lectures may offer an optimum way to study and work.

Furthermore, the review team **recommends** that the School ensures it is operating at full capacity if students are required to be present on campus for their lectures and practical learning. During the review, a student expressed frustration with two specific matters. One cohort of students had been told that in-person attendance at a lecture was mandatory but found there was lack of space in the main lecture theatre (due to social distancing measures) and an overflow lecture theatre with livestreaming was used to achieve capacity. The student pointed out that the cost to get to campus was considerable and they could have had the same experience studying at home, accessing the lecture live online. In the same session, it was pointed out that the library currently closed too early. However, the teaching team were able to reassure the review team that normal library opening hours were about to be reinstated so that students can maximise their time on campus.

The School highlighted that the lack of policy from the central University impedes their efforts to return to campus. Staff and students have been left unsure because there has been no clear direction from the University on in-person/hybrid teaching going forwards now that pandemic restrictions have been lifted. The School proposes that a university-wide policy, which distinguishes between hybrid and flexible working, would be helpful as they commence the transition back to campus-based work and study. This suggestion will be escalated to central University.

The review team **commends** the sense of identity and community that has been fostered within the School; students spoke very positively of their affinity with the R(D)SVS and felt more connected to the School than to the wider university (the review team spoke with a total of 6 students during this review). Despite the challenges raised by the pandemic, the School maintained its sense of community and is supporting social events now that in-person events can take place. The Vet Ball, Taste of Scotland event and staff barbeque are all intended to enhance the in-person experience for both students and staff.

The review team **recommends** that to enhance this further, the School explores ways to build relationships with the wider University so that students feel more integrated with the University of Edinburgh, in addition to their own School. The review team heard from students that timetable

clashes prevented them taking part in Fresher's Week activities and some social activities, and that they would appreciate more opportunities to integrate with the wider university. Discussions with EUSA, for example, might strengthen the relationship between the School and the wider student population and allow for more collaboration in events and socialising.

## 2.2 Assessment and Feedback

The School selected redesigning assessment as one of its remit items, and the review team **commends** the School on the approach so far which has shown care and consideration towards the students and their needs.

The current assessment techniques are broadly split into formal exams and in-course assessment, including start-of-module MCQs/end-of-module MCQs, in-course appraisals, literature reviews, continual assessment tasks, DOPs, OSCEs and a portfolio. The portfolio demands a reflective process, and the review team were unclear exactly if the students were developing this ability and if they were, where the students were learning this technique and how it was going to be further integrated into the course. The review team **recommends** that the process of academic reflection, widely used across medical and dental professions, should be started in the BVM&S Programme from first year.

The review team has confidence in the School's expertise and methodology to successfully redesign the assessment techniques but emphasises that a key aspect for success will be the quality and consistency of feedback provided to the students, and their ability to interpret that feedback. The review team **recommends**, as part of the redesigning assessment project, that multiple feedback mechanisms/templates be explored so that feedback to students is of a consistent standard. The review team also **recommends** that the student voice be present throughout the consultation phase.

In addition to ensuring consistency for students across the School, well-defined feedback mechanisms would be a valuable tool to staff. The review team heard from some staff that there can be trepidation with delivering poor marks and feedback to students who react badly. Once feedback templates are established and used consistently, students will adapt to receiving both commendations and constructive criticism. Once academic reflective processes are embedded in the student assessment, possibly through a portfolio, students will need their feedback on which to reflect. It is often advantageous to have less-than-perfect feedback for a successful reflection because it leaves much for the student to analyse and form a plan for improvement – the keystone to a successful reflection. Formalised feedback mechanisms/templates would provide support for staff to deliver this feedback and would create a standard to which students would learn to appropriately respond.

With regards specifically to exams, and the concept of pass/fail results, the review team acknowledges that a discussion with the international higher education establishments is needed to establish exactly if this could work to ensure that all students can enter further education or career streams that demand specific tiers of excellence.

The review team is supportive of the move to a pass/fail system but recognises that the change will be dependent on the quality of feedback across all academic years and every rotation, so that students can demonstrate their course achievements to progress into their postgraduate careers or further studies.

## 2.3 Supporting students in their learning

The review team **commends** the Student Support System in place within R(D)SVS and its commitment to the Personal Tutor role. Whilst the University of Edinburgh looks to implement the new Student

Support System from 2022/23, the School intends to keep the Personal Tutor arrangement due to the importance of students having a point of contact in a professional mentorship role. The support provided academically by the Personal Tutor will be supplemented by the centralised support services that the University will provide in the new model.

The review team also **commends** the Teaching and Learning Executive Committee that was established in 2021. This committee gives the School opportunities to strategise, to encourage cohesion across the School, to support practices around EDI, CPD and student supports, and to ensure that the provision affords the best opportunities to the students within the School.

The review team **commends** the role of Year Director, with a director appointed to each year of study and two directors appointed to the final year students. This role is vital for the ongoing communication between students and staff within the school. The directors proved to be an asset during the pandemic when they continued to make themselves available and remained visible to students.

During the pandemic, the School was proactive in supporting the welfare of students. With a significant increase in requests for support during the early months of the pandemic, the school launched a new app to manage student welfare cases. The app was rebranded from *Note of Concern* to *Request for Student Support*, and the app allowed students to “self-report”, as well as reporting concern on behalf of others. This was an efficient response to the increased demands on the system.

The review team found that the School had the necessary documentation, instructions and materials available for students but **suggests** that the School and course directors review the signposting of this information and the time at which it is shared. Feedback from students from some courses touched on not knowing quite where to look for information and improved signposting would help this although it was recognised that students need to take some responsibility for reading the signposts and the material.

## 2.4. Listening and responding to the Student Voice

The School has strong practices and mechanisms in place to engage with students and encourage their interaction. Students participate in several committees, and the dedicated Year Directors facilitate ongoing communication with each year group. Town Hall meetings regularly take place and offer an opportunity for students to raise queries and address concerns with the school. These meetings had been face-to-face but have recently taken place on Collaborate. The School acknowledged that the level of attendance at these meetings can be poor and has made efforts to incentivise students to attend.

The review team identified gaps in the shared understanding and communication of the Student Voice Policy across the School and **recommends** that the School explores ways to increase understanding of the Student Voice. The University of Edinburgh updated the Student Voice Policy in 2021 but the review team were unclear how or when the updates were communicated to students within the School.

The review team also **recommends** that the School explore ways to further enhance the mechanisms to communicate to students how their feedback was used and reasons when no action were taken. The review team is satisfied that the School does engage with students but a better understanding and formality on both sides would encourage more transparent and constructive communication and feedback. It would demonstrate to students the School’s process of listening and responding to feedback.

The review team heard from some students that they perceived the removal of the Vet School logo as an action which detracts from the School's community and identity, and they did not know why this action had been taken. Whether the decision was made by the School or the University of Edinburgh, the reasoning should clearly be communicated to students to establish a shared understanding of this action. As the identity and community of the School is something that is clearly valued by the students, any changes may become contentious and open and clear communication is the best way to manage this.

However, the School has demonstrated good practice in dealing with other concerns raised by students. The review team heard that mandatory meetings were scheduled for 4<sup>th</sup> year students as part of their Professional Development to address complaints that the School had received from this cohort. This was a proactive move by the School to respond to a challenge, although better use of the Student Voice Policy may improve the feedback loop between students and the School and avoid mandatory meetings being required in future.

## 2.5 Accessibility, Inclusivity and Widening Participation

The school raised a concern in relation to the socio-economic barrier of the EMS requirement; 38 weeks additional study is challenging for those from lower socio-economic background although this is outside of the School's control. The RCVS is reviewing the requirement to complete this volume of EMS training.

A concern raised by the students involved travel arrangements to and from campus. There is understandable hesitation around the expectation to fully return to campus following two years of hybrid teaching, and logistical concerns around public transport to and from campus. Although the school currently partially subsidises bus passes for all students, the introduction of the Young Scot card that provides free travel for individuals aged 21 and under, has introduced an inequity. The review team **suggests** that the School explores the possibility to increase the subsidy for older students.

## 2.6 Development of Employability and Graduate Attributes

The School consistently demonstrates awareness of the employment landscape facing students and has shown consideration of the practical and soft skills that graduates need to be able to apply in their employment, in addition to the knowledge that they obtain throughout their studies. A focus on "Day 1 competencies" is built into the programme to equip students with the skills required in the workplace.

The RCVS Committee with responsibility for the accreditation of the veterinary degree programmes has recently stated in the 2023 standards and guidance that 70% of the clinical education delivered by the School must focus upon casework in the 'general practice' context. This was acknowledged by the Head of School in the initial session of the review. Since this reflects the reality of veterinary practice in society, this is to be applauded and the review team is confident that the School will absorb this guidance into their teaching construct.

The review team **commends** the School for its strategic approach to combining knowledge, skills and professional attributes. The review team recognises that this will support graduates and prepare them for the workplace.

Students enrolled on the BVM&S Programme are mandated to complete 38 weeks in Extra Mural Studies (EMS) to develop their skills and knowledge in a work-based environment. Completion of this EMS training is a requirement for the student to graduate.

In GAAFS programmes, the curriculum includes a course each year on developing Professional Skills (business, policy, research, career and communication skills) to support transition to the workplace. Further to this, students on the GAAFS programmes complete a work placement in their 3<sup>rd</sup> year and complete a reflective report to identify strengths and gaps in their skill set. Whilst the GAAFS programmes are due to be concluded, the review team recognises the extent to which the programmes have supported the workplace skills of their students.

## 2.7 Supporting and developing staff

Overall, the review team heard that working within R(D)SVS is a positive experience where staff largely feel supported and well equipped to perform their role. There is a coherent and collegiate dynamic between the academic and professional services staff that enhances the student experience and contributes to the success of the school, and the review team **commends** the staff for their cohesive working environment.

The review team met with several postgraduate tutors and demonstrators, and they spoke positively of the support they received in their roles. They had good relationships with their mentors and a positive sense of their own professional development. Postgraduate tutors and demonstrators complete an induction and have a dedicated LEARN area with guidance and resources. The review team **commends** the School for its encouragement towards postgraduate tutors obtaining a teaching qualification.

The review team does **recommend** that the School formalises the feedback loop and monitoring between postgraduate tutors, demonstrators and academic staff to ensure consistent standards and support. This would also allow staff to use that feedback for job/promotions applications and career development opportunities.

The review team noted that the technicians hold a great deal of knowledge and are supportive to academic staff, and as such are an invaluable resource within the school. Technicians can generally progress to grade 5 level but there appears to be a barrier to their career progression beyond this point. The review team **suggests** development of the “Technicians Commitment” from the University of Edinburgh to re-define a career pathway for this cohort that recognises the value of their work and encourages them to stay in their roles.

Finally, the review team **commends** the School’s success of recruiting and retaining staff, which it sees as testament to the School’s excellent reputation and working environment.

## 2.8 Learning environment (physical and virtual)

The School has invested in its estate since the last review, and whilst the review team were unable to visit the site during this online review, details that outlined changes, investments and upgrades to the campus were included in the review documentation. Students representing both the undergraduate and postgraduate cohorts spoke positively of the Easter Bush campus as a learning and social environment, despite its distance from Edinburgh city centre and the central University.

The review team **commends** the Digital Education Unit (DEU) that operates within the School and provides pedagogical advice as well as technical teaching support. The DEU has been an asset to the

School, particularly during the pandemic when teaching moved online, and the DEU will continue to be a huge support to the school as it develops its hybrid teaching approach.

Furthermore, the implementation of the new PROVET system that allows students to interact with clinical data is an asset for students and the access to clinical, practical skills from the start of the course is also valued by students.

Staff and students shared some frustrations with the platforms and tools they have in place. One example is the Pebble Pad system, which is a resource bought into by central University. The School now faces the challenge of moulding their requirements to a system which is not fit for their purpose, rather than having access to an agile platform that supports their needs. Another example is the timetabling system; the central University has a universal timetable for students but during the pandemic the School moved to manage its own timetable to allow for swiftly changing circumstances. This duplication did cause some confusion for students in terms of not knowing where to go, or if classes were online or face-to-face, and left the impression of poor organisation.

The review team **recommends** to the central University that it engages with the School to discuss their specific needs and supports School autonomy wherever possible to allow the School to manage and source its own systems to provide efficient teaching and learning.

### 3 Assurance and enhancement of provision

The Schools operates within the University Quality Framework and has the appropriate mechanisms in place to monitor and maintain its academic standards and quality of provision.

Furthermore, the School's BVM&S Programme is accredited by all major international accrediting bodies for veterinary medicine including the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS), the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), the Australasian Veterinary Boards Council (AVBC), the South African Veterinary Council (SAVC) and the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE).

As part of this ongoing accreditation the curriculum is reviewed every 7 years and in addition to this, the School engages in ongoing monitoring and review of the curriculum in line with the University's QA policies and guidelines.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Range of provision considered by the review

### Undergraduate Programmes:

- Agricultural Economics BSc (Hons) - 4 Years (Full-time)
- Agricultural Science (Animal Science) BSc (Hons) - 4 Years (Full-time)
- Agricultural Science (Crop and Soil Science) BSc (Hons) - 4 Years (Full-time)
- Agricultural Science (Global Agriculture and Food Security) (BSc (VetSci) (Hons))
- Agricultural Science (Global Agriculture and Food Security) BSc (Hons) - 4 Years (Full-time)
- Veterinary Medicine (Clinical) (BVMS)
- Veterinary Medicine (Clinical) (Graduate Entry) (BVMS)
- Veterinary Medicine (Preclinical) (BVMS)
- Veterinary Medicine (Preclinical) (Graduate Entry) (BVMS)

## 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**

- Reflective Report
- Subject Specific Remit Item
- School Quality Assurance Reports 2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2020-2021
- External Examiners Summary Reports 2017-2021
- School organisation chart
- School staff information
- Global Academy staff list
- BVMS key roles
- Programme Handbook
- Stats report
- Graduate outcomes report
- SSLC meeting minutes 2020-2021
- National Student Survey (NSS) results 2021
- University of Edinburgh standard remit 2021-2022