A. Introduction

1. The Teaching Programme Review (TPR) of Oral Health Sciences at the University of Edinburgh is part of the University’s Quality Assurance procedures, and is complemented by the Senatus and College Quality Assurance Committees’ monitoring and reporting, and by the External Examiner system.

2. Range of provision considered by the review: BSc (Hons) in Oral Health Sciences.

   The TPR consisted of:
   
   • The University’s standard remit for internal review: community.
   
   • The College remit items: student support; sustainability of the programme; and gender balance of students and staff.
   
   • The subject specific remit for the review: inflexibility in timetabling clinical sessions; and student access to radiography.
   
   • Remit items from students: integration with the University of Edinburgh; timetabling of lectures; and assessments.
   
   • The analytical report prepared by Oral Health Sciences and additional material provided in advance of the review (additional material listed in Appendix 1).
   
   • The visit by the review team to Oral Health Sciences, including consideration of further material (listed in Appendix 1).
   
   • The TPR report produced by the review team.
   
   • Following the review, action by the programme and others to whom recommendations were remitted.
   
   • Membership of review team:

     Dr Gale Macleod (Moray House School of Education)  Convenor
     Professor Janice Ellis (University of Newcastle)       External Member
     Mrs Angela McGee (Glasgow Dental Hospital and School) External Member
     Dr Peter Kirsop (School of Chemistry)                 Internal Member
     Mr Ivan Paspaldzhiev (School of GeoSciences)         Student Member
     Ms Nichola Kett (Academic Services)                  Administrator

3. Oral Health Sciences is the only undergraduate programme located solely within the School of Clinical Sciences which is one of four schools within the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine. The programme is run by the Edinburgh Dental Institute.
4. Subject area staff are based within the Edinburgh Dental Institute in Lauriston Place where teaching activities (theoretical and clinical) mostly take place. In year four of the programme, students attend three outreach clinics in centres across NHS Lothian, Fife, and Forth Valley.

5. The programme started in September 2009 and this is its first review.

6. The analytical report was prepared by Margaret Ross (Programme Director), Joanne MacLeod (Lecturer), Eilish Duffy (Lecturer), Zoe Coyle (Lecturer), and Elaine Fairchild (BSc (Hons) Programme Co-ordinator, hereafter referred to as Programme Co-ordinator). Student representatives were involved in the production of the report.

Margaret Ross acted as TPR Liaison for the review.

B. Main body of report

1. Management of the student learning experience

1.1 Effectiveness of the review area's approach to the management and resourcing of learning and teaching experience

1.1.1 Edinburgh Dental Institute (EDI) is a unique self-contained organisation at the University of Edinburgh within which the Oral Health Sciences (OHS) programme is run. The programme is funded through a tripartite service level agreement between the University, NHS Education for Scotland (NES), and NHS Lothian.

1.1.2 NES manage the funding provided by the Scottish Government for dentistry education and training, and funds the majority of the OHS programme, the facilities in the building, and postgraduate trainees and lecturer posts and the Programme Co-ordinator's post. EDI receives no funding from the Scottish Funding Council.

1.1.3 The programme is owned by the School of Clinical Sciences which is one of four schools in the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (MVM). Within the School of Clinical Sciences, the Head of School's responsibility for learning and teaching resides at postgraduate level and responsibility for the OHS programme, which is the only undergraduate programme wholly owned by the School, has been delegated to the Director of EDI. The Programme Director is responsible for day-to-day delivery of the programme’s learning and teaching and quality assurance and enhancement activities.

1.1.4 The Review Team commends the commitment of the Programme Team to delivering a programme which produces high quality Dental Hygiene Therapists.

1.1.5 All educational and clinical facilities within EDI are owned by NHS Lothian with the University and NES contributing to rental of rooms and running costs of teaching facilities. There are competing demands on rooms which are managed through a shared timetabling facility. OHS students have priority access to a dedicated ten chair clinic. The students that met with the review team reported that a number of lectures had been cancelled and moved at late notice and that too many gaps are left within the timetable (including within clinical time), leading them to feel that the programme is not well organised. The Programme Team advised that lecture dates and times are changed when staff cannot attend through illness, being delayed or when they are required in theatre. With the support of the Programme Team, the Programme Co-ordinator is working on systems to improve timetabling, for example, by developing a timetable template for external lecturers and organising the timetable in advance of the next academic year. The students greatly value the use of Google calendars and the Programme Team plan to continue to use these.
1.1.6 **The review team recommends** that the Programme Co-ordinator, along with student involvement, undertakes a regular audit of timetable changes to establish if there is an issue with last minute changes to be resolved.

1.1.7 **The Review Team recommends** that the Programme Team explores ways to facilitate the use of the potential afforded by gaps in clinical time created by patient non-attendance, for the further enhancement of student learning.

1.2 **Key features of the learning and teaching experience**

1.2.1 The OHS programme combines dental science with clinical activity and research, and students attend a variety of theoretical and practical sessions.

1.2.2 **The Review Team commends** the clinical and pre-clinical facilities and the opportunities that students are given to work with other members of the dental team as part of the programme.

1.2.3 The review team heard from staff and students about the challenges OHS students face integrating with the wider University. The main reason for this is that the programme has a small cohort of students who are physically present in a building with limited University functionality and with little uncommitted study time. Additionally, OHS students are not part of a wider dental school which, in other institutions, would provide them with opportunities for integration with students on other undergraduate programmes. EDI does have postgraduate students that OHS students interact with on a clinical basis but not socially. Students reported that they had not appreciated that their location in EDI and being fully timetabled for clinics and classes would lead to feelings of isolation from the rest of the University.

1.2.4 The Programme Team have worked hard to develop opportunities for students to attend joint teaching with MBChB and veterinary students and are hoping for a similar arrangement with nursing. The students that met with the review team welcomed the efforts of the Programme Team to create opportunities for further integration with other students across the University.

1.2.5 EDI staff have limited involvement with teaching on other University programmes within veterinary medicine and nursing. The College of MVM will be restructuring from August 2015, with the creation of a single School of Medicine and devolved responsibility to three Heads of Deaneries. The review team **encourages** the Programme Team to pursue opportunities for further integration of OHS students through the College restructuring.

1.2.6 **The Review Team commends** the Programme Team for facilitating Oral Health Sciences student interactions with students from other programmes across the University and encourages them to continue to explore further meaningful opportunities for such integration where appropriate.

1.2.7 There is evidence that students undertake a wide variety of assessments throughout the OHS programme, including: critical appraisal, literature review, dissertation; structured short answer tests; objective structured clinical examination; and directly observed procedures. Students are also expected to undertake a proportion of self-directed learning. The MBChB Assessment Officer has oversight of the assessment procedures for the programme.

1.2.8 Staff advised that students undertake academic writing throughout the programme, with each assessment designed to build to the next. Students would welcome more practice in academic writing in years one and two of the programme, further guidance on the requirements for the literature review and dissertation, and on the level of support they can expect to receive from their dissertation supervisor.
1.2.9 To date, all student dissertations have consisted of desk-based research due to the complications associated with obtaining ethical approval for clinical research, however, the Programme Team are keen to develop and extend the options available to students.

1.2.10 Students undertake outreach placements in their final year, where they rotate between three centres. By fourth year, students have developed most of the clinical skills required of the General Dental Council and these placements allow consolidation of this skill set. Outreach centres cater for patients who can’t access treatment through a dental practice. Outreach placements provide students with real life experience, enabling them to develop their decision-making skills, to manage appointment diaries, to work with patients who have particular needs, to get to know patients, and to have a good balance of paediatric and adult caseloads.

1.2.11 Ahead of each placement, students attend an induction day at each outreach centre and are supported by Centre Supervisors and Clinical Supervisors who themselves attend staff training days at EDI. EDI staff visit outreach centres and there are two outreach meetings held per year. The NHS Lothian Placement Contacts have annual reviews with their NHS line manager but also have annual meetings with the Programme Director.

1.2.12 Outreach placements are discussed at Personal Tutor meetings with students and logbooks are kept. If issues are experienced with or by a student on their outreach placement these would be discussed with the appropriate member of staff. There is a process in place for incident reporting and the Programme Co-ordinator would disseminate such information accordingly.

1.2.13 Students with additional clinical training or personal needs on outreach placement discuss these with their Personal Tutor and appropriate adjustments are implemented. This procedure has worked to successfully support students with allergies in the past (see commendation under 1.7). Programme staff would liaise with University support services as appropriate to support students.

1.2.14 The review team heard from staff and students that outreach placements develop students’ confidence in their clinical skills and are greatly valued by students.

1.2.15 The Review Team commends the organisation of the outreach placements.

1.2.16 In relation to the sustainability of the programme, the Chief Dental Officer ultimately determines the numbers of students training on dental programmes across Scotland. It is not anticipated that student numbers will change in the near future. It would not be possible to increase the number of students on the OHS programme without additional funding to increase the number of dental chairs within EDI. There would also be issues obtaining the appropriate number of patients for an increased number of students as, unlike a dental school, EDI does not have a large regular supply of patients who require primary care level treatment. Special arrangements are in place to recruit suitable patients for the current student numbers.

1.2.17 The Programme Team clearly communicate the expectations of students with regards to their professional approach, for example, in relation to attendance requirements, standard of dress and presentation, patient interaction, and the appropriate use of social media.

1.2.18 The Review Team commends the Programme Team for instilling a professional approach within students from the very start of the programme.

1.3 Key features of (and trends in) the student population and implications for learning and teaching
1.3.1 The small cohort of students on the programme means that they know each other well, however, it also presents issues for ensuring anonymity. As student cohorts are small, it is easy to identify students who are not engaging with the programme so that appropriate support can be given. Absences are reported to the Programme Co-ordinator and discussed at the weekly Team Meetings.

1.3.2 The small core Programme Team also presents challenges, for example, if students wish to discuss an issue with a member of staff who may be both their lecturer and their Personal Tutor. Students are unsure to whom they should talk in certain scenarios. There is a ‘raising concerns’ procedure in place but this is primarily for staff who have concerns about students and students who might have a concern about another student. Additionally, the review team heard that students were unclear about the procedures associated with raising confidential matters and were seeking reassurances that such matters would be dealt with appropriately. The Programme Team may wish to consider engaging an independent member of staff who is external to the programme who could oversee certain situations which arise due to the involved relationship between staff and students.

1.3.3 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team clarifies the procedure for students raising concerns with staff, including how concerns will be dealt with whilst maintaining confidentiality, and ensures that students are aware of the availability of staff from outwith the programme to whom they may go to discuss matters.

1.4 Effectiveness of the review area’s approach to supporting students in their learning

1.4.1 Students attend a full induction programme which occupies the majority of Freshers’ Week and therefore can restrict the ability of students to engage with University wide activities. Continuing students have a re-induction meeting in Freshers’ Week during which a presentation is given on programme updates, including: new staff; programme changes; changes to procedures; and updates on conferences and other opportunities for students to get involved. The review team heard that students value the induction and re-induction activity.

1.4.2 The Review Team commends the Programme Team’s initial approach to student induction and re-induction activity and would encourage them to continue to develop this.

1.4.3 The Programme Team tries to ensure that Wednesday afternoons are kept free from core teaching and clinical skills activities wherever possible, however, the students that met with the review team advised that there were quite often activities taking place at this time.

1.4.4 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team allow students time to participate in University activities such as Freshers’ Week, sports and societies (on Wednesday afternoon), and Innovative Learning Week.

1.4.5 There are three Personal Tutors and one Senior Personal Tutor within the programme. Students meet with their Personal Tutor in scheduled meetings at the beginning of each semester, where they receive feedback on their academic progress. A form, tailored to individual years, is emailed to students in advance and is used at these scheduled meetings to encourage students to engage in reflection and personal development planning. Students request additional meetings with their Personal Tutor using MyEd or email and meetings are normally organised promptly, and certainly within a couple of days. Urgent matters would be referred to another member of staff if a student’s Personal Tutor was unavailable. If there were any issues with their Personal Tutor, students would be asked to discuss this with the Senior Personal Tutor or the Programme Director if their Personal Tutor was the Senior Personal Tutor. As the majority of year groups have the
same Personal Tutor, group meetings are easily organised. Personal Tutors make use of the EUCLID IT Tools to schedule and record meetings with students.

1.4.6 Students were complimentary about the Personal Tutor system and are confident that they can see their Personal Tutor promptly. All the Personal Tutors met with the review team and were confident of their ability to support students with pastoral issues and to signpost University support services to students accordingly.

1.4.7 In relation to the gender balance of the Personal Tutor staff, all are female. It is recognised that this may sometimes be an issue and staff check with male students to establish if they would be more comfortable discussing certain matters with a male member of staff and would facilitate this where necessary.

1.4.8 The Review Team commends the Programme Team for the successful implementation of the Personal Tutor system and for the use of the IT Tools for enhancing and recording student engagement.

1.4.9 Students receive multiple and timely feedback throughout their programme. University regulations on feedback turnaround are met and often exceeded. Students also receive feedback on their academic progress in scheduled Personal Tutor meetings which take place at the beginning of each semester and students can request additional feedback from their Personal Tutor at any time. Students advised that they were no longer able to get feedback on individual exam questions which they greatly valued in the past. Students are given mock exams in the early years of the programme and would like more of these in the final years.

1.4.10 In their clinical skills work, students receive almost immediate feedback on their performance using a recently reviewed form which has been simplified and encourages more dialogue with students.

1.4.11 The Review Team commends the Programme Team on the multiple and timely provision of feedback to students on their clinical skills work.

1.4.12 In September 2015, the Programme Team will implement a comprehensive electronic portfolio system ‘iDentity’ which will enhance the student learning experience by centralising student performance information (including clinical activity), providing feedback to students on their performance, evaluating and supporting student progress, and assisting student reflection on their strengths and areas for future development.

1.4.13 The Review Team commends the commitment of the Programme Team to developing new ways of working and supporting student learning and teaching, as evidenced by the introduction of the e-portfolio system ‘iDentity’.

1.4.14 The Programme Team have engaged with an Edinburgh University Students’ Association initiative and introduced academic families, with three groups of mixed-year students. The students that the review team met identified this as a good initiative in theory but felt that in practice it has been very difficult to organise events and is more about social than academic activities.

1.4.15 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team ensure that adequate academic and administrative support is provided for the facilitation of the academic families initiative in order to ensure its potential for providing academic support is maximised.

1.4.16 Students have their own common room which is well used and serves as a study area and social space but was felt to be quite small. Social media is used by students to build communities. Students would welcome more social interaction with College of Medicine
and Veterinary Medicine students. The review team heard that both students and staff aspire to start a student society and would encourage them to pursue this.

1.4.17 The students that met with the review team advised that they are clearly informed about the course structure and assessment processes and liked the content of the programme which they recognised as being a thorough preparation for future employment. They would welcome further clarification on marking criteria which is currently being developed by the Programme Team as part of their extensive development of the Learn Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). A new student programme handbook for academic session 2015/16 is also in development. Students advise that the programme structure prepares them very well for practical assessments but would welcome more preparation for end of year exams. Additional revision sessions are offered to students before exams or clinical sessions and these are appreciated.

1.4.18 Throughout the visit, the review team heard differing accounts from staff and students which indicated that communication to students by staff would benefit from review and enhancement. Primarily, this related to: when lecture timetable changes would be communicated and why the changes were made (1.1.5); the learning opportunities available to students when patients do not attend clinics (1.1.5); the workings of the Student Staff Liaison Committee (2.3.3); the opportunities students have to develop their academic writing in the early years of the programme (1.2.8); the type of exam feedback that students receive (1.4.9); and the procedure for raising concerns (see 1.3.2).

1.4.19 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team develops clear communication mechanisms with students which are followed and understood by both staff and students.

1.5 Effectiveness of the review area’s approach to promoting the development of graduate attributes

1.5.1 The funding contributions for the programme from NES and NHS Lothian are for a three year programme but the University provides additional funding from student fees for an honours year to enable students to maximise the development of graduate attributes through clinical practice and the dissertation.

1.5.2 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team explores how to maximise the opportunities provided by the four year degree. This may be through providing alternatives to desk-based research for the dissertation or by students taking courses from other areas of the University.

1.5.3 Students are encouraged to attend conferences throughout the programme (which promotes professional interaction and networking), to enter student competitions and to join professional bodies. Students would welcome more careers talks earlier in the programme and advance notice of the application deadline for vocational training.

1.5.4 The Review Team commends the Programme Team’s approach to supporting students’ continuing professional development throughout the programme, through attendance at conferences, student competitions, and membership of professional bodies.

1.5.5 With regards to international students, the number of countries where graduates can practice is limited, however, reciprocal agreements are developing which will enable recognition of qualifications.

1.6 Effectiveness of the review area’s approach to managing the learning environment
1.6.1 The review team heard that student access to radiology is a challenge, as it has recently moved to another directorate and there are no funds available for a radiologist. Staff within EDI have been working to find a solution to increase student access and a proposal is in development. At present, students are trained in radiography by an external provider and gain experience in their outreach clinics in the final year of the programme. The Programme Team wish to improve training in this area.

1.6.2 The Programme Co-ordinator is currently undertaking a major development of the Learn VLE. Students welcome this and find notes being placed on the VLE before lectures so that they can prepare especially useful.

1.7 Effectiveness of the review area’s approach to promoting an accessible and inclusive learning environment for all students

1.7.1 The Programme Team demonstrated a commitment to promoting an accessible and inclusive learning environment for all students, both within EDI and outreach clinics. Students with additional requirements discuss these with their Personal Tutor and issues such as allergies have been successfully managed. Careful consideration is given to admitting students with disabilities within the requirements of the programme and reasonable adjustments would be implemented wherever possible.

1.7.2 The incoming student cohort in academic year 2015/16 will include a high number of widening participation students.

1.7.3 The Review Team commends the Programme Team for their commitment to supporting students as individuals as part of a wider inclusive approach to students with additional requirements.

1.8 Effectiveness of the review area’s approach to supporting and developing staff to promote effective learning for students

1.8.1 New Personal Tutors attend courses organised by the University and are referred to supporting online documentation which was found to be useful. Continuing Personal Tutors attend refresher courses. The Senior Personal Tutor attends the University Senior Tutor Network meetings.

1.8.2 The School will shortly be implementing a workload allocation model to support staff time management.

1.8.3 The core Programme Team are well supported in their development, with staff encouraged and assisted to undertake clinical skills development, research qualifications and University teaching professional development programmes. Some teaching is delivered by NHS Lothian staff and this is recognised within job plans (with the allocation of one half day per week for the delivery of education). Programme Team staff are encouraged to attend conferences, training days, staff seminars, and audit days and have scope over the summer when teaching is not taking place to undertake additional training.

1.8.4 The Review Team commends the Programme Team’s commitment to their own personal and professional development and the Management Team of the Edinburgh Dental Institute for facilitating this.

1.8.5 The Director of EDI has an input into the majority of staff annual reviews and where this is not the case, they are carried out by someone who is familiar with the programme.

1.8.6 New members of staff are given a comprehensive induction, supported by a checklist and shadowing opportunities. Peer observation of teaching is used with new members of staff, typically in clinical teaching rather than didactic teaching. New lecturers undertake the
Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP) and have found this very useful and informative. They are introduced to University policies and practices and have opportunities to work with staff from other disciplines.

1.8.7 The biggest change in staffing as observed by the Programme Team has been the appointment of the current Programme Co-ordinator who is now undertaking all administrative tasks associated with the programme. The students have also seen a positive change since the appointment of the Programme Co-ordinator in terms of programme organisation. The review team heard that the scope of the Programme Co-ordinator's role is extensive.

1.8.8 The Review Team commends the Programme Director for recognising the importance of the role of the Programme Co-ordinator in facilitating the integration of University systems and procedures and the Programme Co-ordinator for their proactive approach to taking these forward.

1.8.9 Programme Team staff share best practice by attending conferences, acting as external examiners at other institutions, participating in the PGCAP and bringing these experiences back to the programme. Best practice is also shared across the EDI programmes at the monthly Programme Directors’ Committee.

2. Management of quality and standards

2.1 The effectiveness of the review area’s approach to setting and maintaining academic standards

2.1.1 With regards to external examiner reports, currently the Director of EDI and the Programme Director initially consider the reports and the Programme Team then formulate a response. Going forward, the programme will utilise the University’s external examiner online reporting system. Responses are then considered by the Board of Studies which also monitors associated actions. The programme quality assurance report is submitted to the College quality assurance executive. Due to the newness of the programme, it will take time to monitor the results and responses associated with quality assurance processes.

2.1.2 Curriculum changes are discussed at the weekly Team Meeting, the Curriculum Executive, and then presented to the Board of Studies. The curriculum is designed in “vertical courses” which are built on each year.

2.2 Effectiveness of the review area's approach to monitoring and quality assurance

2.2.1 The programme has an established quality assurance structure which operates across a large number of committees within EDI and the College. In terms of student matters, these are dealt with by the Personal Tutor System, the Team Meetings, the Staff Student Liaison Committee, the Professional Progress Committee, the Progressional Development Committee, the Internal Review Committee, the Special Circumstances Committee, and the College of MVM Fitness to Practise Committee. Curriculum matters are dealt with at Team Meetings, the Curriculum Executive, and the Board of Studies. Examination and assessment matters are dealt with at the Board of Examiners Committee and the Assessment Board. Programme Management matters are dealt with at the Team Meetings and the Programme Directors’ Committee. The review team felt that the weekly Team Meetings were useful for the Programme Team to manage the day-to-day running of the programme but it was not an appropriate forum to deal with quality assurance and monitoring matters.
2.2.2 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team simplify the quality assurance processes and reporting structure, and excludes the Team Meetings and Personal Tutor meetings from the quality assurance system.

2.2.3 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team formalise monitoring procedures at the individual course level. This should include frequent and transparent gathering and recording of feedback on each course and (continuing with their existing approach) member of staff, and a formal record of how that feedback is responded to made available to students.

2.2.4 Course learning outcomes are mapped to General Dental Council learning outcomes. This is done at individual teaching activity level through discussion at the weekly Team Meeting and is not formally documented. Monitoring of each cohort’s learning outcomes is carried out through sampling and appropriate assessments are constructed. There is scope to formalise the mapping of learning outcomes in conjunction with current College Office practices.

2.2.5 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team map the course learning outcomes for each cohort to the General Dental Council learning outcomes and course assessments.

2.2.6 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team take the opportunity provided by the Programme and Course Information Management (PCIM) project to bring their course information in line with University guidance which then forms the definitive course information for the programme.

2.3 Effectiveness of the review area’s approach to listening and responding to the student voice

2.3.1 Student feedback on the programme is gathered through an annual end of year internal survey, which is currently a mixture of online and paper. The Programme Team aims to move this survey on to the Learn VLE in future. The Programme Team also make use of the results of the internal centrally run Edinburgh Student Experience Survey for students in years one to three of the programme. Unfortunately, due to small cohort numbers, it has not been possible to extrapolate the results of the external National Student Survey. Because of this, specific feedback was sought from the graduating cohort in 2014.

2.3.2 The students that met with the review team were aware of the annual internal end of year survey and would like to see it improved by tailoring it to the programme. The review team encourages the Programme Team to develop the annual internal end of year survey, to involve the students in its development, and to ensure that it is completed anonymously.

2.3.3 The Student Staff Liaison Committee constitutes year student representatives and their deputies from each year and the core Programme Team. The review team heard differing views from staff and students about the organisation of the meetings, specifically in relation to the number of meetings, how and when items for discussion should be submitted, the types of items that should be submitted for discussion, and how and when outcomes are communicated back to students. Moreover students would welcome a more collegiate approach to these meetings, with staff giving careful consideration to matters raised by students.

2.3.4 The Review Team recommends that the Programme Team implement Student Staff Liaison Committees in line with University principles.

2.4 The effectiveness of the review area’s approach to the management of assessment, progression and achievement
2.4.1 The Assessment Board meets twice a year prior to each examination diet, covers all years of the programme, and confirms the final papers. This is complimented by external examiner involvement. The MBChB Assessment Officer is invited to attend the Assessment Board and provides advice on process and spreadsheets for processing results.

2.4.2 The Review Team commends the Programme Team for involving the MBChB Assessment Officer in the assessment processes in order to enhance them.

2.4.3 All exams are double marked and moderated by external examiners due to the small student cohort. There are particular progression requirements and a programme-specific regulation allowing students to re-sit failed components which differs from the majority of the rest of University programmes. These are made clear to the students in programme documentation.

2.4.4 The review team were satisfied that there were sound procedures in place for the management of assessment.

3. Management of enhancement and sharing of good practice

3.1 Effectiveness of the review area's approach to the strategic enhancement of the student experience

3.1.1 The Programme Team demonstrate a strong commitment to enhancing the experience of students on the OHS programme. Enhancements emerge from a range of sources, including: as a result of student feedback; University initiatives; and external requirements. Recent developments that demonstrate this approach are: opportunities for students to attend joint teaching with students from other programmes; and the decision to implement the student assessment and reflective e-portfolio ‘iDentity’.

3.1.2 The review team welcomed the reflective, open and constructive approach taken by the Programme Team to the production of the analytical report and the review visit meetings.

3.2 Identification of areas of good practice for sharing outside the review area

3.2.1 The Oral Health Sciences programme has many areas of good practice to share outside the review area:

- Implementation of the Personal Tutor system.
- Outreach placements, both the management of these and the positive benefits that these have for students.
- The multiple and timely provision of feedback to students on their clinical skills work.

4. Confidence statement

The reviewers found that Oral Health Sciences has effective management of the quality of the student learning experience, academic standards, and enhancement and good practice.

5. Summary

Overall the review team was pleased with the Oral Health Sciences (OHS) programme and the management of the learning and teaching activities by a Programme Team who are clearly committed to providing students with an excellent experience as evidenced by the planned introduction of the e-portfolio system ‘iDentity’ and the extensive redevelopment of the Learn Virtual Learning Environment. Unlike other programmes of this type, the OHS programme at the University of Edinburgh is an honours degree and the review team
recommends that the Programme Team explores how to maximise the opportunities provided by this additional year.

The Programme Team realise the importance of integrating OHS students within the wider University and are continuing to develop further meaningful opportunities. There are challenges with managing the timetable for the programme and the review team recommends that the Programme Team undertake regular audits of timetable changes and explores ways to maximise student learning opportunities in gaps in clinical times. The review team also recommends that students are allowed time to participate in University activities.

A professional approach is instilled within students from the start of the programme and students are provided with excellent facilities within which to develop their clinical skills and additional practice through well managed outreach placements which greatly develop their graduate attributes. Students experience a wide variety of assessments and are provided with multiple and timely feedback. Effective examination and assessment practices are in place and the MBChB Assessment Officer is involved in assessment processes to ensure consistency and enhancement.

Students are well supported by effective induction and re-induction, a successfully implemented Personal Tutoring system, and in their continuing professional development. Furthermore, the Programme Team demonstrated an inclusive approach to supporting students with additional requirements. The Programme Team have introduced academic families and the review team recommends adequate staff support is provided in order to ensure the potential for providing academic support is maximised. The small student cohort and Programme Team present challenges in terms of how matters raised by students are processed and the review team recommends that these be reviewed and clarified. The theme of staff communication to students arose throughout the review and the review team recommends that clear communication methods are developed. The review team recommends that Student Staff Liaison Committees are implemented in line with University principles.

The Programme Team and the Management Team of Edinburgh Dental Institute showed a strong commitment to staff personal and professional development and recognising the importance of the role of the Programme Co-ordinator, who has been instrumental in proactively facilitating the integration of University systems and procedures.

It is recommended that the programme’s quality assurance processes and reporting structures are simplified and that monitoring at individual course level is formalised. In relation to course information, the review team recommends that learning outcome mapping is documented and that course descriptors should be brought in line with University guidance.

6. Prioritised list of commendations and recommendations:

Key Strengths

1. The Review Team commends the commitment of the Programme Team to delivering a programme which produces high quality Dental Hygiene Therapists. [1.1.4]

2. The Review Team commends the Programme Team for instilling a professional approach within students from the very start of the programme. [1.2.18]

3. The Review Team commends the Programme Team for facilitating Oral Health Sciences student interactions with students from other programmes across the University and encourages them to continue to explore further meaningful opportunities for such integration where appropriate. [1.2.6]
4. The Review Team **commends** the organisation of the outreach placements. [1.2.15]

5. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team's approach to supporting students' continuing professional development throughout the programme, through attendance at conferences, student competitions, and membership of professional bodies. [1.5.4]

6. The Review Team **commends** the commitment of the Programme Team to developing new ways of working and supporting student learning and teaching, as evidenced by the introduction of the e-portfolio system ‘iDentity’. [1.4.13]

7. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team on the multiple and timely provision of feedback to students on their clinical skills work. [1.4.11]

8. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team's initial approach to student induction and re-induction activity and would encourage them to continue to develop this. [1.4.2]

9. The Review Team **commends** the clinical and pre-clinical facilities and the opportunities that students are given to work with other members of the dental team as part of the programme. [1.2.2]

10. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for the successful implementation of the Personal Tutor system and for the use of the IT Tools for enhancing and recording student engagement. [1.4.8]

11. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for their commitment to supporting students as individuals as part of a wider inclusive approach to students with additional requirements. [1.7.3]

12. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team’s commitment to their own personal and professional development and the Management Team of the Edinburgh Dental Institute for facilitating this. [1.8.4]

13. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Director for recognising the importance of the role of the Programme Co-ordinator in facilitating the integration of University systems and procedures and the Programme Co-ordinator for their proactive approach to taking these forward. [1.8.8]

14. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for involving the MBChB Assessment Officer in the assessment processes in order to enhance them. [2.4.2]

**Recommendations for enhancement/Areas for further development**

1. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team develops clear communication mechanisms with students which are followed and understood by both staff and students. [1.4.19]

2. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team simplify the quality assurance processes and reporting structure, and excludes the Team Meetings and Personal Tutor meetings from the quality assurance system. [2.2.2]

3. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team implement Student Staff Liaison Committees in line with University principles. [2.3.4]
4. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team formalise monitoring procedures at the individual course level. This should include frequent and transparent gathering and recording of feedback on each course and (continuing with their existing approach) member of staff, and a formal record of how that feedback is responded to made available to students. [2.2.3]

5. The review team **recommends** that the Programme Co-ordinator, along with student involvement, undertakes a regular audit of timetable changes to establish if there is an issue with last minute changes to be resolved. [1.1.6]

6. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team explores ways to facilitate the use of the potential afforded by gaps in clinical time created by patient non-attendance, for the further enhancement of student learning. [1.1.7]

7. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team clarifies the procedure for students raising concerns with staff, including how concerns will be dealt with whilst maintaining confidentiality, and ensures that students are aware of the availability of staff from outwith the programme to whom they may go to discuss matters. [1.3.3]

8. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team map the course learning outcomes for each cohort to the General Dental Council learning outcomes and course assessments. [2.2.5]

9. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team allow students time to participate in University activities such as Freshers’ Week, sports and societies (on Wednesday afternoon), and Innovative Learning Week. [1.4.4]

10. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team ensure that adequate academic and administrative support is provided for the facilitation of the academic families initiative in order to ensure its potential for providing academic support is maximised. [1.4.15]

11. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team explores how to maximise the opportunities provided by the four year degree. This may be through providing alternatives to desk-based research for the dissertation or by students taking courses from other areas of the University. [1.5.2]

12. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team take the opportunity provided by the Programme and Course Information Management (PCIM) project to bring their course information in line with University guidance which then forms the definitive course information for the programme. [2.2.6]
C. Appendices

Appendix 1 Additional information considered by review team

Prior to the review visit:

School Quality Assurance Report
2013-14 (draft subject to committee approval)

External Examiner Reports and Responses
2014 – two reports
2013 – one report
2012 – two reports
2011 – one report

Subject Area Organisation Chart

Current Subject Area Staff Information
Assessment and Special Circumstances
Oral Health Sciences QA Structure
Fitness to Practice
Professional Development Committee and Student Support
Oral Health Sciences Committees

Student Staff Liaison Committee Meeting Minutes
April 2014

Programme Handbook
BSc (Hons) Oral Health Sciences Handbook 2015-16 (draft)
BSc (Hons) Oral Health Sciences Senior Honours Handbook

Appendices
Interim Inspection Report, General Dental Council
Scope of Practice, General Dental Council
Developing the Dental Team: Curricula Frameworks for Registrable Qualifications for Professionals Complementary to Dentistry (PCDs) 2004
Preparing for Practice, Dental team learning outcomes for registration, 2011
BSc (Hons) Oral Health Sciences Vertical Courses
Induction Information
Standards for Education; Standards and requirements for providers, 2012
Credits and SCQF Levels
Clinical Assessment Sheets
  • BSc Oral Health Sciences Assessment
  • Paediatric Clinical Assessment
  • Periodontal Clinical Assessment
  • Adult Restorative Clinical Assessment
  • Clinical Competencies Year 2
  • Clinical Competencies Year 3
Standards for Dental Professionals, General Dental Council, 2005
Draft QA Report

Feedback Documentation
2012-13 - Year 1
  • Clinical Practice
  • Edinburgh Dental Institute
  • Health and Disease
- Personal and Professional Development
- Prep for Practice

2012-13 - Year 2
- Clinical Practice
- Edinburgh Dental Institute
- Health and Disease
- Personal and Professional Development
- Prep for Practice

2012 -13 - Year 4
- Clinical Practice
- Outreach Clinics
- Prep for Practice

Clinical Patient Feedback
Feedback Summary

Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategies
College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine
University of Edinburgh

Programme Specifications

Overview of key features of relevant Student Support Service Provisions
Careers Service
Disability Office
International Office
Student Administration

QAA Benchmark Statement

Reflective Overview of key findings from Internal Review

Background Data for First Destination Information

Institute for Academic Development Case Study WIKI

Undergraduate Degree Classification Report

Personal Tutor Study Results
Undergraduate Student Key Findings Results
Staff Survey Key Findings Results

Glossary of Terms

During the review visit:

The review team were given access to the Learn VLE
General Dental Council Developing the Dental Team
A list of past dissertation topics

Appendix 2 Number of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No intake in 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Summary report

Teaching Programme Review

Review of Oral Health Sciences on 19 and 20 March 2015

Report Summary

This is a brief summary of the full report of the review carried out in Oral Health Sciences. Internal review is carried out by the University on a cyclical basis, and is aimed at assuring and enhancing the quality of its provision. A key focus of the process is the student experience. Reviews are based on three overarching themes:

- Management of the student learning experience
- Management of quality and standards
- Management of enhancement and promotion of good practice

The standard University remit for reviews can be found at [http://edin.ac/1yf6f4Q](http://edin.ac/1yf6f4Q) In addition, the review of Oral Health Sciences considered the following remit items:

- The College remit items: student support; sustainability of the programme; and gender balance of students and staff.
- The subject specific remit for the review: inflexibility in timetabling clinical sessions; and student access to radiography.
- Remit items from students: integration with the University of Edinburgh; timetabling of lectures; and assessments.

Following endorsement by Senate Quality Assurance Committee, the full report of the review is available publicly at: [http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality-unit/quality-assurance/internal-review/teaching-programme-review/reports](http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/quality-unit/quality-assurance/internal-review/teaching-programme-review/reports)

Full information about the internal review process can be found at [http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/quality-unit/quality-assurance/internal-review](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/quality-unit/quality-assurance/internal-review)

Conclusions

The reviewers found that Oral Health Sciences has effective management of the quality of the student learning experience, academic standards, and enhancement and good practice. A number of recommendations have been made to support Oral Health Sciences in managing the student learning experience, quality and standards and the enhancement and promotion of good practice.

Overall the review team was pleased with the Oral Health Sciences (OHS) programme and the management of the learning and teaching activities by a Programme Team who are clearly committed to providing students with an excellent experience as evidenced by the planned introduction of the e-portfolio system ‘iDentity’ and the extensive redevelopment of the Learn Virtual Learning Environment. Unlike other programmes of this type, the OHS programme at the University of Edinburgh is an honours degree and the review team recommends that the Programme Team explores how to maximise the opportunities provided by this additional year.
The Programme Team realise the importance of integrating OHS students within the wider University and are continuing to develop further meaningful opportunities. There are challenges with managing the timetable for the programme and the review team recommends that the Programme Team undertake regular audits of timetable changes and explores ways to maximise student learning opportunities in gaps in clinical times. The review team also recommends that students are allowed time to participate in University activities.

A professional approach is instilled within students from the start of the programme and students are provided with excellent facilities within which to develop their clinical skills and additional practice through well managed outreach placements which greatly develop their graduate attributes. Students experience a wide variety of assessments and are provided with multiple and timely feedback. Effective examination and assessment practices are in place and the MBChB Assessment Officer is involved in assessment processes to ensure consistency and enhancement.

Students are well supported by effective induction and re-induction, a successfully implemented Personal Tutoring system, and in their continuing professional development. Furthermore, the Programme Team demonstrated an inclusive approach to supporting students with additional requirements. The Programme Team have introduced academic families and the review team recommends adequate staff support is provided in order to ensure the potential for providing academic support is maximised. The small student cohort and Programme Team present challenges in terms of how matters raised by students are processed and the review team recommends that these be reviewed and clarified. The theme of staff communication to students arose throughout the review and the review team recommends that clear communication methods are developed. The review team recommends that Student Staff Liaison Committees are implemented in line with University principles.

The Programme Team and the Management Team of Edinburgh Dental Institute showed a strong commitment to staff personal and professional development and recognising the importance of the role of the Programme Co-ordinator, who has been instrumental in proactively facilitating the integration of University systems and procedures.

It is recommended that the programme’s quality assurance processes and reporting structures are simplified and that monitoring at individual course level is formalised. In relation to course information, the review team recommends that learning outcome mapping is documented and that course descriptors should be brought in line with University guidance.

**Key strengths**

15. The Review Team **commends** the commitment of the Programme Team to delivering a programme which produces high quality Dental Hygiene Therapists. [1.1.4]

16. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for instilling a professional approach within students from the very start of the programme. [1.2.18]

17. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for facilitating Oral Health Sciences student interactions with students from other programmes across the University and encourages them to continue to explore further meaningful opportunities for such integration where appropriate. [1.2.6]

18. The Review Team **commends** the organisation of the outreach placements. [1.2.15]

19. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team’s approach to supporting students’ continuing professional development throughout the programme, through attendance at conferences, student competitions, and membership of professional bodies. [1.5.4]
20. The Review Team **commends** the commitment of the Programme Team to developing new ways of working and supporting student learning and teaching, as evidenced by the introduction of the e-portfolio system ‘iDentity’. [1.4.13]

21. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team on the multiple and timely provision of feedback to students on their clinical skills work. [1.4.11]

22. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team’s initial approach to student induction and re-induction activity and would encourage them to continue to develop this. [1.4.2]

23. The Review Team **commends** the clinical and pre-clinical facilities and the opportunities that students are given to work with other members of the dental team as part of the programme. [1.2.2]

24. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for the successful implementation of the Personal Tutor system and for the use of the IT Tools for enhancing and recording student engagement. [1.4.8]

25. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for their commitment to supporting students as individuals as part of a wider inclusive approach to students with additional requirements. [1.7.3]

26. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team’s commitment to their own personal and professional development and the Management Team of the Edinburgh Dental Institute for facilitating this. [1.8.4]

27. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Director for recognising the importance of the role of the Programme Co-ordinator in facilitating the integration of University systems and procedures and the Programme Co-ordinator for their proactive approach to taking these forward. [1.8.8]

28. The Review Team **commends** the Programme Team for involving the MBChB Assessment Officer in the assessment processes in order to enhance them. [2.4.2]

**Recommendations for improvement or enhancement**

13. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team develops clear communication mechanisms with students which are followed and understood by both staff and students. [1.4.19] **Student learning experience**

14. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team simplify the quality assurance processes and reporting structure, and excludes the Team Meetings and Personal Tutor meetings from the quality assurance system. [2.2.2] **Quality and standards**

15. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team implement Student Staff Liaison Committees in line with University principles. [2.3.4] **Student learning experience**

16. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team formalise monitoring procedures at the individual course level. This should include frequent and transparent gathering and recording of feedback on each course and (continuing with their existing approach) member of staff, and a formal record of how that feedback is responded to made available to students. [2.2.3] **Quality and standards**
17. The review team **recommends** that the Programme Co-ordinator, along with student involvement, undertakes a regular audit of timetable changes to establish if there is an issue with last minute changes to be resolved. [1.1.6] **Student learning experience**

18. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team explores ways to facilitate the use of the potential afforded by gaps in clinical time created by patient non-attendance, for the further enhancement of student learning. [1.1.7] **Student learning experience**

19. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team clarifies the procedure for students raising concerns with staff, including how concerns will be dealt with whilst maintaining confidentiality, and ensures that students are aware of the availability of staff from outwith the programme to whom they may go to discuss matters. [1.3.3] **Student learning experience**

20. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team map the course learning outcomes for each cohort to the General Dental Council learning outcomes and course assessments. [2.2.5] **Quality and standards**

21. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team allow students time to participate in University activities such as Freshers’ Week, sports and societies (on Wednesday afternoon), and Innovative Learning Week. [1.4.4] **Student learning experience**

22. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team ensure that adequate academic and administrative support is provided for the facilitation of the academic families initiative in order to ensure its potential for providing academic support is maximised. [1.4.15] **Student learning experience**

23. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team explores how to maximise the opportunities provided by the four year degree. This may be through providing alternatives to desk-based research for the dissertation or by students taking courses from other areas of the University. [1.5.2] **Student learning experience**

24. The Review Team **recommends** that the Programme Team take the opportunity provided by the Programme and Course Information Management (PCIM) project to bring their course information in line with University guidance which then forms the definitive course information for the programme. [2.2.6] **Quality and standards**

Responsibility for actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsibility of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Programme Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Programme Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up to the review

The following reports and response are made in the first instance to Senate Quality Assurance Committee, copied to the Dean/Associate Dean/Director for Quality Assurance/Quality Assurance & Enhancement:

- The review report
- The 14 week response from the subject area/School
- The year-on report

Thereafter annual reporting on progress towards meeting recommendations will be made through the annual School report to the College Quality Assurance committee or equivalent, which in turn reports to Senate Quality Assurance Committee.