A. Introduction

1. Purpose of Review

The Teaching Programme Review (TPR) of The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies 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. Scope of this review

Range of provision considered by the review:

- Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine & Surgery (BVM&S) Veterinary Medicine 5 year Programme
- BVM&S Graduate Entry Programme (GEP)

The TPR consisted of:

- The University’s standard remit for internal review
- The subject specific remit for the review, consisting of the following items:
  1. Rebalancing of Content and Process, in terms of the curriculum
  2. Student Reward and Recognition, in terms of extra-curricular activities
- The analytical report prepared by The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies and additional material provided in advance of the review (additional material listed in Appendix 1)
- The visit by the review team to The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, including consideration of further material (listed in Appendix 1)
- The TPR report produced by the review team
- Following the review, action by the subject area/school and others to whom recommendations were remitted”
- Membership of review team

Dr Peter Allison, Convener
Professor David Price, Internal Member
Professor Jim Anderson, External Member
Ms Carol Gray, External Member
Miss Bobi Archer, Student Member
Ms Toni Dismore, Administrator
3. The Position of the School within its College

The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies is one of two Schools within the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine. The School comprises 105 academic faculty along with 26 staff from the Roslin Institute who provide the equivalent of 2 full time staff (FTE) to the formal undergraduate programmes.

4. Physical location and summary of facilities

Following the completion of the Veterinary Teaching Building and Roslin Institute building in 2011, all activities previously associated with the Summerhall Campus in Edinburgh and Roslin Institute in Roslin have been relocated to the Easter Bush Campus. The Easter Bush Campus comprises the following facilities:

- Veterinary Teaching Building – includes a cafeteria, lecture theatres, digital teaching suites, seminar room, dissection room, post mortem room, diagnostic, teaching and clinical skills laboratories, microscope room, library, tutorial rooms, ‘study landscape’, administrative offices, meeting rooms and gym.
- Hospital for Small Animals
- Equine Hospital
- Farm Animal Hospital
- Easter Bush Middle Wing – includes a break-out area, tutorial room and diagnostic laboratory
- F-Block – includes large animal clinical skills teaching facility, tutorial rooms and exotic animals teaching facility.
- Langhill Farm – the main farm steading is located 2 miles from the main teaching building and includes a teaching building with tutorial rooms.
- Sheep Enterprise Unit
- Roslin Institute
- Animal Research Facilities

5. Date of previous review

The previous review was conducted on 4th and 5th February 2010

6. Analytical report

The analytical report was prepared by Dr Claire Phillips, Director of Quality and Ms Lindsay Dalziel, VTO Manager. The report was reviewed by the BVM&S Learning and Teaching Committee and Board of Studies with student representation. The analytical report comprised of the Self Evaluation Report and Appendices prepared for the Joint International Visitation of the R(D)SVS on 9th – 13th November 2015.
B. Main report

1. Strategic Approach to Enhancing Learning and Teaching

1.1 The School offers two entry points to the BVM&S programme. The 5 year Programme is designed for those leaving secondary education, while the Graduate Entry Programme (GEP) is aimed at those who already hold an Honours degree in an appropriate Biological or Animal Science subject. GEP students have an extended first year and then join the 3rd year of the 5 year programme to form one cohort of BVM&S students. While the School acknowledges that there have been issues with the integration of the GEP students into the main BVM&S cohort, staff and students have worked hard to address this.

1.2 The School holds five external accreditations covering the UK, North America, Australasia, Europe and South Africa. These accreditations are of particular importance for attracting international students. Holding these accreditations enables the School to follow the internationalisation agenda of the University, with AVMA (American Veterinary Medical Association) accreditation a particular attractor for North American students. The School is commended for this.

1.3 The move away from Summerhall to a single campus at Easter Bush in 2011 has enabled the School to make significant enhancements to its learning and teaching and student support. A close relationship with the Roslin Institute enables linkages between research, practice, education and funding opportunities for both staff and students. Leadership from the Head of School has been significant in driving improvements, particularly in how the School and Roslin move forward together, for which the School is commended.

1.4 The provision of a single campus for the School has encouraged redevelopment of the personal tutor/house system. This is supported strategically through the School’s recruitment processes. New faculty are expected to take on personal tutoring responsibilities and this is made clear during recruitment and interviewing.

1.5 The Veterinary Teaching Building at the Easter Bush campus has been designed for optimum use by a specific number of students. It is therefore, the strategic priority of the school to focus on maintaining and enhancing quality in its provision of both learning and teaching, and, student support rather than on growing undergraduate student numbers.

1.6 The School is committed at all levels to the enhancement of the student experience. This was evident in the developmental approach to the review for which the School is commended. The School has developed robust mechanisms for ensuring and enhancing the quality of its learning and teaching provision. These include the move from voluntary to mandatory peer observation of teaching and bespoke workshops designed to develop staff with respect to learning and teaching.

1.7 Overall responsibility for the strategic direction of the BVM&S programme sits with the Learning and Teaching Committee. Changes to courses including curriculum and assessment need to go through this committee which has ‘ownership’ of the programme. Minutes from this committee are reviewed by the School’s Senior Management Group which has overall responsibility for major policy decisions of the School. However it was not always clear, to the review team, how policy decisions and their implementation flow between these two groups. The review team recommends that the School reviews the relationship between the Senior Management Group and the Learning and Teaching Committee to ensure effective two way communication within the School. The review team believe that the key to addressing issues of curriculum overload lies with these two groups exercising their authority.

1.8 The impact of the School’s strategic priority with respect to the student experience was evident through discussions with senior staff, though more could be done to make this, and other priorities apparent. The review team recommends the School ensures that all staff are aware of the strategic priorities of the School. The School should ensure that the strategic plan drives the day to day activities and planning.
2. Enhancing Learning and Teaching and the Student Experience

Supporting Students in their Learning

2.1 The School is committed to supporting students throughout the stages of their journey. The School participates in widening participation schemes including LEAPS and Pathways to the Professions and holds two annual workshops to encourage secondary school students to think about a career in veterinary medicine.

2.2 The School is commended on its recruitment and conversion activities involving both staff and students. The School holds interviews with applicants both on campus and internationally (e.g. in New York) and appreciation of this was evident through discussions with students. In addition, the School uses Student Ambassadors, supported by the Student Experience Officer, to provide insights and guidance to offer holders ahead of their arrival at the School.

2.3 In recognition of the commitment and effort displayed by Student Ambassadors, and the role they play in conversion and student support activities, the School has established the Outstanding Student Ambassador Award. The award was initially instituted to recognise two students who went above and beyond what could be asked in the provision of advice to prospective students. It constitutes a certificate, small monetary reward and badge (akin to those nominated for EUSA Teaching Awards). For this the School is commended. The review team recommends that the School continues its ongoing commitment to the fullest recognition of their students and their contributions, such as through looking at how the Outstanding Student Ambassador Award can be included in the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) certificate.

2.4 The School is commended for its support to students experiencing difficulties transitioning across the years. There is a mandatory, non-credit bearing, course in professional development that all students who need to repeat a full or part year, due to failure to achieve academic standards, must take. This course is also available to students repeating a full or part year due to previous special circumstances on a voluntary basis, ensuring that support is inclusive to all repeating students regardless of their journey to that point.

2.5 Commitment to the Personal Tutoring system was evidenced by staff-student ratios of tutees and support structure flexibility. As programme content is largely dictated by external accreditation and professional competency requirements, the role of Personal Tutor is largely pastoral in the School as academic choices for students are limited. Students reflected that their experience of support was not dependent on who they are assigned as a personal tutor, as they felt they could approach ‘anyone’. This whole school approach to student support is commended.

2.6 In line with other institutions in the sector, the School has a 'Note of Concern' system for alerting staff to potential student difficulties. Any member of staff or student can submit a Note of Concern online. Reasons for this can include concern over non-attendance or unprofessional behaviour. These Notes of Concern are then reviewed by a student support team, including the Student Experience Officer, who decide on whether and how further action should be taken. In addition, feedback on students is provided following their clinical rotations further enabling the school to detect and act on student support needs. These robust mechanisms are commended and are an example of best practice within the university regarding student support.
Student Engagement

2.7 Staff responsiveness to student needs, both academic and pastoral is commended. The School has two peer supporter schemes; VETPALS which involves student run academic skills sessions, and a peer supporter scheme which is more pastoral in nature. The School has also arranged (and funds internally) for university counselling services to hold regular sessions at the Easter Bush campus. In addition, there are a number of student-led schemes that provide support, including the ‘Vet Families’ and the annual Welfare Week. Welfare Week is normally held in parallel to Innovative Learning Week (which the School does not officially participate in due to timetabling issues that would result from clearing one entire week from all years’ schedules) and involves sessions run on maintaining wellbeing throughout the student journey. This is of particular relevance to the Veterinary Profession which is known to have relatively high incidence of mental health issues and an increased risk of suicidal ideation. These student-led projects are fully supported by the School and demonstrate the energy and commitment of both staff and students to creating a vibrant and supportive community, which is commended.

2.8 The School has effective mechanisms for listening and responding to student feedback. Each course on the programme has its own SSLC and changes are implemented relatively quickly following student feedback. Students the team spoke to reflected that “it is scary how much power students have”. It was clear to the students that the School really works to accommodate them and respond to their concerns. Students are also represented on the Learning and Teaching Committee which has responsibility for making changes to courses. The School is commended for ensuring that students feel listened to and changing things where relevant and possible.

2.9 The School has recently introduced the EvaSys system for course evaluation surveys, which is currently being rolled out across the University. Course Organisers receive reports on these surveys which they then circulate to students with a response to their feedback. These surveys are also discussed at the Learning and Teaching Committee with examples of best practice shared in this forum. In addition, a traffic light system is being developed for benchmarking results of these surveys and comparisons year on year will be able to be made going forward.

2.10 The School produces a ‘You Said We Listened’ booklet which summaries changes made on the basis of student feedback. This is circulated to students and is available from various locations around the School. The review team commend the School for this.

2.11 The mechanisms for engaging students in providing feedback are generally effective. However, while the course surveys enjoy relatively high response rates due to paper completion, response rates are much lower for provision of feedback on clinical rotations. The School uses an online system (EEVeC) for providing feedback on their rotation experience. It was clear from discussions with both residents (who supervise rotations) and students that engagement with this system is not as effective as it could be. Students admitted that they rarely take the time to complete these feedback forms as they are time limited and online. The review team recommends that the School reviews the mechanisms for providing feedback to residents from students as it would be useful to their professional development as instructors.

2.12 With respect to National Student Survey (NSS), the School has an overall satisfaction rating above that of the University as a whole (90% vs 84%). This reflects the level of engagement and commitment of staff and students throughout the School.

2.13 Due to ‘fitness to practise’ needs of the profession, the School works on developing graduate attributes above and beyond those of the institution. The School adheres to the 37 Day One Competences established by the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) mapping programme content to attributes ranging from effective communication to clinical governance. The School also provides a professional skills course to assist with developing graduate attributes in their students.
Approach to Promoting an Accessible and Inclusive Learning Environment for All Students

2.14 The School provides training to those involved in the Inglis Veterinary Rotation in identifying and managing students with specific needs, as referred to in the Analytical Report.

2.15 The School includes skills development in how to communicate with clients with disabilities (including visual, hearing and mobility impairments) as part of the professional skills curriculum.

2.16 The School provides opportunities for students to experience diverse cultures and socio-economic situations. These include working at a young offenders’ institution, clinics for homeless animal owners and areas of economic deprivation.

Learning and Teaching

2.17 The School demonstrates effective mechanisms for curriculum design and development. The Learning and Teaching Committee has ownership of the curriculum for the programme. Proposed changes to courses needed to be presented to and decided on by the committee. Implications on programme provision are considered when deciding on changes.

2.18 In addition, the School has an Assessment Executive (ASSET) which has an overview of assessment on courses. It is currently undertaking a process of formal assessment pathways blueprinting mapping to the Day One Competences. ASSET is also responsible for ensuring exam questions are testing the relevant outcomes.

2.19 The team was impressed by the energy and commitment to enhancing learning and teaching demonstrated by the staff they spoke to, including the postgraduate residents and demonstrators. For this the School is commended.

2.20 The physical learning environment is appropriate for meeting the needs of students, with provision of a library and study landscape for private and group study. Students really appreciated that everything they needed during their time at the School was available on one campus.

2.21 The School has made some use of flipped classrooms with students engaging in directed reading ahead of class allowing class time to be dedicated to discussion based on the readings. Students who had experienced the courses where this approach has been taken, expressed that they found this form of learning valuable. The review team commends the School on the adoption of innovative teaching practices and suggests that the School utilises rolling out flipped classroom methods where appropriate.

2.22 Students on the programme are required to undertake selective rotations in their final year. While many are provided on-campus (e.g. pathology) the School also uses external partners to host students on rotation (e.g. Edinburgh Zoo). External rotation hosts are often established via informal networks, leading to more established relationships. While rotation hosts are expected to provide feedback on students via the EEVeC system, little guidance is provided on how to evaluate student performance while on rotation. The review team recommends that the School look more deeply at how to formalise Quality Assurance processes for selective rotations with external partners and how these relationships are maintained.

2.23 Students are also expected to take Extra Mural Studies (EMS) while on the programme to enhance their veterinary skills and knowledge in a work-based environment. This consists of 12 weeks in the pre-clinical years of the programme and 26 weeks in the clinical stage towards the end of the programme. Students must complete the 38 weeks of EMS with evaluations on their attendance and progress from their placement providers in order to graduate. All students are able to source EMS placement providers internationally with some international students electing to take up these placements in their home country.

2.24 The School has taken active steps to embed the One Health agenda into the BVM&S programme. The One Health agenda recognises that the health of humans is dependent on the health of animals and the environment. Two courses in particular (Animal Life and Food Safety 1 and 2) highlight this agenda to students. In discussions with students, it was apparent that they were aware of the One Health agenda with ‘farm to fork’ being a recurring phrase in their reflections. In addition, students are aware of talks provided by the University on issues affecting One Health and
attend those of interest, while acknowledging that none have yet to take place at the Easter Bush campus. The review team recognises and **commends** the progress made with embedding One Health throughout the programme.

Assessment and Feedback

2.25 The review team were provided with the opportunity to examine samples of feedback provided to students. The team found there are many examples of good practice in the provision of feedback to students. The review team **commends** the School for this and suggests that the best practice should be shared.

2.26 Discussions with students revealed that there is a lack of consistency with respect to feedback provided on assessment, both in terms of quality and timeliness. Students felt that the quality of feedback was largely dependent on who was providing it and that it was not always clear from feedback as to how they should improve their future assessment performance. Students also remarked that feedback on in-course assessments was not always provided within the 15 working days turn-around time stipulated by the University.

2.27 The review team **recommends** that the School:

i) Should undertake a comprehensive review of the feedback provided to students both in taught courses and selective rotations.

ii) Should pay particular attention to consistency of quality and timeliness (15 day turn-around) of feedback.

iii) Develop and establish mechanisms to ensure the quality and consistency of feedback to students.

2.28 Students on the programme are required to complete a portfolio for each year of their studies. The portfolio is used to evidence the learning outcomes of being able to be self-reflective and maintaining and organising records. Completion of the portfolio is mandatory i.e. a progression requirement. Presentation of all the required elements of the portfolio is checked by the administrative team who ensure that all required documents are present, with an academic member of staff (Course Organiser) responsible for oversight and internal moderation. There was a lack of clarity amongst both staff and students as to whether the portfolio is, in fact, assessed, how and by whom. While Personal Tutors do not have official responsibility for assessing the portfolio, they are required to discuss self-reflection elements with students as part of the second semester Personal Tutor meeting. Some students commented that Personal Tutors were not reading the self-reflection elements, while others commented that their personal tutor read their reflections and prompted them to write more before submission. The team’s view was that potential conflicts of interest could arise if personal tutors have the responsibility to assess the portfolio, and that the role of administrative staff in evidencing the learning outcomes should be clarified. The review team **recommends** that the School reviews the portfolio, how it can be assessed and by whom, in relation to reflective practice skills and attainment of relevant Day One Competences.

2.29 With respect to achieving the baseline KPI of 80% satisfaction with their Personal Tutor experience, if this is based on the ESES dimension “Overall, I am satisfied with the academic advice and support I have received”, then the School is achieving this KPI as in the 2015 ESES they achieved 87% satisfaction. However, only 66% were satisfied with the amount of time they had with their Personal Tutor, 55% with feeling their Personal Tutor helped them reflect on academic performance and only 53% were satisfied that their Personal Tutor had helped them reflect on how their learning contributes to longer-term aspirations.
Supporting and Developing Staff

2.30 The School demonstrates commitment to ongoing development of staff throughout their academic career, with respect to learning and teaching. This is evidenced by the range of bespoke professional development workshops that the School has implemented. While the majority of the workshops are voluntary, however, all faculty are required to attend workshops in setting learning objectives and writing MCQ questions. Attendance for these workshops is audited. The team commends the School on these developments and suggests that the School commits further effort in this area and consider collaborating with SCQF.

2.31 The review team met with a number of PhD student demonstrators and clinical residents who have teaching responsibilities. Their commitment, energy and enthusiasm were evident in the discussions. None of those spoken to, however, felt that they had been given adequate guidance on what was required from them in terms of feedback to students or assessment. One PhD student noted that he was unable to answer his tutees queries on whether their work was of sufficiently high standard as he had not been provided with the assessment criteria. Another noted that training on small group teaching was not provided to him by the School and he had to self-fund his attendance at an IAD course on the subject.

2.32 Clinical residents are expected to provide feedback on students they supervise during rotations using EEVeC. However, they did not feel that they had been given adequate guidance on providing this feedback and its implications. For example, they were unclear as to what would be the consequence of them recording a student’s performance as ‘unsatisfactory’.

2.33 The School utilises the skills of a number of research staff from the Roslin Institute to deliver teaching to students, as well as some external specialists. While the ability to select external specialists may be limited by the availability of said specialists, students reflected in their discussions with the team, that the quality of teaching by those not directly employed by the School was not always consistent with the School’s own faculty.

2.34 The review team recommends that the school develops a system to ensure the consistency of quality and ongoing enhancement of teaching, learning and assessment, ensuring that all groups involved in teaching are included (residents, interns, PhDs and lecturers from outside the school etc.).

3. Academic Standards

3.1 The BVM&S programme is mapped to the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Courses in the 1st and 2nd years of the 5 year variant, and the GEP year, are at level 8. Courses in the 3rd year are at level 9, 4th year at level 10 and the final year courses are all at level 11.

3.2 The School has robust and multi-layered mechanisms for course approval and assessment, including the Learning and Teaching Committee, ASSET and a Quality Assurance Committee. The Learning and Teaching Committee has student representation and overall responsibility for curriculum and assessment.

3.3 The School also utilises the skills of a statistician to check and balance exam marks on some courses, for which the School is commended. Given that external examiners did note at least one occurrence of marks errors, it is suggested that the use of statistical modelling be applied wherever possible to exam marks.

3.4 The review team noted that there were some inconsistencies with the application of marking schemes. Students were not always clear on where they had lost marks, and at least one student was told that marks above 70 would not be awarded. The external examiner report for ‘The Animal Body 3’ also commented on the lack of annotation of exam scripts, making it difficult to determine how marks were allocated. The review team recommends that the School ensures transparency and consistent use of marking schemes.

3.5 The School reports on the key themes from External Examiner reports and subsequent actions taken, where relevant, in its Annual Quality Assurance and Enhancement Report which is submitted to the College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine.
4. Collaborative Activity
   4.1 The School has no joint undergraduate degrees provided with other institutions.
   4.2 The School has a number of external providers of selective rotations (see sections 2.22). This includes one provider at another Higher Education institution, with the Fish Medicine rotation being hosted at a specialist unit within Stirling University.

5. Self-Evaluation Overview
   5.1 Two areas stood out to the review team for deserving of particular praise – student support and faculty teaching development.
   5.2 The review team found the commitment of the School to enhancing student support and the building of an academic community commendable. From the Personal Tutoring system and Notes of Concern to Welfare Week, student support is fully embedded in the way the School operates. The School has a holistic approach to supporting students that involves all faculty, staff and students.
   5.3 Schools across the University should be encouraged to look at the School of Veterinary Studies in this regard.
   5.4 The review team found that the commitment to enhancing teaching quality commendable. The expectation that faculty should engage with professional development in terms of their teaching practice and the opportunities provided by the School in this regard are an area of best practice.

6. Confidence Statement
   The review team found that Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies has effective management of the quality of the student learning experience, academic standards, and enhancement and good practice.
## Prioritised List of Commendations and Recommendations

### Key Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Commendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The School is commended on the leadership from the Head of School which has been significant in driving improvements, particularly in how the School and Roslin move forward together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>The School is commended on its committed at all levels to the enhancement of the student experience. This was evident in the developmental approach to the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The School is commended on the establishment of the Outstanding Student Ambassador Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The School is commended for its support to students experiencing difficulties transitioning across the years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>The School is commended for its commitment to the Personal Tutoring system and for the whole school approach to student support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>The School is commended for its robust mechanisms for alerting staff to potential student difficulties, for example the Note of Concern. They are an example of best practice within the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>The School is commended on staff responsiveness to student needs, both academic and pastoral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>The School is commended on the energy and commitment of both staff and students to creating a vibrant and supportive community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>The School is commended for ensuring that students feel listened to and changing things where relevant and possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>The School is commended for its production of a ‘You Said We Listened’ booklet which summaries changes made on the basis of student feedback. This is circulated to students and is available from various locations around the School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>The School is commended for the energy and commitment to enhancing learning and teaching demonstrated by the staff they spoke to, including the postgraduate residents and demonstrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>The review team commends the School on the adoption of innovative teaching practices and suggests that the School utilises flipped classroom methods where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>The review team commends the School for the many examples of good practice in the provision of feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>The School is commended on the development of professional development workshops to enhance teaching practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The School is commended on its attainment of international accreditation which enables the School to follow the internationalisation...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The agenda of the University, with AVMA (American Veterinary Medical Association) accreditation a particular attractor for US students.

| 16 | 2.2 | The School is commended on its recruitment and conversion activities involving both staff and students. The School holds interviews with applicants both on campus and internationally (e.g. in New York) and appreciation of this was evident through discussions with students. |
| 17 | 2.24 | The review team recognises and commends the progress made with embedding One Health throughout the programme. |
| 18 | 3.3 | The School is commended for its use of a statistician to check and balance exam marks. |

### Recommendations for Enhancement/Areas for Further Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>The review team recommends the School ensures that all staff are aware of the strategic priorities of the School. The School should ensure that the strategic plan drives the day to day activities and planning.</td>
<td>Senior Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>The review team recommends that the School look more deeply at how to formalise Quality Assurance processes for selective rotations with external partners and how these relationships are maintained.</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine Quality Assurance Committee (VMQAC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3        | 2.27    | The review team recommends that the School:  
   i) Should undertake a comprehensive review of the feedback provided to students both in taught courses and selective rotations.  
   ii) Should pay particular attention to consistency of quality and timeliness (15 day turn-around) of feedback.  
   iii) Develop and establish mechanisms to ensure the quality and consistency of feedback to students. | Learning and Teaching Committee |
<p>| 4        | 2.28    | The review team recommends that the School reviews the portfolio, how it can be assessed and by whom, in relation to reflective practice skills and attainment of relevant Day One Competences. | Learning and Teaching Committee and ASSET |
| 5        | 2.34    | The review team recommends that the school develops a system to ensure the consistency of quality and ongoing enhancement of teaching, learning and assessment, ensuring that all groups involved in teaching are included (residents, interns, PhDs and lecturers from outside the school etc.). | Senior Management Group |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>The review team recommends review of the mechanisms for providing feedback to residents from students as it would be useful to their professional development as instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The review team recommends that the School continues its ongoing commitment to the fullest recognition of their students and their contributions, such as though looking at how the Outstanding Student Ambassador Award can be included in the HEAR certificate. [Subject Specific Remit Item 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>The review team recommends that the School reviews the relationship between the Senior Management Group and the Learning and Teaching Committee to ensure effective two-way communication within the School. The review team believe that the key to addressing issues of curriculum overload lies with these two groups exercising their authority. [Subject Specific Remit Item 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The review team recommends that the School ensures transparency and consistent use of marking schemes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Appendices**

**Appendix 1** additional information considered by review team

Prior to the review visit
- Accreditation 2015 –Self Study Report and Appendices
- Analytic Report
- Course Survey Traffic Light Analysis
- External Examiner Reports and Responses
- Feedback Turnaround Deadlines and Dates
- School Quality Assurance Reports
- Student Handbooks (Course and Programme)
- Student Staff Liaison Committee Minutes
- ‘You Said, We Did’ 2015

During the review visit
- Examples of feedback
### Appendix 2 Number of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Year Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth (Final) Year</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth (Final) Year</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overall</strong></td>
<td>716</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>