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The panel also met:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students undertaking the MBChB</th>
<th>Levels 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students undertaking the BDS</td>
<td>Levels 2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments on the Self-evaluation Document were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms Katja Christie</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Lucy Foley</td>
<td>Head of Student Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Gail Smillie</td>
<td>School DIT Relationship Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Impressions

The School of Medicine and Dentistry is the largest of four schools of the College of Life Sciences and Medicine and is located at the University’s Foresterhill Campus. The School comprises the disciplines of Medicine and Dentistry.

Overall, the panel **commended** the quality of teaching and learning in the School as a whole and expressed confidence in the maintenance of academic standards. The panel recognised the School’s commitment to teaching and learning quality and enhancement. Furthermore, the panel recognised that where issues did occur, the School was responsive and proactive in resolving these quickly, efficiently, and with the best interests of the students in mind at all times.

The panel were particularly heartened by the obvious efforts of all School staff, academic and administrative, amongst whom a clear sense of collegiality and commitment was very evident.

The panel **commended** the School for embracing innovative methods of teaching and noted its forward-looking attitude which encompassed plans for future innovation.

The panel welcomed the very positive response towards the School from students.

**Notes:** *The numbering of sections below reflects the numbering of the self-evaluation document (SED). Some sections of the SED attracted no commendations or recommendations.*

Section 1: Range of Provision

**PROGRAMMES**

1.1 The School of Medicine and Dentistry offers the following degree programmes:

   i. Degree of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (MBChB)
   ii. Degree of Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS)
   iii. Degree of Bachelor of Science in Medical Sciences (BSc Med Sci)
   iv. Degree of Bachelor of Science in Medical Sciences (Medical Humanities)
   v. Physician Associate Studies (PGDip)

1.2 The Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) is a graduate entry programme.

1.3 The MBChB programme and the BDS programme are recognised and regulated by the General Medical Council (GMC) and the General Dental Council (GDC) respectively.

Section 2: Aims of Provision

2.1 The panel **commended** the School as a whole on the commitment of its staff to high quality provision, a recurring theme in the review documentation and throughout the review itself.

2.2 The panel **commended** the School for its clear vision in terms of the provision of teaching. The panel noted clear staff engagement with the aim, as laid out in the documentation, *to produce graduates who meet outcomes determined by applicable Regulators* (point 1.3 refers) and *to function as compassionate, articulate and skilled practitioners ready to enter the next stage of their personal and professional development* [SED, section 2 refers].
2.3 The panel specifically recognised and **commended** the innovative nature of the Physician Associate Diploma and its design to **produce graduates who are competent and reflective practitioners trained in the medical model and who meet the requirements of the Physician Associate Curriculum Framework and Matrix** [SED, section 2 refers].

Section 3: Staffing

3.1 The panel noted the structure of the School of Medicine and Dentistry and its three Divisions; the Division of Medical and Dental Education (DMDE), the Division of Applied Medicine (DAM) and the Division of Applied Health Sciences (DAHS). The panel **commended** the School for a structure that appeared efficient in the management of the work of the School. While noting the overall responsibility of the DMDE in delivering teaching and for liaising with regulators, the panel **commended** the whole School commitment to teaching delivery and the wider student experience.

3.2 The panel noted the dependence of the School on the School of Medical Sciences (SMS) and NHS Scotland staff for the delivery of teaching across the School and specifically within the MBChB. The panel **commended** the strong working relationships evident between all parties and the commitment shown towards the teaching provision required. The panel noted, however, the difficulties of such a teaching model and specifically the complex funding and staffing pressures currently being experienced across NHS Scotland. The panel noted the obvious commitment of the School in negating any such issues for the sake of the student experience and **recommended** only that such commitment continue. The panel **recommended** that the College as a whole and the wider University community provide support as required and where possible.

3.3 Specifically with regard to Dentistry and teaching provision across the BDS, whilst the panel **commended** the School for its efforts in recruiting junior staff and mentoring them to progress, the panel noted the challenges faced by the School as a consequence of a national shortage of senior Dental Academics. The panel were reassured to note that the appointment of a new Director of Dentistry was, however, imminent and **commended** the School and wider University for the work undertaken to recruit in this regard. Despite the evident challenges faced across Dentistry, the panel **further recommended** an average staff-student ratio of 1:5 for clinical supervision.

3.4 The panel **commended** the efficiency and dedication of the School administrative staff. The panel was heartened by their largely positive and enthusiastic attitude despite obvious pressures across the School. The panel **commended** the discussions held with staff during the review and were heartened by their responses, which gave the panel confidence in their professionalism and commitment to quality.

Section 4: School Organisation

4.1 With reference to the DMDE, DAM and DAHS (point 1.3 refers) the panel **commended** the clear organisational structure of the School as a whole.

4.2 The panel acknowledged and **commended** the dedication of all individuals within the School but particularly the leadership and commitment shown by the Head of School and each of the Heads of Division and their deputies. The panel specifically **commended** the leadership demonstrated within the DMDE and noted a collegial and committed environment. The
panel noted a culture of intelligent reflection on practice and of responsiveness to issues in general.

4.3 The panel noted the Committee structure of the School and specifically, on first glance, the seemingly large number of Committees. The panel commended feedback from across the School that the Committee structure worked well and was clearly understood, thus allowing for the strengthening of internal School relationships. The panel recommended that the School continue to review the Committee structure on an ongoing basis to ensure it continues to meet the needs of the School in an effective and transparent manner.

4.4 The panel noted significant good practice within the School; specifically within the established MBChB programme (section 6 refers). The panel recommended that the School ensure the Committee structure be used to disseminate this good practice across the School as a whole.

4.5 The panel acknowledged the requirement of the School to engage not only with the wider College and the University as a whole, but with its NHS partners and regulatory bodies. The panel noted the complexities of such relationships and commended the School’s approach to fostering these relationships, as demonstrated in the review documentation and during the review itself. The panel recommended that, where possible, the processes for engaging with the partners mentioned above also remain under continual review.

4.6 The panel noted the obvious separation of the School from the University as a whole, largely brought about by the location of the School on the Foresterhill campus. The panel specifically noted a feeling of separation from the broader University amongst the student body. The panel acknowledged the difficulties in ensuring a stronger relationship, however, recommended that in the first instance, steps towards improving this be taken by ensuring the administration of the School further align with that of the University as a whole. The panel recommended that both the School and central administration bodies, such as the Registry, contribute to work in this regard.

4.7 The panel commended the obviously strong relationship between the School and its students and the importance placed on their input and feedback. The panel noted School engagement with students in terms of their participation in committees such as the School Teaching and Learning Committee and Staff Student Liaison Committees. The relationship between the two was exemplified to the panel by both the staff and student body.

4.8 The panel commended the use of School Teaching Away Days and recommended that this activity be continued.

Section 5: Course and Programme Design, Accessibility and Approval

5.1 The panel commended the breadth of teaching methods and the flexible approach to learning across the School. The panel specifically noted the use of innovative teaching methods particularly across the well-established MBChB programme.

5.2 The panel noted the restrictions placed on the School in the development of their courses and programmes by the requirements of appropriate regulatory bodies, and the panel further noted the requirement for periodic review in this regard. The panel commended the School, however, for carefully reflecting on its course and programme structures.
5.3 In further considering the requirements of regulatory bodies, the GMC and the GDC, the panel commended the School’s interaction with both and its responsive nature in dealing with the requirements of professional bodies. While section 6 refers specifically to the BDS, the panel noted the determination of the School as a whole and notably of specific individuals, to appropriately meet the needs of regulators to ensure the best possible quality of provision across the School.

5.4 The panel commended the reflective and critical attitude adopted by the School towards its own provision as demonstrated in its responses to External Examiner’s reports, in its away days, and in the commissioning of the Physician Associate Diploma.

5.5 The panel specifically recognised the innovative nature of the Physicians Associate Diploma and commended the School for its development.

5.6 The panel acknowledged the strong relationships between the School and its External Examiners (EE) and commended the School for the appropriate use of EE’s as a source of help and expertise and as individuals with whom ideas and good practice are exchanged. The panel noted with some concern the very large number of EE’s currently engaged with the School and recommended that this be revised downwards to ensure transparency, and that External Examiners could more readily develop a broad overview of the curricula and their delivery.

5.7 The panel noted concerns raised by the School regarding the rules over the appointment of EE’s. The panel acknowledged the small pool from which EE’s for all of the School’s disciplines are drawn and noted that University policy can be somewhat restrictive to the School in appointing individuals. The panel noted the pressures of this particularly in both Dentistry and the Physician Associate programme where the skill set from which the School can draw is small. The panel noted that requirements for the appointment of EE’s are set out by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and therefore may not be in the University’s gift to amend. The panel recommended, however, that dialogue between the School and the Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning), via the Registry, be entered into to see if there exists any opportunity for manoeuvre in this regard.

5.8 The panel was heartened to commend the interaction of the School with its students in influencing and designing the curriculum. The panel noted clear examples of an evident partnership with the student body through methods such as the Student Course Evaluation Form (SCEF), staff-student Liaison Committees (SSLCs), student driven enhancements such as peer teaching, and student created teaching resources. The panel commended the constructive staff-student partnership evident through its interviews with representatives of both the staff and student body.

5.9 The panel commended the level of work undertaken by the School in supporting students with disabilities. The panel commended all staff in this regard, but particularly the work of individuals such as the Lead in Student Support and the Student Welfare Officer, and also the Regent structure as a whole. The panel noted work undertaken in recent years to raise staff awareness of, and engagement with, mental health issues amongst students and the support offered to students suffering in this regard. The panel commended the work of the School in ensuring that the needs of individuals such as these are met. The panel commended the relationship between the School and the University’s central Student Support Services team.
5.10 The panel **commended** the commitment of the School to ensuring students studying off campus, on placement in Inverness or undertaking remote and rural placements, continue to receive a high level of support. The student representatives interviewed endorsed the level of support received at all times.

5.11 The panel noted in discussions with staff the high standard of equipment and provision in teaching rooms noting, however, that this is variable based on student intake. The panel **recommended** that the standard of teaching accommodation be continually reviewed to ensure provision remains of a high standard, reliable, and well supported.

**Section 6: Teaching, Learning and Assessment**

6.1 The panel acknowledged significant differences in the provision as delivered by the School of Medicine and Dentistry, largely attributed to the nature of the differing programmes taught and the duration for which they had been in operation. The panel therefore considered it helpful to provide a report on Teaching, Learning and Assessment for each of the four main areas of study.

**DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF MEDICINE AND BACHELOR OF SURGERY (MBChB)**

6.2 The panel **commended** the established MBChB programme for its continuing successes in producing graduates of the highest calibre. The panel **commended** the use of differing forms of teaching methods and assessment such as lectures, small group tutorials, peer teaching, online case based learning, problem solving, use of video recording and practical classes.

6.3 The panel **commended** the School’s use of student feedback in informing teaching and further **commended** the School’s timely feedback to the student body. The panel found the School’s perception of a strong partnership with students to be echoed clearly by the Students themselves.

6.4 The panel noted the use of NHS funding to provide the Clinical Skills Centre for MBChB students. The panel **commended** the use of monies in this regard and noted the enthusiasm of staff and students for such an innovative and useful resource. The panel noted that funding such as that received for this project is likely to be unavailable in the coming years. The panel **recommended** to the School and College that steps are taken to ensure the resource is maintained as far as possible.

6.5 Specifically with regards to assessment the panel **commended** the School on the appointment of an Assessment Group to oversee Assessment within the MBChB, to ensure the standards of assessment meet not only the requirements of the GMC but of the University as a whole. The panel further **commended** initiatives to make use of technologies in assessment, an initiative demonstrated by example of iPad-based marking.

6.6 The panel **commended** many areas of good practice clearly evident within the MBChB. These included, but were not limited to, the use of myMBChB, a flexible and personalised curriculum and learning management platform tailored to Medical students, and the use of Peer Teaching, including the Peer Assisted Learning Society, a student driven and staff-supported vehicle.

6.7 The panel noted responses of a very positive nature from students of all levels undertaking the MBChB. The panel **commended** the School for their interaction with the MBChB cohort.
DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL SCIENCES (BSc Med Sci)

6.8 The panel commended staff and students involved with the BSc Med Sci programme, noting their dedication to a complex programme taught over the course of one academic year. As with the MBChB, the panel noted the use of a variety of teaching and assessment methods across the programme. The panel commended the quality of this provision.

6.9 The panel noted the complex nature of the material taught during a relatively short period, and its assessment using a diversity of methods often unfamiliar to the MBChB students. While acknowledging the work undertaken to advise students in this regard, the panel recommended that steps be taken to provide exemplar formative assessment for students in advance of the summative assessment required. The panel further noted a short turnaround time separating teaching and associated assessment on the BSc Med Sci programme in semester 1. The panel acknowledged that timings would need to be tight, specifically in recognition of the changes to the Academic Year structure, but recommended that consideration be given how these timings could be changed, to ensure students have as much time to prepare for examination as possible.

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DENTAL SURGERY (BDS)

6.10 The panel, in considering the ITR documentation provided by the School, noted the most recent report of BDS provision as provided by the GDC (GDC Inspection Report 2014). The panel noted with concern the points raised, specifically regarding assessment provision. On visiting the School, however, the panel commended an evidently strong and collegial attitude amongst staff to ensuring the requirements of the GDC are met, in full, while maintaining an excellent student experience. The panel commended the forward looking attitude of the School and acknowledged its setting of clear objectives for achieving and maintaining standards, to address the concerns of the GDC Inspectorate.

6.11 Members of the panel commended the School for the use of a variety of teaching and assessment methods such as lectures, small group tutorials, web-based learning, case-based scenarios, dental laboratory techniques, clinical skills training and dental public health attachments. The panel specifically noted significant work undertaken to enhance assessment within the programme and commended the introduction of initiatives including written case based assessments and the removal of the final unseen case examination.

6.12 The panel noted the introduction of the Clinical Skills Passport as a means of recording and reviewing the clinical ability of students. The panel commended the initiative and noted the enthusiasm of both staff and students for it. The panel also noted the enhancement of student clinics to include initiatives such as clinical protocols, clinical recording sheets, monthly clinic meetings and clinic leads.

6.13 The panel commended the efforts of the academic staff, noting the desire of the School to appoint senior academic staff to help contribute to the student experience and to build successfully on the requirements of the GDC. The panel commended steps taken in this regard and noted the difficulties associated with it (point 3.3 refers). The panel also commended the work of administrative staff, noting their commitment and engagement.

6.14 The panel acknowledged efforts taken within the School to communicate effectively with staff and students, specifically in light of the GDC report and its publication. The panel commended the efforts of the School to date in the arrangement of initiatives such as
student focus groups. The panel specifically noted the response from students that they had felt engaged during this time. The panel did note, however, that communication could be improved, using a proactive rather than reactive approach, to ensure the community as a whole were given the opportunity to be updated on issues. The panel therefore **recommended** that positive steps to communicate with staff and students continue to be built upon.

6.15 The panel specifically **commended** the work of the Deputy Director of Dentistry, in collaboration with the Head of the DMDE, in working to address the requirements of the GDC. The panel, though unable to comment on the specifics of teaching within the School, **commended** the forward moving attitude expressed and were encouraged by the work undertaken in response to the GDC.

6.16 The panel noted the interaction between Medicine and Dentistry staff in the development of the BDS. The panel **commended** this and **recommended** that it continue, specifically in the sharing of the established good practice that exists within the MBChB. The panel further **recommended** that the College and wider University, support Dentistry in its work to appropriately fulfil the requirements of the GDC. The panel **recommended** that the School communicate with its staff as effectively as possible.

**Physician Associate Studies (PGDip)**

6.17 The panel **commended** the introduction of the Physician Associate Diploma introduced in response to requirements within the health sector. The panel noted the innovative nature of the programme itself and **commended** the use of a variety of teaching and assessment methods to ensure the appropriate assimilation of knowledge.

**Section 7: Course and Programme Monitoring and Review**

7.1 The panel **commended** the School on the consistently positive comments and endorsements from EEs by way of their feedback throughout the year and their centrally submitted annual reports.

7.2 The panel further **commended** the School for consistently receiving positive feedback from the student body. Students informed the Panel that should an issue occur, it can be raised with the School through a variety of mechanisms and is subsequently responded to quickly and effectively (point 4.7 refers).

**Section 8: Academic Standards and the Academic Infrastructure**

8.1 The panel noted the fact that the degree programmes offered have been designed in accordance with the academic standards required by the University, as set out by the QAC, and, where appropriate, the requirements of the regulatory bodies, the GDC and the GMC.

8.2 The panel **commended** the steps which had been taken to ensure consistency in policy and procedures throughout the School. The panel acknowledged the existence of the School-owned Academic Quality Handbook but **recommended** that the School liaise with the University’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) via the Registry to ensure the document is consistent in its approach to University wide policy.

**Section 9: Training and Supervision of Research Students**
9.1 The panel made no comment on this section of the SED as the provision offered by the School in this regard was covered by the Internal Teaching Review of the College of Life Sciences and Medicine Graduate School.

Section 10: Personal Development and Employability

10.1 The panel commended the commitment of the School to the development of its students at all stages of their studies. The panel noted engagement with employability across all programmes within the School and the School’s strong working relationship with the University Careers Service.

10.2 The panel noted that despite many elements of the Medicine and Dentistry curricula being determined by the GMC and GDC, the School seeks to embrace the Aberdeen Graduate Attributes (AGAs) of the University where possible. The panel commended the School for this.

10.3 The panel specifically commended the employability of those undertaking the Diploma in Physicians Associate Studies, recognising not only the commitment of the School to these students, but the growing demand which this innovative programme seeks to satisfy.

Section 11: Professional Bodies/Units

11.1 As is noted above, the panel commended the School on its positive and constructive relationships with accrediting bodies.

Section 12: Staff Training and Educational Development

12.1 The panel commended the School for the evident commitment and intelligently reflective attitudes of teaching and administrative staff, at all levels. The quality of the teaching team became most obviously clear in meetings with new members of staff, employed by both the University and NHS Scotland. The panel commended the School on its strong collegial, and professionally supportive ethos which was very evident in all meetings with staff.

12.2 The panel commended both the School’s supportive approach to the induction of new staff, as instanced in the team-teaching with more experienced staff, as well as the collegial and supportive atmosphere in general. The panel recommended, however, that all new staff also undergo induction at Institution level.

12.3 The panel noted a high level of commitment to CPD activities. The panel recommended that such a commitment be extended to ensure all staff have the opportunity to attend relevant courses, such as those run by the Centre for Academic Development (CAD).

Section 13: Student Involvement in Quality Processes

13.1 The panel commended School responsiveness to student input, as confirmed by the students themselves and referred to throughout this report.

Section 14: Public Information/Management Information

14.1 The panel made no comment on this section of the SED.
Section 15: Student Support, Retention and Progression

15.1 The panel was heartened to commend an evident commitment to student support demonstrated throughout the review; in the review documentation and in discussions with both staff and students. The panel noted that all staff held office hours or could be contacted - student comments suggested little difficulty in making contact with individual members of staff.

15.2 The panel commended the School’s Regent system, representatives of which demonstrated an impressive and knowledgeable attitude which showed appropriate balance between empathy and professionalism. The panel specifically commended work undertaken by the School to form a partnership with the student body and to identify students facing difficulties (points 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10 refer).

15.3 The panel noted a high level of satisfaction expressed by students. Students were fully aware of the avenues of support open to them and the panel commended the School for this. The panel commended the variety of approaches the School demonstrated to engaging with the student body to ensure a culture of seeking help if required.

15.4 The panel noted an increase in non-continuation figures (students repeating, failing or leaving for any reason) for the MBChB in recent years (Appendix J; Performance Indicator Data). When questioned on this, the School clarified that such increases were predominantly due to a direct recognition of student needs, allowing a student to take a break from study, for example. The panel commended the ability of the School to comment on this trend and in identifying the needs of these individuals, providing them with the appropriate advice and support. The panel further recommended that a close watch is kept on retention rates and appropriate action taken to ensure students are supported in their studies to an adequate extent.

Section 16: Recruitment Access and Widening Participation

16.1 The panel recognised the commitment of the School to ensuring admission to its programmes is based on merit and on the basis of ability to achieve. The panel commended the School for work undertaken to ensure admissions are dealt with in a fair and transparent manner, taking into account all aspects of an individual’s application and not academic profile alone.

16.2 Members of the panel noted the differences in the School owned admission processes from the University admissions processes as a whole and accepted the rationale for this. The panel commended the School for its commitment to widening participation in spite of the differences in approach to admission and specifically noted activities on campus and in Reach schools. The panel noted the structured advice provided and the integration of widening participation into the Medical Humanities programme.

16.3 The panel noted the graduate intake to both the BDS and the Diploma in Physicians Associate Studies and again commended the School for its fair and transparent approach to the admissions process.
16.4 The panel commended the recruitment of students from within the MBChB to the BSc Medical Science programmes. The panel were assured that students were admitted fairly and that the students involved clearly understood the application process.

Section 17: SFC Quality Enhancement Engagements

17.1 The panel made no specific comments on this section of the SED.

Section 18: Recent Developments

18.1 The panel noted the satisfactory implementation of many changes by the School since it last undertook an Internal Teaching Review. The panel commended the School on the steps taken to act upon the points raised by the previous panel.

18.2 The panel acknowledged significant changes within the School since the last review, specifically that of the implementation of the BDS, in only its first year at the point of last review, and the introduction of the Diploma in Physician Associate Studies.

Section 19: Quality Enhancement and Good Practice

19.1 The panel recognised a clear commitment to quality enhancement and several examples of good practice (see throughout), combined with evidence of critical self-reflection as contained in the documentation submitted to the panel.

Section 20: Impediments to Quality Enhancement

20.1 The panel made no specific comments on this section of the SED, noting only the staffing and funding issues as raised elsewhere in this report (section 3 refers).

Conclusions

The panel recommended unconditional revalidation of all undergraduate programmes within the School of Medicine and Dentistry.

The panel was confident to revalidate all provision within the School. The panel was content that the work of Medicine and Dentistry to ensure appropriate Academic Quality was ongoing.

The panel wished to thank all members of staff within the School of Medicine and Dentistry for the work that had gone into producing the ITR documentation and for their commitment to the review process. The panel also wished to thank all students and staff who participated in the visit; the visit itself went very smoothly, the School was very open and accommodating and the panel was made to feel very welcome.