

# Code of practice for annual programme review: postgraduate research programmes

Academic year 2019/20

**Contents**

Contents ..... 1

Aims of the annual programme review ..... 1

Guiding principles ..... 1

Level at which the annual programme review will be conducted ..... 1

Revised process for annual programme review for reporting on 2018/19 ..... 1

Appendix 1 - Annual programme review report – Practitioner Doctorate and Structured PhD programmes..... 2

### **Aims of the annual programme review**

1. The purpose of the annual programme review is to conduct an evidence-based evaluation of postgraduate research degree provision at a sufficiently granular level. The main objective of the process is to support the enhancement of postgraduate research degree provision and to improve research students' learning experience.

### **Guiding principles**

2. The annual programme review of postgraduate research degree is underpinned by the following principles:
  - a clear process with clearly defined roles for those involved
  - an evaluative and reflective exercise focussed on the enhancement of postgraduate research provision to improve the experience of postgraduate research students
  - open, transparent and inclusive of stakeholders
  - responsive to stakeholder feedback
  - takes account of the diverse nature and differences of postgraduate research undertaken at the University
  - conducted at a level of granularity to facilitate identification and sharing of good practice
  - conducted at a level of granularity to identify areas of concern and ensure remedial action is taken
  - Informed by reliable and easily obtained data

### **Level at which the annual programme review will be conducted**

3. The annual programme review will be conducted for each Department, Centre, School, programme or, where appropriate, combination of these.

### **Revised process for annual programme review for reporting on 2018/19**

4. The annual programme review process for reporting on 2018/19 has been amended. There will be no requirement to produce an Annual Programme Review report instead the process will consist of a review of the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) data and student comments. These should be reviewed by local Postgraduate Research Directors in consultation with student reps and an action plan formulated for the 19/20 academic year.
5. Where particular programmes are expected to produce an Annual Programme Review for a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB), the template in Appendix 1 can be used.

**Appendix 1 - Annual programme review report – Practitioner Doctorate and Structured PhD programmes**

**Academic year 20XX/XX**

<b>Postgraduate Research Director name:</b>	<b>Contact email:</b>
<b>Title of the programme covered by this report:</b>	
<b>Action points addressed from previous annual programme review report:</b>	
<p>Please provide in this section an update on progress made against the actions agreed at the last annual programme review. Please state if an action is 'incomplete', 'ongoing' or 'complete'. Where an action is 'incomplete' the reasons for this should be clearly explained with a time-bound plan proposed in which to complete the action.</p>	
<b>Key Performance Indicators</b>	
<p>This section covers a number of measures of the programme's performance against targets. You are invited to write an evaluation of the programme's performance against these targets paying particular attention to any shortfall. The reasons for the shortfall should be explored and action to remedy the situation proposed.</p> <p>The Key Performance Indicators are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Recruitment against targets</li><li>• Submission and completion rates (data available in Management Reports R62, R66, R63, and R67).</li><li>• Overall satisfaction score from PRES (data available in the Management Reports)</li></ul>	

## Admission

In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of the effectiveness of the procedures in place for admitting students to a doctoral programme. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points:

- How procedures conform to the requirements set out in the [Code of practice for research degrees](#) particularly in regard to ensuring selectors are appropriately trained, two selectors are used to judge applications, interviews are conducted, and English language requirements are adhered to
- An evaluation of how applicants are guided through the admissions process
- An evaluation of how an applicant's motivation, aptitude and potential to successfully complete the programme are taken into account

## Student-facing information

In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of the effectiveness of the information and guidance available to students. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points:

- The induction and orientation for new students, including those who do not start in October
- Usefulness of handbooks and other guidance
- How students are made aware of their responsibilities including any placement-related responsibilities for students on placements. This might also cover awareness of the [Regulations for fitness to practise](#) and the [Procedure for support to study](#)
- Arrangements and requirements for progress monitoring and examination (including the confirmation)
- Use of SurreyLearn
- Provision of information to students based off-campus

Supervision				
Current score	Previous PRES score	Faculty score	Russell Group score	National score
<p>In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of supervisory arrangements for students. A quantitative measure of performance derived from PRES is provided. Where the score is below comparisons the reason for the shortfall should be explored in the narrative and remedial action proposed. Where the score is above the comparisons you are invited to analyse the reasons why so that the good practice can be shared across the institution.</p> <p>In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisors are fully trained;</li> <li>• Supervisors understand their responsibilities, including six-monthly and annual reviews of students;</li> <li>• Supervisors based in collaborative organisations are trained and understand their responsibilities;</li> <li>• Supervisors know where to go if they need support/advice;</li> <li>• Supervisory sessions take place (at least monthly) and are monitored;</li> <li>• A procedure is in place if the student-supervisor relationship breaks down;</li> <li>• Supervisor loading is monitored to ensure they have sufficient time to dedicate to each student.</li> <li>• Any themes relating to supervision, good or bad, that have emerged during the year from student feedback and/or complaints or appeals.</li> </ul>				

<b>Researcher training</b>				
Current score	Previous PRES score	Faculty score	Russell Group score	National score
<p>In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of training available to students. A quantitative measure of performance derived from PRES is provided. Where the score is below comparisons the reason for the shortfall should be explored in the narrative and remedial action proposed. Where the score is above the comparisons you are invited to analyse the reasons why so that the good practice can be shared across the institution.</p> <p>In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider the relevance, effectiveness, and timeliness of some of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The taught element of the programme</li> <li>• The development of skills and acquisition of competencies through placement-based learning</li> <li>• Other support and training available to research students to develop research-related skills (this might include, for example, training on research methods, ethical pursuit of research, academic misconduct, intellectual property, communicating research)</li> <li>• Feedback received from research students, Research Councils, and any other relevant stakeholder</li> </ul>				

<b>Professional development and careers</b>				
Current score	Previous PRES score	Faculty score	Russell Group score	National score
<p>In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of professional development opportunities and careers advice available to students. A quantitative measure of performance derived from PRES is provided. Where the score is below comparisons the reason for the shortfall should be explored in the narrative and remedial action proposed. Where the score is above the comparisons you are invited to analyse the reasons why so that the good practice can be shared across the institution.</p> <p>In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to and support for development opportunities that contribute to the research student's ability to develop personal and professional skills</li> <li>• How personal development plans are established, reviewed and adhered to in order to address the individual needs of research students</li> <li>• Careers guidance and support will also be covered in this section as well as an overview of graduate career destinations</li> </ul>				
<b>Research environment</b>				
Current score	Previous PRES score	Faculty score	Russell Group score	National score
<p>In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of the research environment. A quantitative measure of performance derived from PRES is provided. Where the score is below comparisons the reason for the shortfall should be explored in the narrative and remedial action proposed. Where the score is above the comparisons you are invited to analyse the reasons why so that the good practice can be shared across the institution.</p> <p>In writing the evaluative commentary about the research environment, you may wish to consider the opportunities available to students to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gain exposure to researchers working at the highest level in the student's chosen field and in cognate and related disciplines</li> </ul>				



Code of practice for annual programme review: postgraduate research programmes

- Be encouraged to work and exchange ideas with people and organisations using research outcomes for their own purposes and with colleagues in the wider research environment
- Have access to academic staff and other colleagues able to give advice and support
- Have access to a collegial community of academic staff and postgraduates conducting excellent research in cognate areas
- Develop peer support networks where issues or problems can be discussed informally (this could include access to social space provided for the purpose)

**Teaching/demonstrating**

Current score	Previous PRES score	Faculty score	Russell Group score	National score

In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of support for students who undertake teaching and demonstrating duties. A quantitative measure of performance derived from PRES is provided. Where the score is below comparisons the reason for the shortfall will be explored in the narrative and remedial action proposed. Where the score is above the comparisons you are invited to analyse the reasons why so that the good practice can be shared across the institution.

In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider adherence to the [Code of practice for postgraduate researchers who support teaching](#) and some of the following points:

- The mechanisms used to advertise and recruit suitable research students to teaching and demonstrating opportunities
- The training available to students who undertake teaching and demonstrating
- The on-going support for students engaged in teaching and demonstrating
- Monitoring of the time dedicated to such duties to ensure that it does not impede progress with the research project

<b>Facilities and resources</b>				
Current score	Previous PRES score	Faculty score	Russell Group score	National score
<p>In this section you are invited to write an evaluation of the facilities and resources available to research students. A quantitative measure of performance derived from PRES is provided. Where the score is below comparisons the reason for the shortfall will be explored in the narrative and remedial action proposed. Where the score is above the comparisons you are invited to analyse the reasons why so that the good practice can be shared across the institution.</p> <p>In writing the evaluation, you may wish to comment on access to and availability of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate learning and research tools such as access to IT equipment, library and electronic publications, and placement resources</li> <li>• Access to the facilities and equipment necessary to enable research students, in all modes of study, to complete their research programmes successfully</li> </ul>				
<b>Feedback</b>				
<p>In this section you are invited to comment on any themes that have emerged from feedback from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students: This may comprise feedback gathered informally, through the end of year and interim progress reviews, PRES, Postgraduate Research Student Engagement Forum, student representatives etc.</li> <li>• Other stakeholders: Feedback received from any other stakeholder, for example, collaborative organisations, sponsors, employers, placement supervisors etc.</li> </ul>				
<b>Pastoral care</b>				
<p>In this section you are invited to write an evaluative commentary on the pastoral support available to research students. Recognition of the distinctive nature of research degree study and diversity of research students should be taken into account in the provision of pastoral care.</p>				

## **Collaboration**

In this section you are invited to write a commentary on the effectiveness of collaborative arrangements in place. Collaboration can include joint supervision arrangements, students conducting research in other organisations, placements etc. You may wish to consider the following and adherence to the [Code of practice for collaborative provision](#):

- A list of collaborations
- The use of agreements and contracts
- Quality assurance arrangements in place to ensure a positive learning experience for the student
- Information and guidance on the expectations of collaborative organisations and individuals

## **External examiners' reports**

In this section the report author is invited to write an evaluative summary of the comments made by the external examiner(s) for the programme.

## **Issues raised through validation and periodic review**

In this section the report author will write an evaluative summary of how any conditions or recommendations raised in validation or periodic review exercises are being addressed.

## **Action plan**

In this section, please provide a summary of the actions required to address any shortfalls in provision. The action plan will consist of a series of SMART targets:

**Specific**

**Measurable**

**Achievable**

**Realistic**

**Time-limited**

<b>Areas of good practice</b>
In this section please specify areas of good practice you would like to share with the wider research community offering PGR degrees. Any good practice identified should be supported by evidence, for example, a high score in PRES, positive feedback from students etc.
<b>Support with actions</b>
Please flag in this section any actions that will require support from the wider University.
<b>Sign off</b>
Signed by the report author: Name ..... Signature .....
<b>Approval</b>
The report has been approved by:  Associate Dean (Doctoral College):  Name .....  Signature .....