|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EVALUATIVE REPORT (typically 3,000 – 6,000 words) and ACTION PLAN** | |
| **Academic year of review:** | |
| **Review Area: The Subject(s), School(s) or equivalent or Off Campus Doctoral Centre(s) encompassed by this report:** | |
| **Research Coordinator(s) name(s)(s):** | **Contact email(s):** |
| 1. **Action points addressed from previous periodic review report**: | |
| Provide an update on progress made against the actions agreed at the last periodic review (any previous action plan is to be updated and attached to this report). State if an action is ‘incomplete’, ‘ongoing’ or ‘complete’. Where an action is either ‘ongoing’ or ‘incomplete’ the reasons for this should be clearly explained; such actions should be transferred to the appropriate section of the current action plan with a time-bound plan proposed in which to complete the action. | |
| 1. **Performance Indicators** | |
| This section covers a number of measures of performance which you should have lodged in the Moodle PDR. You should provide an evaluation of this data, paying particular attention to overall satisfaction and to any non-completions, whatever the cause, along with reasons and remedies for any identified shortcomings as they relate to the relevant review area. The measures of performance are:   * Overall experience score(s) from PRES and/or other measures of student satisfaction. * Data on student cohort sizes, completions, failures, withdrawals and continuing numbers for the previous 5 years. | |
| 1. **Supervision** | |
| Provide an evaluation of supervisory arrangements for students, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list):   * There are clear criteria for how supervisors are appointed. * Supervisors’ capacity to deal with the numbers and types of students they are allocated is appropriate and monitored, bearing in mind the University’s published regulations on supervisory workload allowances. * Supervisors have relevant skills and knowledge, are fully trained and given opportunities to undertake relevant training and professional development. * Supervisors understand and execute their responsibilities, including identifying, planning and fostering students’ training and development, providing constructive feedback to help students direct their research activities, involvement in research progress monitoring, annual and mid-programme reviews and preparation for final assessment. * Supervisors based in collaborative organisations are trained and understand their responsibilities. * Supervisors know where to go if they need support/advice. * Supervisory sessions take place (at least monthly) and are monitored in writing. * A procedure is in place if the student-supervisor relationship breaks down. * There are effective mechanisms in place to ensure minimum expectations are met regarding contact between research students and supervisory teams. * Any themes relating to supervision, good or bad, that have emerged from student feedback and/or complaints or appeals. | |
| 1. **Resources** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of the resources available to students, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * The working space available to students. * Provision of adequate computing resources and facilities. * Adequacy of library facilities (physical and online). * Availability of specialist resources. | |
| 1. **Research culture/environment** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of the research culture/environment, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * How your research culture/environment allows for postgraduate researchers to access supportive peer networks to facilitate discussion of their research with other researchers, including research students. * How your research culture/environment takes account of student diversity, health and well-being. * How well your research culture/environment supports the engagement of research students in their discipline, internally and externally, and in their department or institution more broadly (for example, engaging in committees, or having opportunities to go to conferences). * How your research culture/environment is informed by the feedback received from research students. * How the research culture/environment serves to stimulate students and facilitate research achievement. | |
| 1. **Admissions, progress and assessment** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of the admissions, progress monitoring and assessment processes, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * How admissions procedures conform to the requirements set out in the ***Research Degree Regulations*** and the ***Code of Practice for Research Students and Supervisors***, particularly in regard to ensuring selectors are appropriately trained, at least two selectors are used to judge applications, interviews are conducted, and English language requirements are met. * How applicants are guided through the admissions process. * How an applicant’s motivation, aptitude and potential to successfully complete the programme are taken into account. * Induction and orientation for new students, including those who do not start in September/October. * How you ensure that students understand progression monitoring procedures and deadlines. * How you successfully monitor the individual and collective progress of students through the life cycle of their research degree, including the research proposal, research ethics matters, suspension and withdrawal. * How effective your mechanisms are for identifying and implementing support for students who are not progressing satisfactorily. * What criteria you have in place for the appointment of examiners. * How you ensure that research degree examinations are consistent, equitable and fit for purpose. * How you ensure that students understand the final assessment procedures for their degree and the standard required. | |
| 1. **Responsibilities** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of how students and others are made aware of their own and others’ responsibilities, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * How the governance of research degrees functions in the review area, what committees, boards and individual responsibilities exist to manage and operate the provision, including admissions, progression, ethical considerations, examination, student representation. * How and where the roles and responsibilities of research students, supervisors and examiners are made known. * How students know that the University values and responds to their feedback. * Student’s understanding of their responsibilities as research degree students. * Students’ awareness of supervisors’ responsibilities to them. * The role of staff other than the supervisor in resolving any concerns students may have about their research degree programme. | |
| 1. **Research skills** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of the training available to students, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * Any taught elements in the programme(s) concerned. * The development of skills and the acquisition of competencies through any placement-based learning. * The effectiveness of other support and training available to students to develop research-related skills (this might include, for example, training in research methodologies, tools and techniques, research integrity (good research practice, pursuit of ethical research, transparency, attributing the contribution of others, research misconduct), intellectual property, communicating research). * Feedback received from research students, Research Councils and other external funding bodies, and any other relevant stakeholders. * Evidence of the development of students’ confidence to be critically analytic and evaluative, creative or innovative. | |
| 1. **Professional development and opportunities** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of professional development and other opportunities available to students, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * How professional development plans are established, reviewed and adhered to in order to address the individual needs of research students. * Whether there are opportunities for postgraduate researchers to develop a range of research, and transferrable personal and professional-related skills to aid them in their future careers. * The development of students’ ability to manage projects, communicate information to diverse audiences, grow their contacts and professional networks, engage in placements and internships and manage their own professional development. * Whether students are given the opportunity to undertake teaching or equivalent work, with relevant support, guidance and formal training. * Careers guidance, advice and support for postgraduate career destinations. | |
| 1. **Wellbeing** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of the pastoral support available to postgraduate research students which contributes to their wellbeing, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on this dimension are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * How you actively determine whether students are satisfied with their own life and generally happy. * What steps you take to address any concerns relating to student wellbeing. * The effectiveness of the informal and formal pastoral support available to students who may be experiencing difficulties. | |
| 1. **Motivations, career intentions and preparedness, withdrawal indicators** | |
| * Provide an evaluation of any quantitative and/or qualitative data you have that bears upon these matters, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Quantitative and/or qualitative data on these dimensions are provided in the PRES report. Where performance is below relevant comparators and/or there is negative comment, this should be explored in your narrative and action proposed to help improve the position **from the perspective of the review area under consideration**. Where the score is above the comparators and/or there is positive comment, you should suggest **how your review area may have contributed to this**, so that your good practice can be shared across the institution. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list): * Whether the primary motivations and career intentions of pursuing a research degree have implications for the way your provision is delivered. * How the main reasons given for considering leaving or suspending study might suggest changes to the way in which your provision is delivered. | |
| 1. **Provision of information to research students, staff and examiners** | |
| Provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of the information and guidance available to students, staff and examiners, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. In writing the evaluation, you may find it helpful to consider some of the following points (this is not to be considered as an exclusive or exhaustive list):   * Provision of information to students, including those who do not start in September/October. * How and where the regulations and procedures, including the code of practice, research ethics and research conduct frameworks, are made clear and accessible, including provision of information to those students and staff based off-campus. * How the diverse needs of research students are reflected in regulations and codes of practice. * Whether there is appropriate supplementary information provided at review area level. * Communication of the arrangements and requirements for progress monitoring, annual progress review and examination. * Usefulness of handbooks and other guidance. * Use of Moodle. | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Feedback** |
| Provide an evaluation, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR, of any themes that have emerged from feedback from:   * Students: This may comprise feedback gathered informally, through the end of year and interim progress reviews, PRES, postgraduate research student representatives etc. * External Examiners: Comments on theses provided in External Examiners’ reports for the relevant period. * Other stakeholders: Feedback received from any other stakeholder, for example, collaborative organisations, sponsors, employers, placement supervisors etc. |
| 1. **Collaborative provision** |
| Provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of the **additional** arrangements in place for any collaborative postgraduate research degree provision, referring to your evidence in the Moodle PDR. Collaboration can include arrangements with approved Doctoral Centres, with other organisations, or via students conducting their research in other organisations, placements etc.  You may wish to consider the following :   * The use of agreements and contracts. * Management of supervisory arrangements. * Operation of administrative procedures. * Particular quality assurance arrangements in place to ensure a positive learning experience for the student. * Liaison between colleagues at both institutions. * Information and guidance on the expectations of collaborative organisations and individuals. |
| 1. **Action plan** |
| Provide an action plan (see below) to address any identified shortfalls in the provision. The action plan will consist of a series of targets that are **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic and **T**ime-limited. Where possible, derive holistic, meaningful actions rather than a plethora of detailed ones. Aim for no more than a half dozen or so. |
| 1. **Request for support with actions** |
| Please flag in this section any actions that will require support from the wider University. |
| 1. **Sign off** |
| Report author: |
| 1. **Approval** |
| This report has been approved by:  **Name:**  **Post title:** |

**Date of Action Plan:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference: A-Carried over from previous year’s action plan; B-Current Performance Indicators; C-Supervision; D-Resources; E-Research Culture; F- Progression and assessment, including admissions; G-Responsibilities; H-Research skills; I- Professional development and opportunities; J- Wellbeing; K-Motivations, career intentions and preparedness, withdrawal indicators; L- Provision of information to research students, staff and examiners; M- Feedback; N- Collaborative provision.** | | | | |
| **Reference** | **Action** | **Date Due** | **Individual responsible** | **Progress**  **(‘complete’, ‘ongoing’, or ‘incomplete’)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |