

**POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Postgraduate Research Collaborative Partnership Annual Review is the system that the University operates to review its Collaborative PGR provision on an annual basis. The review is carried out, in consultation with the collaborative partner and it primarily aims to:

* Monitor and review academic standards and quality;
* Monitor and review the student experience;
* Highlight best practice for dissemination across the University;
* Highlight areas for development;
* Monitor and review action plans

Annual Review encourages Programme Management Teams[[1]](#footnote-1) and collaborative partners to reflect on and evaluate the academic year. During academic years where a PGR Collaborative Partner Review is scheduled it is not necessary to also undertake PGR Collaborative Partnership Annual Review. As well as enabling the University to check the academic health of its collaborative provision, Collaborative Partnership Annual Review is designed to identify areas for development and to identify and disseminate good and/or effective practice in PGR provision. The process also aids the Programme Management Team and the collaborative partner in their preparations for PGR Collaborative Partnership Review as it is a similarly evaluative and reflective exercise.

Annual Review also provides a structured mechanism for managing ongoing action plans and feeding relevant issues up to the wider Faculty and University.

The review should be undertaken for any PGR collaborative provision offered in association with a partner, including PhD, MPhil, MD and professional doctorates. Consideration of MRes degrees takes place within the Annual Subject Review of postgraduate taught provision.

1. **PROCESS**

The UoL Academic Lead should work with the collaborative partner to complete the template pro forma (Appendix 1) referring to the questions under each section and the action plan (Appendix 2). It is important that students are able to contribute to the PGR Collaborative Partnership Annual Review process; the completed pro forma should be made available to students and staff from within the review area to provide comments and suggest amendments. The Annual Review process should be a reflective exercise that summarises the previous academic year and an evaluation of areas of provision that are managed well and those that need improvement.

The pro forma and the action plan should be completed in July each year (and consider the events of the session that is ending) and be submitted to the first meeting of the relevant Faculty PGR Committee (or equivalent) in the following academic year. The Faculty PGR Committee should be responsible for overseeing a Faculty PGR Action Plan (a template for this is provided in Appendix 3) and reporting University issues to the PGR Committee. Where a collaborative partnership spans more than one Faculty, the Collaborative Provision Annual Review Report should be submitted to the Faculty PGR Committee meeting of the lead Faculty responsible for managing the partnership. Feedback from all Faculties involved with the collaboration should be incorporated into a single report.

1. **MONITORING AND SUPPORT**

Monitoring of the completion of CP Annual Review is undertaken by the relevant Faculty PGR Committee. The Annual Review process consists of individual partner reports which are submitted to the first FPGRC meeting of the following academic year. The FPGRC will provide a summary Faculty PGR Collaborative Partner Annual Review report for submission to the UPGRC, which will provide feedback on each of the Faculty reports. Decisions or actions in respect of cross Faculty collaborative partnerships should be discussed and agreed by UPGRC.

AQSD can provide advice and guidance on the process and content of the report. AQSD retains institutional oversight of reports and is responsible for producing a summary report of Collaborative PGR activity across the University to UPGRC. The summary reports give details of activity that has taken place, best practice and action identified. University level issues will be considered at UPGRC.

**The role of Faculty and University PGRC in CP Annual Review**

Faculty Postgraduate Research Committee

(i) Reviewing Collaborative Partnership Annual Review Reports:

The Collaborative Partnership Annual Review reports should be submitted to Faculty PGRC in time for their first meeting of the new academic year. Where a partnership spans more than one Faculty, the report should be submitted to the meeting of the lead Faculty. At this meeting FPGRC should review and evaluate the CP Annual Review reports; seeking to identify any emerging issues, common aspects to the reports, points of particular interest or note, and/or matters that need to be brought to the attention of the University.

(ii) Providing feedback on the CP Annual Review Reports:

The Faculty PGRC will provide feedback on the CP Annual Review report for each collaborative partnership; where a partnership spans more than one Faculty, feedback will be provided by the lead Faculty PGR Committee. If it is considered necessary, Faculty PGRC may request further information, or re-submission of a report if Faculty PGRC considers that it was not sufficiently reflective or self-appraising. This should not cause any delay in the Faculty CP Annual Review summary report being submitted to University PGRC, but it is expected that the Faculty CP Annual Review summary report will include details about actions being taken by the Faculty to get further information and/or an improved report.

(iii) Producing the Faculty CP Annual Review Summary Report:

The Faculty PGRC is responsible for producing a report for University PGRC summarising the CP Annual Review reports. The Faculty report will need to be produced in time for submission to the December/January meeting of University PGRC.

(v) Faculty PGRC actions arising from CP Annual Review Reports:

CP Annual Review reports may highlight actions that will need to be addressed by the wider Faculty. The Faculty PGRC should ensure that these actions are followed up and closed down, with feedback provided to relevant parties as appropriate.

(vi) Ongoing monitoring of CP Annual Review:

The Faculty PGRC is responsible for monitoring actions identified for review areas through the CP Annual Review reports.

University Postgraduate Research Committee

The University PGRC will receive the Faculty CP Annual Review summary reports from the Faculty PGRCs and review and evaluate them. It will provide feedback on the reports and it will progress or oversee any institutional level actions that have been identified as a result of the CP Annual Review process.

****

**PGR COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REVIEW**

APPENDIX 1

TEMPLATE PRO FORMA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PARTNERSHIP BEING REVIEWED:** | |  |
| **UoL ACADEMIC LEAD** | |  |
| **SECTION 1- PROGRAMMES COVERED BY THIS REPORT** | | |
| * Please complete a separate report for each collaborative partnership. Please list all PGR programmes on offer in association with this partnership (e.g PhD, MPhil etc). Where a collaboration spans more than one Faculty, please provide details of all PGR programmes offered across all UoL Faculties involved with this collaborative partnership * Is this a new or established partnership? * What is the nature of the collaboration? * How is communication/ relationship with the partner managed? * Provide an overview of the following: * recent major changes * the future of the collaboration * any planned developments | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 2- ADMISSIONS & INDUCTION** | | |
| * How are admissions and induction managed? * Provide an overview of new enrolments for the academic year | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 3 - RESEARCH SKILLS TRAINING** | | |
| * Provide an overview of research skills training provision * Comment on student engagement with research skills training opportunities | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 4 – RESOURCES & FACILITIES (AT BOTH INSTITUTIONS IF RELEVANT)** | | |
| * Provide a brief summary of issues/developments relating to learning resources and facilities (including staffing, technical support, library resources, VLE). Please detail any actions necessary in the action plan * Provide an updated list of academic staff at both institutions with responsibility for the supervision of research students on the programme | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 5 – STUDENT PROGRESSION & AWARDS** | | |
| * Provide a brief overview of student progress and completions for the academic year. Any action required to address poor achievement or retention should be carried forward to the action plan | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 6- STUDENT FEEDBACK** | | |
| * What opportunities have been made available to students to provide feedback this academic year? * What issues have been raised? * What actions were taken to address issues raised? * What actions are still outstanding?   + Please add them to the Action Plan | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 7- SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK** | | |
| * What opportunities have been made available to supervisors to provide feedback this academic year? * What issues have been raised? * What actions were taken to address issues raised? * What actions are outstanding?   + Please add them to the Action Plan | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 8- EXAMINER FEEDBACK** | | |
| * What process have you employed to review examiner feedback on the examination process? * Have any themes been identified? * What issues have been identified? * Where relevant, what action has been taken to resolve the issues? * What actions are outstanding?   + Please add them to the Action Plan | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 9- POLICY** | | |
| * Have any issues with the policy/ policies been highlighted during the academic year?   + If yes, please list and add to the Action Plan | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 10- COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS** | | |
| Describe the themes that have arisen in relation to the following (please do not provide information that enables identification of individual students):   * What informal complaints have been submitted by students? (Please describe the circumstances)   + What was the outcome? * What formal complaints have been submitted by students? (Please describe the circumstances)   + What was the outcome? * What appeals have been submitted by students? (Please describe the circumstances)   + What was the outcome? | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 11- AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT** | | |
| * Please state any other areas within the School/ Institute/Partnership that need developing.   + Include appropriate actions within the Action Plan | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 12- AREAS OF GOOD PRACTICE** | | |
| * Please state best practice within the School/ Institute/Partnership that should be disseminated across the Faculty/ University. | | |
|  | | |
| **SECTION 13- SIGN OFF** | | |
| To be completed by the UoL Academic Lead | | |
| Name |  | |
| Signature |  | |
| Date |  | |
| To be completed by the Collaborative Partner Academic Lead | | |
| Name |  | |
| Signature |  | |
| Date |  | |

**PGR COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REVIEW**

APPENDIX 2

TEMPLATE PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TEAM/ COLLABORATIVE PARTNER ACTION PLAN

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | Action | Owner | Deadline | Escalate to Faculty? | Date completed | Carry forward (Y/N) |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | Action | Owner | Deadline | Escalate to University? | Date completed | Carry forward (Y/N) |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |
|  |  |  |  | Y / N |  | Y / N |

**PGR COLLABORATIVE PARTNER ANNUAL REVIEW**

APPENDIX 3

TEMPLATE FACULTY ACTION PLAN

1. Where collaborative activity spans more than one UoL Faculty, the Programme Management Team will designate one Faculty as the partnership lead. The lead Faculty will also provide appropriate administrative support to the partnership. Each collaborative partnership of UoL must have an appointed PMT in place. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)