

## Annex H

### **Examples of institutional good practice mapped against the framework of quality standards**

The framework of standards and of good practice in the provision and delivery of RDPs is reproduced from Annex D. Against this framework we have mapped current examples of good practice at both institutional and unit level (in the grey boxes).

We had the opportunity to visit only a small number of institutions during the course of the project, and most of our examples of good practice relate to these visits. This is not meant in any way to imply that good practice exists only in these institutions: rather we hope that these few examples will encourage institutions to develop mechanisms to share further examples of good practice for the benefit of the sector as a whole.

The framework is divided into eight sections:

1. Institutional arrangements for research degree programmes
2. Research Environment
3. Selection, admission, enrolment and induction of students
4. Supervisory arrangements
5. Initial review and subsequent progress
6. Development of research and other skills
7. Feedback mechanisms
8. Appeals and complaints procedures

Column one identifies the requirements for the academic provision; columns two and three show how that translates into responsibilities for supervisors, and for students. Column four identifies the institutional requirements for good administrative procedures, regulations and processes.

Statements and figures in square brackets [ ] are offered tentatively.

Annex A contains a glossary of the terms used in this framework.

1. Institutional arrangements for research degree programmes (RDP)			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p><b>1A: The institutional code of practice must meet, and preferably exceed, the standards in this document.</b></p> <p>Institution to ensure that it has adequate arrangements and resources to deliver to standards that are at least as high as those set out in this document. It should have mechanisms to ensure that all areas meet these criteria.</p> <p>Co-operation arrangements can be made with other units, institutions and organisations if there are any aspects for which the minimum standards are not met. Any arrangements must be formal, explicit, recorded, and monitored by the institution.</p>	<p>All supervisors to receive, and conform to the practices within the institutional code of practice.</p>	<p>All potential students to receive clear and accurate information on RDPs, including the expectations and demands (financial and other) placed on the research student.</p> <p>Make explicit to students their legal commitment to the institutional code of practice when enrolling on an RDP.</p> <p>Make it explicit that the institution has a legal commitment to make provisions to students at levels which are also set out in the code of practice.</p>	<p>Standards to be together in an institutional code of practice covering all the points in this document and conforming to current legislation.</p> <p>The code to be given (and made available on the web) to every applicant, student, supervisory team, academic panel and examiner in a form that makes clear their respective responsibilities.</p> <p>Ensure that the provision of RDPs and related activities are accessible to all students, particularly part-time students and students with special needs.</p> <p><b>1B: Institution to monitor, review and act on the application of the standards in its code, including the various standards set out in this document.</b></p> <p><b>1C: Institutional and unit performance to be monitored [annually] on progress and attrition against agreed targets including gender and ethnic groupings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ submission rates [80% within 4 years]</li> <li>▪ average time to submission</li> <li>▪ completion rates [80% within 4.5 years]</li> <li>▪ level of appeals, complaints</li> <li>▪ student feedback.</li> </ul>
<p>University of Sheffield tri-annual independent faculty review of research supervision and support. Review panel of two internal academics nominated by the Graduate Office, one external nominated by the faculty and a faculty observer. Recommendations go to faculty and institutional research committees.</p>	<p>University of Middlesex audited all eight Schools over a two-year period following the QAA code of practice. Each audit panel included the Chair of School, and an external and an internal auditor from the Research Degrees Committee. It is organised and minuted by the University's HEI Quality Assurance and Audit Service.</p>	<p>UCL provides easy external web access to key documents of interest to postgraduates, eg the code of practice and sources of funding <a href="http://www.ucl.ac.uk/gradschool/essinfo">www.ucl.ac.uk/gradschool/essinfo</a></p> <p>UCL produces a short student-focused code that outlines responsibilities of student and those of main supervisor, subsidiary supervisor, departmental graduate tutor and head of department.</p>	

2. The Research Environment			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p>Research training programmes should only be offered by units that meet defined research standards. The HEI should set these for each unit by reference to, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RAE rating</li> <li>▪ level of grants and other funding</li> <li>▪ number of research active staff</li> <li>▪ papers, publications &amp; patents</li> <li>▪ facilities</li> <li>▪ completion and pass rates.</li> </ul> <p>For units which do not meet the institution's standards, research training should only be offered after co-operative arrangements have been made with a unit in which the standards are met.</p> <p><b>2A: RDPs offered in units with minimum RAE rating consistent with [current QR funding levels].</b></p> <p>Research active units should have a critical mass of research active staff, postdoctorates and research students within the unit or arrange this through explicit co-operative arrangements with other relevant units.</p> <p><b>2B: Demonstrate, within the unit/cognate area, a way of providing effective interactions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ with a minimum [5] research active staff/postdoctorates</li> <li>▪ between a group of at least [10] students.</li> </ul> <p><b>2C: Sufficient facilities for the research project, including library and IT facilities, should be available at or above the level needed for research of a national standard.</b></p>	<p>Supervisors to have relevant experience and recent publications in students' project areas.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>The White Rose consortium of the Universities of Leeds, Sheffield &amp; York offers PhD collaborative scholarships across two of the partner universities. Students have access to the full research facilities at both institutions. <a href="http://www.shef.ac.uk/pgresearch/wr2002.html">www.shef.ac.uk/pgresearch/wr2002.html</a></p> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>The Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, Imperial College London, and University College London run a Joint Inter-University Poster Competition for life and clinical sciences postgraduates. It offers students an opportunity to meet, advertise and discuss their research. <a href="http://www.ucl.ac.uk/gradschool/comp/jointposter">www.ucl.ac.uk/gradschool/comp/jointposter</a></p> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>The Scottish Doctoral Programme in Economics provides a single site MSc to serve the PhD programmes for eight institutions. During the PhD there is continuing interchange between the postgraduate community at a series of seminars and weekend reading parties. <a href="http://scottie.stir.ac.uk/intro.htm">http://scottie.stir.ac.uk/intro.htm</a></p> </div>	<p>Students to have a duty to contribute to the research environment (see Section 6).</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p>University of Middlesex School of Arts and Humanities provides a series of visiting speakers and trips to learned societies in London followed by deconstructive analysis the next week. University of Manchester Graduate School of Science, Engineering and Medicine provides peer-mentoring by PhD students for PhD students particularly in the importance of skills development. Described in the SRHE series of guides (see Annex J)</p> </div> <p>Students to have same access as academic staff to institutional resources, facilities and equipment (eg library privileges, funds for inter-library loans) and sufficient resources to do the project.</p>	<p>Institutions to establish unit research standards (at or above the threshold); such standards to be subject to monitoring and regular review by the institution.</p> <p>Co-operative links with other units, institutions and organisations formed in order to reach minimum standards must be formal, explicit, recorded and monitored by the institution. This should include demonstrating how the agreement(s) will achieve the effective operation of the required minimum standard.</p> <p>Institution should demonstrate a commitment to RDP by providing year-round access to facilities with no distinction between term time and vacations.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>University of Cambridge modern language students have 24hr access to dedicated postgraduate study space and computers</p> </div>

3. The selection, admission, enrolment and induction of students			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p>There must be a rigorous admissions procedure to match students with a programme of research, supervisory team and institution. This may be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>requiring all students to meet a minimum academic standard</li> <li>conducting face to face interviews for all applicants – which could be by video conference or local agent for overseas applicants</li> <li>taking up a minimum number of academic references for each applicant</li> <li>assessing other relevant information , eg language proficiency.</li> </ul> <p><b>3A: Institutional minimum level of academic entry standard [2.1 or masters or institutionally defined equivalent APL/APEL].</b></p> <p><b>3B: Selection process and admission decision to involve at least [2] experienced and research active academics, trained in admission processes.</b></p>	<p>University of Warwick Chair of Graduate School reviews all offer on basis of quality of the student, project and capacity to supervise.</p> <p>University of Sheffield uses two academics and supervisor on interview panels.</p>	<p>Confidentiality should be maintained throughout the admissions process.</p> <p>The student should be informed of and agree during the admission process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>broad outline of proposed research topic and length of study</li> <li>facilities and space to be made available to the student</li> <li>choice of supervisory team, nature of the supervisory arrangements and 'contract' (see Section 4)</li> <li>requirements on the student eg attendance, progress reports, contact, enrolment, registration</li> <li>expectations of student in relation to academic and social conduct and performance</li> <li>requirements and availability of training.</li> </ul> <p>Applicants to made aware of any relevant institutional funds/bursaries to support students.</p> <p>National Postgraduate Committee (NPC) website provides guidance for prospective students (including overseas) and list of questions to ask before deciding to do a PhD <a href="http://www.npc.org.uk">www.npc.org.uk</a></p> <p>US survey of questions to ask yourself, institution and supervisor when thinking about doing a PhD. <a href="http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/phd-survey/advice/advice.htm">www.wcer.wisc.edu/phd-survey/advice/advice.htm</a></p>	<p>Written criteria and processes for admission of students and allocation of projects, achievement of which should be monitored.</p> <p>The person(s) responsible for making offers to be defined.</p> <p>Target response timescales to be published and monitored for each stage in the admissions cycle.</p> <p>University of Sheffield publishes timescales on the web for each stage in the application process. <a href="http://www.sheffield.ac.uk/pgresearch/Recruitment/HowToApply/index.html">www.sheffield.ac.uk/pgresearch/Recruitment/HowToApply/index.html</a></p> <p>University of Manchester has a target to respond to enquiries within one month</p> <p>Institution to seek assurance that the student has sufficient financial support to complete the RDP.</p> <p><b>3C: Open access to all relevant material on web.</b></p> <p><b>3D: Formal offer letter should include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>fees and charges</li> <li>period of study</li> <li>direction of study</li> <li>specific requirements</li> <li>other requirements</li> <li>direction to other relevant information and codes of practice (eg on the web)</li> <li>student's responsibilities.</li> </ul>

### 3. The selection, admission, enrolment and induction of students (continued)

Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p>Induction process to explain the academic requirements of the RDP including matters such as research codes and ethics, academic misconduct, IPR and plagiarism.</p> <p>UCL Dept of Physiology 4 year programme provides students with a list of 10 questions to ask when selecting a laboratory.</p> <p>KCL Institute of Psychiatry Student &amp; Supervisor Guidance for Supervision, designed and written by students, contains responsibilities of head of department/PhD tutor, supervisor and student. This document is signed by both parties and submitted to the PGR committee by the first three month review meeting.</p>	<p>Main supervisor to be actively involved in ensuring the student receives, understands and accepts the expectations of the RDP, and of any Health and Safety requirements and relevant legislation through the induction process.</p> <p>University of Sheffield provides an induction checklist to all research supervisors.</p> <p>University of Manchester and UMIST Careers Service's 'Postgrad Futures' annual magazine is provided at induction to all students to highlight the development opportunities for postgraduates.</p> <p>University of Leeds Staff Development Unit provides a checklist as an aide-memoire to supervisors who are inducting students into an RDP. <a href="http://www.leeds.ac.uk/sddu/new/ind_res.htm">http://www.leeds.ac.uk/sddu/new/ind_res.htm</a></p>	<p>The induction process should provide students with the opportunity to meet other researchers and staff and should explain mutual expectations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ challenges typically faced by a research student and where guidance may be sought</li> <li>▪ facilities made available to students as well as the provision of learning support infrastructure</li> <li>▪ provision for student welfare and other support arrangements</li> <li>▪ skills training programmes (Section 5)</li> <li>▪ expectations about opportunities to broaden knowledge through seminars, conferences, forums, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>3E: Student and institution to sign up to an agreement on the learning outcomes of the RDP.</b></p> <p>University of Leeds provides a list of learning outcomes to help students reflection on progress and development. Some units incorporate this into a personal profile or personal development plan. <a href="http://www.leeds.ac.uk/sddu/new/ind_res.htm">www.leeds.ac.uk/sddu/new/ind_res.htm</a></p>	<p>Institution to provide a formal induction process within the first three months to cover all the points in columns 1-3 as well as other institutional matters such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the institution and its postgraduate portfolio</li> <li>▪ the institution's regulations and procedures – including on IPR</li> <li>▪ Health &amp; Safety and other relevant legislation.</li> </ul> <p>Institution to monitor student attendance during the induction process and provide mechanisms to accommodate cross-session entrants.</p> <p><b>3F: Institution to provide a formal induction process with monitored attendance.</b></p> <p>University of Sheffield has institutional induction events to coincide with registration, with 98% attendance. Students issued with 'induction passport' with key information and contacts, research training programme handbook and guidebook for research students and supervisors. Graduate Office runs a weekly 'drop-in' surgery.</p>

4. Supervisory arrangements			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p><b>4A: Provide a supervisory team consisting of at least [2], one of who should be designated as the ‘main’ supervisor with overall responsibility for the student.</b></p> <p>For interdisciplinary, collaborative or externally/industrially supervised projects, there should be a ‘third party’ in the supervisory team to provide the student with access to an independent view.</p> <p><b>4B: At least [2] members of the ‘supervisory team’ should be demonstrably research active academics with relevant knowledge and skills to supervise and with defined roles.</b></p> <p><b>4C: At least [1] member of the supervisory team to be from a minimum [3a] RAE rated department.</b></p>	<p>The roles of the members of the supervisory team should be clearly understood by the team and student.</p> <p><b>4D: The ‘main’ supervisor to have had experience of at least [1] successful supervision within a supervisory team.</b></p> <p><b>4E: The ‘main’ supervisor should only take prime responsibility for a maximum [8] students.</b></p> <p><b>4F: Training should be institutionally specified and compulsory for [new] supervisors.</b></p> <p>All supervisors, whatever their level of experience should have regular training.</p> <p>Institute of Animal Health requires all supervisors to go through its portfolio-based Training and Accreditation Programme for Postgraduate Supervisors (TAPPS). www.iah.bbsrc.ac.uk/TAPPS/index.html</p>	<p>Student to have an identified contact (mentor/advisor) to whom they could go for confidential advice and support outside the immediate supervisory team. This person to have proactive periodic contact with the student.</p> <p>KCL Institute of Psychiatry provides every student with a personal tutor who is required to have contact with student every six months.</p> <p>Leeds Metropolitan University requires a supervisory team of at least a Director of Studies and one other supervisor. Normally a supervisory team has a combined experience of no fewer than two successful PhD completions or at least one member of the team has successfully completed the Advanced Professional Diploma in Research Awards Supervision. www.lmu.ac.uk/rdo/newrdo/apdras.htm</p>	<p>Guidelines should be provided for supervisors and for students setting out their respective responsibilities, with the arrangements embodied in institutional procedures.</p> <p>The workload associated with supervision should be identified and managed: this should involve transparent procedures for allocating time to the supervision of students.</p> <p>Periodic [annual] independent institutional review of the supervisory arrangements, with the outcomes used to adjust supervising responsibilities.</p> <p>Individual supervisor performance should be reviewed [annually] as part of the academic staff appraisal process.</p> <p>University of Middlesex recommends all supervisors should receive feedback on their performance as supervisors from the Director of Research and Postgraduate Studies as part of the annual appraisal process.</p>
<p>Regular structured [monthly] interactions with at least the ‘main’ supervisor to provide feedback on progress, with agreed outcomes recorded.</p> <p><b>4G: There should be structured interaction with the supervisory team to report, discuss and agree academic and personal progress at least every [3 months]. Outcomes of all such meetings to be recorded as agreed.</b></p>	<p>Alternative arrangements to be provided if any member of the supervisory team is unavailable for a significant period, defined by the institution.</p> <p>Specify the means by which a supervisor can seek independent advice on supervisory issues, especially if they have concerns about a student’s ability or application to the study programme.</p>	<p>Student has responsibility to record and confirm outcomes of meetings.</p>	

5. Initial review and subsequent progress			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p><b>5A: Progress subject to institutionally defined periodic review by a panel of at least [3] research active and relevant academics, the majority of whom are independent of the supervisory team. At least one of the independent panel members should be from a minimum [3a] RAE rated department.</b></p> <p>An initial panel review to approve the project proposal might include a written or oral presentation, with an interview, on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarity of objectives</li> <li>feasibility and project plan</li> <li>knowledge and skills of student and supervisory team</li> <li>availability of resources</li> <li>skills training needs</li> </ul> <p>Subsequent progress reviews to be assessed by the same (or equivalent) panel by means of one or more of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>open presentation with critical feedback from their peers and department</li> <li>written progress report</li> <li>project presentation and viva to panel.</li> </ul> <p>Panel to provide a written report of the required steps to be taken if areas of concern are identified. Panel to have the power to sanction the student and/or the supervisor.</p> <p>Institute of Psychiatry, KCL student handbook sets out a monitoring timetable with major landmarks during a student's progress from enrolment to the submission of the thesis. Monitoring will occur for all students at 3, 6 and 12 months and on an annual basis thereafter.</p>	<p>Supervisory team has a responsibility to support the progress of the student.</p> <p>Responsibility to raise any concerns with the student in advance of each assessment and record them in writing</p> <p>The supervisory team has the responsibility to support the development of the project proposal, to ensure that it is achievable within the timescale of the degree programme and to confirm that sufficient resources will be available.</p> <p>Supervisory team to have access to panel progress reports to help address any areas of concern identified.</p> <p>University of Middlesex students present their research proposal within 6 months of enrolment to a panel of the Director of Research, an independent academic from the School and up to three relevant academics from outside the School (or HEI).</p> <p>University of Warwick Department of Sociology requires a first year review consisting of a 5,000 word paper, chapter headings for thesis, description of practical work and timetable, submitted in June to an independent panel.</p>	<p>The student has a responsibility to listen to, understand and accept feedback and criticism from the panel and supervisory team, recognising that this may sometimes be negative.</p> <p>Outcome of formal reviews to be provided as written (supportive) guidance to help the student identify the issues to be addressed.</p> <p>Student to be provided with an opportunity to address the concerns of the panel and re-submit within a time period set by the institution.</p> <p>Outcomes subject to academic and administrative appeal by the student.</p> <p>To transfer to a PhD from an MPhil (usually 18-24 months FT), the University of Middlesex requires students to produce: three draft chapters, fieldwork plan, literature review, aims &amp; methods, open presentation and viva with transfer panel. He or she must also have completed any specified training programme, and must show how the project has changed from the original proposal.</p>	<p><b>5B: Institutional procedures and time limits to be set, and unit performance monitored, for initial review and subsequent progress covering:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>initial review within [12] months of 'enrolment' and confirm continuation or upgrade to a PhD</li> <li>[annual] review processes</li> <li>implications of the possible outcomes of each assessment</li> <li>criteria for deciding suspension or termination of a student's registration.</li> </ul> <p>Institutional procedures to be communicated to all; supervisory teams, students, panels, examiners, with a clear process for a student to appeal against a decision on academic or administrative grounds (see Section 8).</p> <p>Defined mechanisms for advising students if standards have not yet been, or are unlikely to be, achieved at any point in the programme.</p> <p>Project proposal should be subject to agreement by the resource manager that it is consistent with likely resource availability.</p> <p>For project proposals that are developed in advance of allocating students to them, the approval and above agreements should take place before the arrival of any student – with a subsequent check that the student's skills match those needed by the project.</p>

5. Initial review and subsequent progress (continued)			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p><b>5C: Final examination to be by a viva to an independent panel of at least two examiners who are research active in relevant fields, at least one of whom is an external examiner.</b></p> <p>All examiners to be independent of the project and to have had no prior role in its development, implementation or assessment.</p> <p>Operation of the panel managed by an independent chair.</p> <p><b>5D: At least one of the examiners to be from a minimum [3a] RAE rated department. Each examiner to provide an independent report on the thesis prior to the viva.</b></p> <p>University of Middlesex operates an independent chair responsible for regulations and policy requirements, external and internal examiners who submit independent reports in advance. Chair conducts the pre-meeting, viva, and joint report to registry and gives feedback to the student. Student has the right to opt to have the main supervisor present at the viva. Joint report is subsequently available to supervisor and student.</p>	<p>Supervisory team to support the development of the thesis and advise on preparation for the viva, including offering a practice session.</p> <p>Supervisor and team should be available to the panel if required.</p> <p>Supervisory team to have access to examiners' reports following the viva.</p> <p>Leeds Metropolitan University provides research degree examination workshops for staff and research students who expect to examine or to be examined for a research award.</p>	<p>For the final defence, the student should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>be able to comment on the choice of examiners</li> <li>have the right to request or refuse the presence of the main supervisor as a non-contributing observer (unless asked to contribute by the chair).</li> </ul> <p>Examiners' reports to be made available to student following the viva.</p> <p>If required to re-submit, students should be given a written statement of the work to be done to get their degree within an agreed timescale.</p> <p>University of Strathclyde produces video packs targeted at students for use in workshops, eg '<i>Thesis Writing</i>', '<i>The Viva</i>'.</p> <p>Former students from the University of Cambridge Faculty of Classics produced '<i>Writing a Cambridge Classics PhD: a Survivor's Guide</i>'</p>	<p>Institutional procedures and timings to be set for the examination and made available to the student.</p> <p>Procedures and approval process for the selection of internal and external examiners to use transparent criteria.</p> <p>Training for examiners to be available as part of the institution's staff development.</p> <p>Institutional assessment criteria for the examination to be provided to examiners in writing, with an offer of training.</p> <p>External examiners requested to provide comments on the broader issues of the research training and environment to an appropriate institution-wide body.</p>



<b>6. The development of research and other skills</b>			
<b>Academic standards</b>	<b>Standards for supervisors</b>	<b>Standards for student/institution relations</b>	<b>Administrative process standards</b>
<p><b>6A: Provide training programmes to develop a range of skills and knowledge consistent with the Joint RC/AHRB skills statement, including skills for employment, and provide mechanisms to assess formally the development of these skills.</b></p> <p>The Research Councils' Graduate Schools Programme (RCGSP) provides access to five-day personal development and career management courses, materials and custom courses that meet part of the Joint RC/AHRB skills statement.</p> <p>The University of Edinburgh life sciences departments are mapping provision of current training programmes, the RCGSP and supervisor support against the Joint RC/AHRB skills statement.</p> <p>Royal Society of Chemistry (RSC) produces a booklet for scientists 'Getting the Message Across' on improving communication skills, <a href="http://www.rsc.org">www.rsc.org</a></p>	<p>Know about the range of relevant research training courses both within and outside the institution – and ensure the student knows this too.</p> <p>Agree a programme of training with the student, ensure that it is a balanced training programme throughout the RDP.</p> <p>Review progress and give guidance to the student if additional action is needed.</p> <p>Have access to guidance and support in assessing skills and identifying students' training needs.</p> <p><b>6B: Student and supervisory team to identify and agree a training needs analysis against the Joint RC/AHRB skills statement as part of the [induction] process. It should be reviewed [quarterly] to ensure needs are being met.</b></p> <p>Institute for Learning &amp; Teaching (ILT) produces a guide 'Inspiring Learning about Teaching and Assessment' for postgraduate and academics new to teaching and demonstrating (Annex J)</p>	<p>With the supervisory team, agree and document a skills training programme that takes into account prior learning and experience.</p> <p>With the supervisory team, review and record annually, an assessment of the evidence of skills developed.</p> <p><b>6C: Student to maintain a jointly agreed record of personal progress.</b></p> <p>UCL requires every student and main supervisor to document progress in a log book .</p> <p>The Royal Society of Chemistry produces a comprehensive 'Postgraduate Skills Record' for recording progress and skills development. Although targeted at chemists it is useful for all scientists.</p>	<p>Ensure provision of a programme of training courses consistent with the Joint RC/AHRB skills statement, including skills for employment.</p> <p>Ensure that there is the same access to training for all students, taking into account the needs of part-time students, students with special needs and students remote from the institution.</p> <p>Conduct a periodic independent institutional review of the quality and capacity of training programmes and of students' access to them. The review panel should include external representation such as other academics and prospective employers.</p> <p>The University of Leeds provides a virtual graduate centre for postgraduates to make the most of their academic, social and personal development. <a href="http://www.fldu.leeds.ac.uk/opensite/graduate/">www.fldu.leeds.ac.uk/opensite/graduate/</a></p>
<p><b>6D: Minimum level of activities defined and monitored to promote breadth and depth of knowledge and experience by means of attendance at internal and external seminars, conferences, discussion forums, [twice annual] 'presentations', teaching, demonstrating</b></p> <p>Encourage students to publish and/or present papers to benefit from receiving critical feedback from outside the supervisory team.</p>	<p>Provide students with an introduction to relevant academic networks to enable them to participate in wider scholarly activity .</p> <p>Provide advice on attendance at relevant seminars, conferences, etc.</p>	<p>Responsibility on students to attend and contribute to seminars and discussion forums.</p> <p>Students actively to seek opportunities to present work and to receive feedback.</p> <p>The NPC website presents 10 tips for postgraduates wishing to teach. <a href="http://www.npc.ac.uk">www.npc.ac.uk</a></p>	<p>Set standards for the extent of such activities and establish a monitoring process to ensure that they are being met.</p> <p>AUT, NPC and NUS have produced an employment charter for postgraduate students and academic related staff who teach. It covers employment rights and responsibilities, good practice guide and training advice. <a href="http://www.npc.ac.uk">www.npc.ac.uk</a></p>

7. Feedback mechanisms			
Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
<p><b>7A: Establish and operate confidential feedback mechanisms for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ current students [column 4]</li> <li>▪ supervisory teams and review panels</li> <li>▪ external parties, eg examiners, funders, collaborative organisations, employers, alumni.</li> </ul> <p><b>Incorporate this feedback into the regular review of academic standards and provide information on action taken in response.</b></p> <p>University of Sheffield has an annual confidential survey (or independent focus groups in small departments). Results accumulated at department, faculty and institutional level go to Senate. Highlights are reported in the student newsletter and posted on the web. The university also surveys new students 6-8 weeks after commencement on recruitment, admission, and induction procedures.</p>	<p>Supervisors to be responsible for providing feedback to improve research provision.</p> <p>Supervisors to be provided with explicit mechanisms to give feedback on RDP performance (confidential where appropriate).</p> <p>Supervisors to receive personal feedback on their own performance to help them improve and identify their own training needs.</p> <p>The Wellcome Trust evaluated its three and four year programmes using questionnaires to supervisors and students (see Annex J).</p> <p>University of Manchester School of Biological Sciences surveyed final year students, five cohort years of previous postgraduates, and employers on their PhD experience, expectations, skills and subsequent employment. <a href="http://www.lmi4he.ac.uk">www.lmi4he.ac.uk</a> (Post PhD – What Next?)</p>	<p>Students to be responsible for helping to improve research provision through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ providing feedback to their own supervisory team</li> <li>▪ providing feedback to the institution by participating in, for example, interviews and focus groups</li> <li>▪ representation on committees</li> <li>▪ responding to surveys</li> <li>▪ as alumni, providing information to first destination surveys and subsequent longitudinal studies.</li> </ul> <p>University of Warwick has student representation on every postgraduate policy making committee, eg Students' Union (SU) Chair and Officer and three faculty representatives on the Board of Graduate Studies. There is a strong relationship between SU and Graduate School: joint events are held in SU, funded by Graduate School, such as welcome party, conference, and booklets for new PGR students. SU actively involved in producing postgraduate guidelines issued by Graduate School.</p>	<p>Establish and operate confidential feedback mechanisms and provide information on actions taken in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ conduct survey up to [10 weeks] after start, on recruitment, admission and induction procedures</li> <li>▪ annual survey (or conduct independent focus groups in small departments)</li> <li>▪ exit questionnaires on student completion</li> <li>▪ exit interviews (conducted by a relevant person, but not someone from the supervisory team).</li> </ul> <p>Research students to be represented on those policy committees relevant to research degree programmes.</p>

**8. Appeals and complaints mechanisms**

Academic standards	Standards for supervisors	Standards for student/institution relations	Administrative process standards
To operate transparent, clear criteria for complaints and appeals, which might be made on academic grounds.		Students to be provided with clear explanations about the mechanisms for complaints, and appeals.	<b>8A: Institution to arrange and publicise separate, fair, transparent, robust and consistently applied complaints and appeals procedures, appropriate to all categories of research students.</b>