

Annex E

Summary of framework standards

| |
|--|
| <p>1. Institutional arrangements</p> <p>1A: Institution's code of practice for RDPs must meet, and preferably exceed, the standards in the framework.</p> <p>1B: Institution to monitor, review and act on the application of the standards in its code of practice, including the various standards set out in the framework.</p> <p>1C: Institutional and unit performance to be monitored [annually] on progress and attrition against agreed targets including gender and ethnic groupings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ submission rates [80% within 4 years]▪ average time to submission▪ completion rates [80% within 4.5 years]▪ level of appeals, complaints▪ student feedback. |
| <p>2. Research environment</p> <p>2A: RDPs offered in units with a minimum RAE rating [consistent with QR funding]¹.</p> <p>2B: Demonstrate, within the unit/cognate area, a way of providing effective interactions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ with a minimum of [5] research active staff/postdoctorates▪ between a group of at least [10] students. <p>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.</p> |
| <p>3. The selection, admission, enrolment and induction of students</p> <p>3A: Institutional minimum level of academic entry standard [2.1, masters, or institutionally defined equivalent APL/APEL].</p> <p>3B: Selection process and admission decision to involve at least [2] experienced and research active academics, trained in admission processes.</p> <p>3C: Open access to all relevant material on web.</p> <p>3D: Formal offer letter should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ fees and charges▪ period of study▪ direction of study▪ specific requirements▪ other requirements▪ direction to other relevant information and codes of practice (eg on the web)▪ student's responsibilities. <p>3E: Student and institution to sign up to an agreement on the learning outcomes of the RDP.</p> <p>3F: Institution to provide a formal induction process with monitored attendance.</p> |

¹ Mainstream QR funding is currently linked to RAE ratings of 3a and above in England and Scotland, and 3b and above in Wales.

4. Supervisory arrangements

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.

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.

4C: At least [1] member of the supervisory team to be from a minimum [3a] RAE rated department.

4D: The 'main' supervisor to have had experience of at least [1] successful supervision within a supervisory team.

4E: The 'main' supervisor should take prime responsibility for a maximum [8] students.

4F: Training should be specified by the institution and compulsory for [new] supervisors.

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.

5. Initial review and subsequent progress

5A: Progress should be subject to 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.

5B: Institutional procedures and time limits to be set, and unit performance monitored, for initial review and subsequent progress covering:

- initial review within [12] months of 'enrolment' and confirm continuation or upgrade to a PhD
- [annual] review processes
- implications of the possible outcomes of each assessment
- criteria for deciding suspension or termination of a student's registration.

5C: Final examination to be by a viva with an independent panel of at least two examiners who are research active in relevant fields, at least one of whom is an external examiner.

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.

| |
|---|
| <p>6. The development of research and other skills</p> |
| <p>6A Provide training programmes to develop a range of skills and knowledge consistent with the Joint Research Councils/AHRB skills statement, including skills for employment, and provide mechanisms to assess formally the development of these skills.</p> <p>6B Student and supervisory team to identify and agree a training needs analysis against the Joint Research Councils/AHRB skills statement, as part of the [induction] process. It should be reviewed [quarterly] to ensure needs are being met.</p> <p>6C: Student to maintain a jointly agreed record of personal progress.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| <p>7. Feedback mechanisms</p> |
| <p>7A Establish and operate confidential feedback mechanisms for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ current students ▪ supervisory teams and review panels ▪ external parties, eg examiners, funders, collaborative organisations, employers, alumni. <p>Incorporate this feedback into the regular review of academic standards and provide information on action taken in response.</p> |
| <p>8. Appeals and complaints mechanisms</p> |
| <p>8A Institution to arrange and publicise separate, fair, transparent, robust and consistently applied complaints and appeals procedures, appropriate to all categories of research students.</p> |