



# Annual Monitoring of Postgraduate Research Degrees: Procedure

## Documentation Management

### Document Record

Maintained by:	Quality Assurance
Owned by:	University Education Committee
Location of Master Document:	<a href="https://intra.brunel.ac.uk/s/QSO/Team/Monitoring_and_Review/Annual_Monitoring/PGR_AM/Forms_and_Guidance">https://intra.brunel.ac.uk/s/QSO/Team/Monitoring_and_Review/Annual_Monitoring/PGR_AM/Forms_and_Guidance</a>

### Version Control

Document Version	Amendments	Amended By	Date	Approved By
1.2	Amendments to wording to clarify process, inclusion of table overview.	Head of Quality Assurance	25/09/2017	University Education Committee
1.3	Document Management Table updated	Head of Quality Assurance	July 2018	N/A

# Annual Monitoring of Postgraduate Research Degrees: Procedure

## 1 Introduction

1.1 All higher education providers are expected to have effective procedures in place to routinely monitor and periodically review their programmes ([UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) Part A; Chapter B8 Programme Monitoring and Review; Chapter B11 Research Degrees)

1.2 The QAA sees this as central to an institution's assurance of the quality and standards of its provision, and Chapter B11 (Research Degrees) Indicator 3 states: *Higher education providers monitor their research degree provision against internal and external indicators and targets that reflect the context in which research degrees are being offered.*

1.3 The importance of regular monitoring is clear – it allows the University to assure itself of the continued quality of its provision. Additionally, it benefits the institution in the identification of and sharing good practice.

1.4 Colleges are responsible for annual monitoring of their postgraduate research degree provision and they will make use of qualitative and quantitative data in order to identify any concerns and propose responsive actions.

1.5 Outcomes from these annual processes will also inform the University's Periodic Programme Review of its Colleges.

## 2 The Annual Monitoring Process Overview

The University's annual monitoring process for PGR provision has 5 distinct stages:

Stage		Output	Key staff/Committee/Board	Timing
1	Production of Departmental Evaluation Form	Draft Departmental Evaluation Form (including evaluation of report on any provision offered in partnership)	PGR Director	October/November
2	Departmental Evaluation	Departmental Evaluation Form (including evaluation of report on any provision offered in partnership)  Updated APR/PPR Action Plan  Department Management Board Minutes	Departmental Management Board	November
3	Inter-Departmental Scrutiny	Inter-Departmental Scrutiny Form	Scrutineer	November

Stage		Output	Key staff/Committee/Board	Timing
4	College consideration and confirmation	College Annual Monitoring Form	College Education Committee	January
5	University Reporting	Annual Monitoring Institutional Overview Report	Senate University Education Committee	February March

### 3 The Annual Monitoring Process

#### Departmental Evaluation

3.1 Departmental evaluation is carried out by the Department Management Board and the following documents constitute the full report for its PGR provision:

- the completed Departmental Evaluation Form;
- minutes of the relevant DMB meeting;
- the inter-departmental scrutiny form (see sections 3.7 to 3.9);
- report of annual monitoring of collaborative provision (where applicable, see paragraphs 3.5 to 3.6);
- and any completed pro-formas in relation to quality audits/PPRs

3.2 The Departmental Evaluation Form (available on the [Quality Assurance Programme Monitoring and Review webpage](#)) is drafted by the relevant PGR Director and presented to the Department Management Board for discussion and confirmation in November. To support the Department in its monitoring and review of the previous academic year, centrally-produced data will be provided by Quality Assurance in October of the academic year following the year to be reviewed. The data will relate to the key factors which are required to be considered.

3.3 Where applicable, an updated response to Periodic Programme Review recommendations and/or actions arising from quality audits of collaborative provision will be considered. Departments should therefore review and submit any associated actions/recommendations tracking pro-forma and submit these as part of the Departmental report on an annual basis until all actions have been completed to the satisfaction of the College Education Committee.

3.4 The identification and dissemination of good practice is an important outcome of the annual monitoring process, and the Departmental evaluation meeting should ensure that good practice is recorded in the completed reports.

#### Collaborative Provision

3.5 The University currently does not have any high-risk partnership agreements. However, it is important that annual monitoring of PGR provision offered as part of collaborative provision takes place.

3.6 A separate report should be produced, on the standard pro-forma available on the [Quality Assurance Programme Monitoring and Review webpage](#), by the lead Brunel academic member of staff with responsibility for oversight of students studying under the partnership. This report should be submitted to the Departmental Academic Committee to inform its discussions and to allow it to address collaborative provision in the Departmental report.

### **Inter-Departmental Scrutiny**

3.7 In order to ensure robust scrutiny of the monitoring carried out by the Departmental Management Board, inter-departmental peer review is undertaken on behalf of the College Education Committee by a scrutineer from another Department within the College (normally a PGR Director)

3.8 Following the DMB meeting, the scrutineer will review the Departmental Report, (including Department Management Board minutes and any updated PPR/quality audit action plan). Any issues with the provided documentation will be documented and referred back to the Department for resolution/comment.

3.9 The scrutineers will complete the [Annual Monitoring Inter-Departmental Scrutiny Report pro-forma](#), which should include careful tracking of issues raised and their resolution in the appropriate sections. The completed Scrutiny Report, along with the Departmental Report and other relevant documents included under section 3.1, will be submitted to the College Education Committee for consideration.

### **College Education Committees (CECs)**

3.10 The College Education Committee will consider the Departmental reports and inter-departmental scrutiny reports. Colleges must ensure that members of the College Education Committee have access to all the relevant documentation. Issues highlighted for attention will be discussed, and assigned for resolution at College level or consideration at University level. Additionally, the identification and dissemination of good practice within the College is an important outcome of the annual monitoring process, and Colleges should consider how this will be achieved.

3.11 The College Education Committee will confirm, or otherwise, that it is satisfied the annual monitoring process has been carried out effectively and has adhered to University policy.

3.12 Accountability to the University is through completion of the College Annual Monitoring Report, which is discussed and approved at the College Education Committee (CEC).

### **Reporting to Senate**

3.13 The Chair of the College Education committee will report to Senate on Annual Monitoring in the College.

3.14 The Chair of the University Education Committee will receive the College Annual Monitoring Reports and is responsible for providing Senate with an institutional overview of

the process and any issues arising; in particular highlighting issues that are common across Colleges.