**Departmental Postgraduate Research Provision**

**Periodic Review**

**Self-Evaluation Document**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department:** |  |
| **Head of Department:** |  |
| **Director of Postgraduate Studies:** |  |
| **Date of Submission:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Guidance**   * **Please complete the ‘Departmental response’ sections.** * **If asked to ‘include’ a piece of evidence, this should be provided by the Department and included within the appropriate section of the SED. More substantive documentation should be provided as an appendix. Any data ‘held by the QA&E team’ will be sent to departments along with this template.** |

|  |
| --- |
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# Section A: Introduction to the Department

## 1. Overview

|  |
| --- |
| Give a brief introduction to the Department, which should include an outline of the future direction of postgraduate research. Two brief statements are desirable:  a) One covering the short/medium term direction (5 years)  b) One projecting the long-term direction (10 years)  The statement should also demonstrate how the Department’s postgraduate research provision reflects both Faculty and College strategies for research degree training (e.g. Academic Strategy, Learning and Teaching Strategy). |

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

## 2. Organisation of the Department

|  |
| --- |
| **Include** an organisational chart relating to research, indicating members of staff responsible for academic, pastoral and welfare support. The chart should include, where applicable, members of staff involved with the management of any collaborative programmes (e.g. joint research degrees, Centres for Doctoral Training).  Provide a summary of each research theme **including** research group size and a breakdown of academic staff in the management structure of each section. This summary should include details of any partnerships with other institutions for the provision of collaborative programmes (e.g. joint research degrees, Centres for Doctoral Training) and collaborative activities (e.g. Split PhDs, Partner Research Institutions (PRIs)). |

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

## 3. Sector Regulation, Reference Points and Qualification Frameworks

|  |
| --- |
| Highlight how research degree provision within the Department contributes to the College’s continued compliance with the Office for Students’ initial and general ongoing conditions of registration and the expectations and practices set out in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](file:///\\icnas1.cc.ic.ac.uk\stucker3\downloads\revised-uk-quality-code-for-higher-education%20(5).pdf) (with reference to ‘[Advice and Guidance: Research Degrees](file:///\\icnas1.cc.ic.ac.uk\stucker3\downloads\advice-and-guidance-research-degrees%20(3).pdf)’)  Demonstrate how research degree provision within the Department meets the requirements relevant [Qualification and Credit Frameworks](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/qualifications-and-credit-frameworks) |

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

## 4. Resources for the Support of Research Degree Students

|  |
| --- |
| Provide details regarding availability of resources (staff, space, equipment, library, English language support and computing provision), including those at partner institutions, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of these resources in supporting students  Provide details of funding opportunities (e.g. UKRI, industrial support) and a summary of how students have been funded within the Department for the previous 5 years, including those students at collaborative institutions. |

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

# Section B: Precepts

## 1. Copy of the Previous Departmental Precept Review

|  |
| --- |
| **Include** the previous Departmental Precept Review documentation, including the Departmental response to any follow-up action taken as a result of the review.  **Include** extracts from the minutes of the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee where this was discussed should be provided **(held by QA&E team).** |

## 2. College Precepts

|  |
| --- |
| **Use the ‘Departmental response’ boxes to set out how the Department complies with the College precepts. Bullet points are provided as prompts and are not exhaustive.** |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 1: Interviewing  All prospective students must be interviewed before an offer of a place is made. Interviews may be conducted as a videoconference or teleconference if it is not possible for the candidate to visit the Department. The Selection Panel must comprise at least two members of staff and will normally include the Director of Postgraduate Studies or nominee. Staff not experienced in student selection or recruitment should attend a relevant recruitment and selection workshop before participating in an interview. All staff involved in interviewing students must keep up to date with current legislation and the College’s admission policies and policies to promote equal opportunities and widening participation.   * Provide details of the Department’s applicant interview process |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 2: Offers/Admissions  Only appropriately qualified and prepared applicants should be accepted. No offers should be made unless a student can be provided with an environment which is supportive of their research achievement; this includes only appointing supervisors who have sufficient time to carry out their supervisory responsibilities satisfactorily as well as access to necessary facilities and equipment.   * Provide details of the Department’s selection process |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 3: Supervision  New and/or inexperienced supervisors (who have not had primary responsibility for the supervision of a successful student), including inexperienced clinical supervisors and/or those acting as second (or co-) supervisors, must attend the “Introduction to Supervising PhD students at Imperial” workshop (or equivalent). Where Departments appoint new members of academic staff who have experience of supervising PhD students at other institution(s) it is the responsibility of the Department to determine a strategy for training/support. Depending on the individual’s prior experience this may either be through attendance at the full day “Introduction to Supervising PhD students at Imperial” workshop or by completing the online version of the training. In selecting supervisors and supervisory teams, Departments are expected to comply with the requirements set out in the College’s “Policy on Research Degree Supervision”. Departments are also expected to have in place effective mechanisms to monitor the completion of mandatory supervisor training by new and/or inexperienced supervisors.   * Provide details of the training provided for new and/or inexperienced supervisors if not the ‘Introduction to Supervising PhD Students at Imperial’ workshop |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 4: Non-Imperial staff who supervise  Departments must have mechanisms to ensure those supervisors working in industry or professional practice or a Partner Research Institution are aware of all College rules, regulations and procedures relating to research degree supervision. These supervisors should also be offered the opportunity to engage in developmental and other activities relating to the support of their research students.   * Provide details of the support and training available to supervisors working in industry or professional practice or at a Partner Research Institution * Provide details of how supervisors at external locations (e.g. Split PhDs, PRIs) are made aware of their roles and responsibilities |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 5: Continuing professional development & support of students  All supervisors are expected to engage and participate in [Continuing Professional Development (CPD)](http://www.imperial.ac.uk/study/pg/graduate-school/supervisors-guidebook/cpd/) activities. All supervisors are expected to undertake CPD specifically related to PhD supervision which, in addition to the courses/workshops for new and/or inexperienced supervisors, involves participating in Departmental [“Focus on Best Practice in Supervision”](http://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/study/graduate-school/public/supervisors-guidebook/Focus-on-Best-Practice-Workshop-Schedule.pdf) workshops. These are Department-led workshops and Departments are therefore responsible for determining the cycle of participants and frequency of these workshops. Within this cycle it is expected that every supervisor will attend at least one workshop over a six year period. Similar to the mandatory training for new and/or inexperienced supervisors, Departments are expected to have in place effective mechanisms to monitor the engagement of supervisors in CPD activities. Departments and supervisors themselves are responsible for ensuring that they are fully aware of their role and responsibilities as a supervisor, as described in the College document [“Mutual Expectations for the Research Degree Student Supervisor Partnership”](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/administration-and-support-services/registry/academic-governance/public/academic-policy/codes-of-practice-for-research-degrees/Mutual-expectations-for-the-Research-Degree-Student-Supervisor-Partnership-(Dec-17).pdf).   * Provide details of the opportunities for continuing professional development for all supervisors * Provide a list of any staff prizes for research supervision |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 6: Supervisory arrangements  All students must have a supervisor who is identified as the main single point of contact and it must be made clear to the student who is their alternative contact if that individual is unavailable. The main supervisor must ensure that adequate contact with and support for their research student(s) is maintained throughout the research degree programme. Where a student has more than one supervisor, it is important that the student understands their respective roles.   * Give a brief description of the responsibilities of the supervisory team (including supervisors at external locations, where appropriate) * Provide details of how individual supervisors are selected and made aware of their supervisory responsibilities, and how it is ensured they have sufficient time to carry out these responsibilities effectively. In particular the Department should comment on how it monitors and controls its supervisors’ workloads and ensures regular supervisor-student contact is maintained * Provide details of how supervisory arrangements are communicated to students * **Include** an anonymised list of students and their supervisors including those studying at partner institutions for the last 5 years **(held by QA&E team)** |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 7: Induction  Each Department must have an induction day/programme for new students and must make provision for late arrivals, either in the form of a second induction day/programme or through arrangements whereby students meet individually with key staff to complete the induction programme. Students should be made aware of their responsibilities and entitlements (including financial) at early and/or appropriate stage in their research degree programme.   * Provide details of the Department’s induction programme for new students, including arrangements which are made for students starting at a non-standard point of entry * **Include** student-facing induction documentation |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 8: Student Handbooks  Each Department must have a postgraduate student handbook, either in hard or electronic copy which contains, but is not limited to, information listed in the [College’s guidelines for handbooks](http://www.imperial.ac.uk/staff/tools-and-reference/quality-assurance-enhancement/programme-information/programme-handbooks/).   * **Include** an electronic copy of the Department’s research degree student handbook (or a URL if this can be accessed externally) * Confirm that the handbook contains all of the items listed for inclusion in handbooks, or if they are not included, please say when and how students will receive this information |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 9: Research Student Communities  Departments must make provision to allow research students to interact with their peers and should facilitate the existence of a collegial/scholarly community.   * Provide details of how the Department promotes student interaction with their peers and facilitates the existence of a collegial/scholarly community |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 10: Pastoral Care Network  Departments must make provision for a research student pastoral care network, led and managed by the PG Tutor. Departments are free to choose which model to use, but the model should be clearly communicated to students. Examples may include, cohort building, mentoring, or a buddy scheme.   * Provide details of the provision of a research student pastoral care network within the Department * Provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures for monitoring and enhancing student welfare |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 11: Research & Professional Skills Development All students must be made aware of the [Graduate School’s Professional Skills Development requirement](http://www.imperial.ac.uk/study/pg/graduate-school/professional-skills/doctoral/professional-development-attendance-requirement/) during their induction. All students should be supported in completing this requirement. Furthermore, all students should have the opportunity to engage in further activities and training to enhance their research and professional skills and receive careers advice.   * Provide details of arrangements which are made for students to identify their development needs and to attend any development opportunities (research-related or other), including details of the systems in place for students to complete Graduate School’s Professional Skills Development requirements * Provide details of any programme level skills training provided to students by the Department (e.g. health and safety, report writing, language skills, laboratory techniques, lecture courses) and other events facilitated by the Department (e.g. conferences, symposia and opportunities for personal development for students * Include an analysis of student participation in the Graduate School’s Professional Skills Training (held by the Graduate School) * Provide information on the number of students who have made use of the Centre for Academic English * Provide details of training provided for GTAs and mechanisms for monitoring the success of this * Provide details of how e-learning for research degree provision is monitored by the Department, if applicable * Provide information on how the Department supports employability and any Department led initiatives in place * **Include** a summary of destination data for graduates during the previous 5 years, including a summary of how many students go into industry/business and how many to academia **(held by QA&E team)** |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 12: Management/Organisation Each Department must have a Postgraduate Committee (with a minimum composition of 3 members including the Director of Postgraduate Studies and Postgraduate Tutor) chaired usually by the Director of Postgraduate Studies, to oversee the format and quality of the higher degree programme including recruitment, admissions, induction, registration, progression, assessment, student feedback, complaints, training, proposal of external examiners, submission and completion rates. The Committee must report to the Head of Department and meet regularly. There should be a written record kept of all meetings which is accessible to the staff and study body.   * **Include** a diagram of the Departmental committee structure including any Joint Management Committees established to oversee collaborative research degree programmes * Provide details of any postgraduate committees (or forums) with responsibility for PGR issues, and **include** terms of reference, schedule, and membership of the committee, as well as minutes of the meetings from past 2 academic years |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 13: Assessments / Appeals and Complaints Assessment procedures and the mechanisms for complaints and appeals should be clearly communicated to research students, supervisors and examiners. Students and supervisors should have a clear and mutually understood mechanism to raise concerns at a Departmental level.   * Provide details of assessment procedures * Provide details of the systems in place to manage appeals and complaints and how these are communicated to students |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 14: [Early Stage Assessment](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/administration-and-support-services/registry/academic-governance/public/academic-policy/milestones-for-pgr/Early-Stage-Assessment-Guidance-Notes.pdf) Assessment of students' research ability to determine whether registration for the research degree can continue will involve a confirmation examination held in the 9th month (18 months for part-time students) after the date of initial registration. This is to be assessed by at least one independent assessor but normally two. Assessors can only be selected by the Director of Postgraduate Studies, Postgraduate Tutor or Postgraduate Committee, who can choose to ask for suggestions from the supervisor. Where a student fails the confirmation examination, written feedback should be provided to the student (with a copy to Registry) within one month of the examination date. Students who have been asked to re-submit must do so by 11 months of initial registration. Any decision\* to transfer to the MPhil degree must be made within one year of the date of registration.  \*A student can also be required to withdraw from the College.   * Provide details of the Department’s early stage assessment process, including assessment procedures and selection of assessors * **Include** a statistical analysis of students, by cohort, who have completed the Early Stage Assessment (ESA) within the 9-month deadline **(held by QA&E team)** * Comment on the attached statistics, in particular: * How the Department is supporting timely completion? * If any students were more than three months late completing the ESA or have not completed, how these students are being managed? * If any students competed significantly early (within 5 months of starting the programme or equivalent) please explain? |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 15: Late Stage Review A further review of a student's research ability will be undertaken between 18 and 24 months (between 30 and 36 months for part-time students) after the date of initial registration. The form of review will be determined by the student's Department and must be clearly communicated to students. Where a student fails to satisfy the assessors at this stage, written feedback should be provided within one month of the review date. Students who have been asked to re-submit\* should do so within 3 months of their initial Late Stage Review.  \* A student can also be required to withdraw from the College.   * **Include** a statistical analysis of students, by cohort, who have completed the Late Stage Review (LSR) within the 24-month deadline **(held by QA&E team)** * Comment on the attached statistics, in particular: * How the Department is supporting timely completion? * If any students were more than three months late completing the LSA or have not completed, how these students are being managed? * If any students competed significantly early (within 12 months of starting the programme or equivalent) please explain? |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |
| Precept 16: [Writing Up Stage](http://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/administration-and-support-services/registry/academic-governance/public/academic-policy/research-degree-examinations/Writing-up-period.pdf) All students who have not submitted their thesis within their 36-month registration period (or equivalent) will be subject to a monitoring point at 36 months to ensure that they have a realistic plan for submitting the thesis within 48 months (or equivalent) of their start date. By 36 months, students should submit a timetable of remaining work to be done in order to complete the thesis within the required time. A key outcome of the monitoring point at 36 months is to confirm whether the student will enter the completing research period or whether they will be writing up away from College.\*  \* A student who still has experimental work to perform at this stage cannot move into the completing research period and will continue to pay full fees.   * Provide details of the Department’s 36-month monitoring process * **Include** Departmental *submission rates* for full-time and part-time students who completed their studies within the last 5 years (including those awarded to students studying for collaborative research degrees and on Split, PRI and EngD programmes) **(held by QA&E team)** and comment on the attached statistics, in particular:   + How the Department is supporting to support timely submission of theses?   + If any students were more than 3 months late submitting their theses, or have not submitted, how these students are being managed?   + If any students submitted significantly early (within 24 months of starting the programme or equivalent) please explain?   + If the submission rate is below 80%, please explain? * **Include** Departmental list of awards conferred **(held by QA&E team)** * Provide a brief analysis of the number and nature of requests for late thesis submissions for the previous 5 years together with an evaluation of the outcomes **(held by QA&E team)** | |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 17: Student Representation Each Department should have a Staff-Student Committee in which postgraduate research students are represented to discuss postgraduate issues. This can be the Postgraduate Committee [Precept 12] or a separate forum. A meeting including student representatives should normally take place at least three times per year. There should be a written record kept of all meetings and this should be made accessible to students and staff.   * Provide details of the Staff-Student Committee (or equivalent) where PGR issues are discussed. **Include** the terms of reference remit and membership of the committee and provide minutes / notes of meetings in past 2 academic years |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

|  |
| --- |
| Precept 18: Evaluation Regular evaluation of the Department’s research programme(s) should be carried out internally. All stakeholders should have the opportunity to provide their feedback (and in confidence if appropriate). Evaluations should be considered openly and the results communicated appropriately with any decisions made by the Department to implement (or not) any changes resulting from this feedback communicated clearly to all stakeholders.   * Provide details of Department’s mechanisms for seeking, analysing and acting upon feedback and for communicating the results to all stakeholders * Provide details and a summary of the conclusions drawn from any Departmental surveys, if applicable * **Include** a copy of the approved Departmental action plan following the most recent PRES survey * Provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures for maintaining and enhancing the quality of research degree training provision and academic standards |

**Status at previous precept review:** Compliant/Non-Compliant/Working towards Compliance (please delete)

|  |
| --- |
| Departmental response: |

# Section C: Good Practice

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Please highlight any instances of good practice in the Department and comment on specific enhancement initiatives and innovative practices with respect to research degree training** | |
| Report Ref | Description |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Section D: Appendices

**PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL SUBMISSIONS SHOULD BE ANONYMISED**

**PLEASE PAGINATE & INDEX THE APPENDICES**

**Data may be supplied by the Department or by the Quality Assurance and Enhancement (QA&E) team for College systems data. The expected data provider is indicated at the end of point.**

## Organisational chart relating to research, indicating those members of staff responsible for academic, pastoral and welfare support [Section A2] – Department

## The previous Departmental Precept Review documentation, including the Departmental Response to any follow up action taken as a result of the review [Section B1] – QA&E team

## Extracts of the PRQC minutes where the Previous Precept Review was discussed [Section B1] – QA&E team

## An anonymised list of students and their supervisors including those studying at collaborative partner institutions for the last 5 years [Section B2, Precept 6] – QA&E team

## Student-facing induction documentation, if applicable [Section B2, Precept 7] - Department

## Electronic copy of student handbook [Section B2, Precept 8] - Department

## An analysis of student participation in the Professional Skills Training [Section B2, Precept 11] - Department

## Destination data for graduates over the past 5 years [Section B2, Precept 11] – QA&E team

## A statistical analysis of students, by cohort, who have completed the ESA within the 9-month deadline [Section B2, Precept 14] – QA&E team

## A statistical analysis of students, by cohort, who have completed the LSR within the 24-month deadline [Section B2, Precept 15] – QA&E team

## A statistical analysis of departmental thesis submission rate [Section B2, Precept 16] – QA&E team

## Late case thesis submission requests by cohort [Section B2, Precept 16] – QA&E team

## List of Departmental Awards Conferred for the last five years [Section B2, Precept 16] - Department

## Minutes of Departmental PG Committee Meetings & Staff-Student Committee Meetings for past two years, plus terms of reference and membership [Section B2, Precept 17] - Department

## Copies of local survey results [Section B2, Precept 18] - Department

## Up-to-date version of the Department’s approved Action Plan from the most recent PRES Survey [Section B2, Precept 18] - Department