



Annual Monitoring of Postgraduate Research Degrees: Procedure

Documentation Management

Document Record

Maintained by:	Quality Assurance
Owned by:	University Education Committee
Location of Master Document:	https://intra.brunel.ac.uk/s/QSO/Team/Monitoring and Review/Annual Monitoring/PGR AM/Forms and Guidance

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
2	Revised process for AM of 2018/19 year	Quality Assurance	May 2019	Senate

Annual Monitoring of Postgraduate Research Degrees: Procedure

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Monitoring underpins the Expectations for Quality and Expectations for Standards ([UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#)), which are mandatory requirements for all UK providers and will be assessed as part of the OfS regulatory framework.
- 1.2 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.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 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 4 distinct stages:

Stage	Output	Timing	
1	PGR Directors Meeting	Minutes and actions	October
2	Enhancement Conversation	Priorities and Actions Report	November/December
3	College Review	CEC minutes and actions	January
4	Senate Reporting	Senate Minutes and Actions	February/March

3 The Annual Monitoring Process

Stage 1: College PGR Directors Meeting

- 3.1 PGR Directors should discuss PGR provision in the context of data and feedback. Any issues requiring actions should be discussed in depth and an improvement plan agreed.
- 3.2 Data will be provided to inform the discussion. Whilst data is provided centrally, Departmental PGR Directors should avail themselves of additional Departmental-level data which may be available and useful in providing more granularity.
- 3.2 Where applicable, an updated response to Periodic Programme Review recommendations and/or actions arising from quality audits of collaborative provision will be considered and any progress recorded.

- 3.3 The identification and dissemination of good practice is an important outcome of the annual monitoring process, and this meeting will be an opportunity to discuss good practice and record how it will be disseminated.

Output from Stage 1: Minutes and Actions from PGR Directors' meeting

Stage 2: Enhancement Conversation

- 3.7 The Enhancement Conversation is the primary mechanism by which scrutiny of annual monitoring is documented and sufficient time (normally two hours) will be allowed to ensure an appropriately detailed discussion of the provision.
- 3.8 The Enhancement Conversation follows the PGR Directors' meeting and the number of conversations required will be decided in consultation with each College. The meeting will be Chaired by the Vice-Provost (Education) and attended by:
- PGR Directors
 - Student Representative(s)
 - Quality Assurance Manager
 - Director of the Graduate School
 - Any other relevant members of staff from across the University as required.
- 3.9 Agreed outcomes from each conversation will be documented by an appropriate member of staff from the College on the Enhancement Conversation proforma. Annual monitoring data sets and PPR or PSRB review action plans will be made available to those involved in the meeting.

Output of Stage 2: Enhancement Priorities Report

Stage 3: College-level Monitoring

- 3.10 It is essential that Colleges have a mechanism for considering the annual programme monitoring process and ensuring that appropriate actions are taken both in regards to routine improvements and enhancement priorities. A College overview of the process also allows identification of issues that are common to several Departments, and those that may need to be brought to the attention of the University.
- 3.11 The College Education Committee will consider the Enhancement Conversation priorities report. The CEC will take a view of how the priorities will be supported by the College. Where appropriate matters can be identified which need to be drawn to the attention of Senate if a University response/action is required.

Output of Stage 4: College Education Committee Minutes and Actions

Stage 4: University Reporting

- 3.12 The Chairs of the College Education Committees (Deputy Deans (Academic Affairs)) and the Vice-Provost Education will report to Senate on the enhancement actions/focus for the current and future year(s) for the Colleges and University respectively. In particular, it is envisaged that these will set the direction for the focus of the University's enhancement priorities and should inform the planning cycle both for Colleges and professional services.