

Responsibilities for supervisors are outlined in the [Mutual Expectations for the Research Degree Student Supervisor Partnership](#)

The College provides [induction and continuing professional development](#) for supervisors through

Guidance

Guidance

Departments are free to decide which support network / model they would like to adopt in their department subject to the following:

The network should involve individuals who will support the Senior Tutor (PGR) in their role.

Collaborative programmes: Each joint/collaborative programme must have a Joint Management Committee (e.g. EngD Boards, Joint PhD Academic Boards etc.) which meets at least annually to review procedures, student progress, good practice etc.

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.

Precept 15: Late Stage Review (LSR)

A further review of a student's research ability will be undertaken by 24 months (48 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.

Guidance

Further information about the Late Stage Review is available in the [Late Stage Review guidance notes](#).
[Late Stage Review Form](#).

Collaborative programmes: All students on joint and collaborative programmes are subject to the same assessment procedures as programmes based solely at the College unless an alternative approach is agreed by the Postgraduate Research Quality Committee and QAEC/Senate, as appropriate.

Precept 16:

at appropriate intervals during the programme. Academic partner institutions/ must offer students on joint and collaborative programmes the opportunity for on postgraduate academic forums whenever possible.

ation

and have the opportunity to provide their feedback (and in confidence if appropriate). be considered openly and the results communicated appropriately with any the department to implement (or not) any changes resulting from this feedback rly to all stakeholders.

months departments must give their students the opportunity to submit a confidential their experience on the programme.

assurance purposes the responses from the student surveys are considered as regular and periodic review of departmental research degree training.

a biennial basis. Departments and Faculties are expected to complete an action omment on their PRES results annually.

ve programmes: Joint and collaborative programmes are subject to the same evaluation mechanisms as programmes based solely at the College.

ile:	Collaborative Research Degree Precepts (2021-22)
	3.2 Date: March 2022
filename:	R:\7.Quality Assurance\7. Quality Assurance\3. Policy Framework\11. Precepts
	PRQC May 2017 and QAEC May 2017 PRQC May 2020 PRQC October 2020 and QAEC October 2020 PRQC February 2022 and QAEC March 2022
m:	October 2021
	Graduate School
quiries:	Graduate School
ences:	Periodic Reviews of Research Degree programmes Policy on Research Degree Supervision (Eligibility) Early Stage Assessment Late Stage Review Staff-Student Committees Good Practice Guidelines Mutual Expectations for the Research Degree Student Supervisor Partnership
test changes:	June 2018 Updated to reflect new policy on Expectations for the Research Degree Student September 2019 to include new Precept 10 Care Change to Precept 9 (now Student updated links. June 2020: Updated to reflect outcomes from PRES Task and Finish Group for PRQC. October