**Professional Doctorates: Course Standards and Quality Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course title(s):** |  |
| **Academic year:** |  |
| **Current Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) details:** |  |
| **Collaborative partners:** | Please include details of collaborative partnerships including those in teach-out. Please indicate the level of involvement of collaborative partners (e.g. ‘The Centre provides all but module 1 which is provided by NTU staff at NTU’; ‘ Modules 1 and 2 are taught collaboratively between NTU and the Centre staff and remaining modules are taught by the partner in its premises’) |
| **Name of course leader(s):** |  |
| **Rolling Action Plan:** | see part B |
| **Consideration of external examiner comments:** | see part C |
| **Consideration of student progression and achievement:** | see part D |

#####

##### **PART A**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executive summary** | This section is used to summarise for the reader the content of the report and any specific issues that need drawing attention to. This section is one that is written with the external reader in mind (e.g. University Research Degrees Committee (URDC) reader, external examiner, students etc.). The audience of the remainder of the document is primarily the course team itself. |
| **Reflection on currency and course health:***For collaborative courses, please ensure that you reflect on the currency of the curriculum and course health across the provision, both at NTU and at the collaborative partner(s).*  | This section requires the course to confirm that the course remains current. This section could include reflection on issues such as: staff development activity; changes to the course(s); staff research (and its impact on the curriculum, supervision etc.); learning resources;research environment; staff feedback etc. |
| *The course team should reflect on any activity in the reporting year which demonstrates that the course is both current and in good health. This reflection should be evidence based.* *For example, a member of staff may have undertaken research or development which has impacted upon the curriculum. External examiners for phase one may have commented upon the currency of the course.**This section should be used to report any changes made to the course in the reporting year and when these were approved. The report should reflect how the changes enhance the currency and health of the course.**This section should reflect on whether the resource base and the research environment remain appropriate, and whether it aligns to the requirements of the NTU Postgraduate research environment. It should state any concerns about quality as a result of the current research environment.* | Ref. rolling action plan |
|  |
| **Developments and initiatives:** | Details of any significant initiatives which may be shareable and which have taken place during the reporting year.*For collaborative courses, this may be practice identified in a particular partner, or may be an aspect of practice relating to the collaboration itself.* |
| *Here the course team should consider any developments or initiatives that have led to, or have the potential to lead to, practice or process enhancements which may be shareable across the University. The course team should reflect on the impact of developments and initiatives on student learning and research opportunities.* | Ref. rolling action plan |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Areas to raise for the attention of URDC:** | This section should be used to raise to URDC issues that are outside of the control of the course team and that have not been addressed during the reporting year. |
|  | Ref. rolling action plan |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issues raised by students and course response:** | This will be informed by feedback from students at workshops, course committee meetings, supervisory meetings and through module evaluations and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES). |
| *The course team should reflect on how student feedback is sought and whether this is effective. The report should demonstrate how feedback has been responded to in the reporting year, and how the reporting loop was closed.* *The report should highlight any specific areas where response to student feedback was particularly effective or where issues were unable to be resolved and the reasons for this.* | Ref. rolling action plan |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consideration of supervision:** | Reflects on the quality of supervision of students. |
| *The course team should reflect on evidence pertaining to the following:**supervisor capacity (i.e. is there an increasing/decreasing number of available supervisors)**new supervisors**supervisory training and Continuing Professional Development (CPD)**student engagement with supervision**effectiveness of supervision of students, and issues / concerns on the quality of supervision of students* | Ref. rolling action plan |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consideration of collaborative arrangements:** | Reflects on the comparability of standards and quality of collaborative provision. |
| *The course team should reflect on the comparability of standards and quality at collaborative partners using:**Collaborative academic lead report**Data**Partner reports* | Ref. rolling action plan |
|  |

**Part B**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rolling action plan** | The rolling action plan is a separate document which can be easily considered at each course committee meeting. Structure this in a way that you find most useful. Actions need to be cross referenced to relevant discussion in the remainder of the report. You need to include the following kinds of information (see exemplar rolling action plan):what is the issue that needs addressing;what do you anticipate being the final outcome;what action(s) will need to be taken to reach this outcome;when will you aim to complete these actions;who will lead;at which course committee meeting will it be addressed/ discussed/reviewed;the date when the action gets completed.*For collaborative courses, this action plan may include specific actions which have specific reference to a particular collaborative centre.* |

**Part C**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reflection on external examiner(s) comments for phase one:** | This section provides the course’s consideration of comments raised by the phase one external examiner(s). This will form the basis of the letter of response to the examiner(s). Where something raised is not going to be taken further, the rationale behind this decision should be provided in this response.  |
| *The course team should reflect on what the external examiner report(s) indicate about the standards and quality of the course(s).**Where externals have made recommendations or raised concerns these should be explicitly responded to in the report. Where there is an action resulting from this then it should be included in the rolling action plan and cross referenced appropriately.* *Where something raised is not going to be taken further, the rationale behind this decision should be provided in this response.**Where an external has provided a negative response to any of the questions on the report (i.e. answered ‘no’ rather than ‘yes’) the course team should investigate this further and respond appropriately in this section.* | Ref. rolling action plan |
| **Reflection on external examiners’ comments for phase two:** | This section provides consideration of comments made by external examiners as part of the final phase two examination process.  |
| *The course team should consider reports from all viva voce examinations that have taken place in the reporting year. The report should reflect on what these demonstrate about the standards and quality of the course. The course team should look for trends and patterns in feedback and outcomes, and reflect on and respond to these appropriately.*  |  |

 **Part D**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consideration of student progression and achievement** |  |

**1. Progression**

Key questions for the course committee to consider:

* Are the patterns of progression similar across the last three years? If they are different, why might this be the case?
* Do the data suggest a change in progression rates that concerns the course team?
* Are the patterns of progression in line with other professional doctorate courses? If not, is there a reason why this may be the case?
* On the basis of this analysis is any action required?

**2. Achievement**

Key questions for the course committee to consider:

* Are patterns of achievement similar across the last three years? If they are different, why might this be the case?
* Do the data suggest a change that concerns the course team?
* Are the patterns in line with other professional doctorate courses?
* On the basis of this analysis is any action required?

**3. Module data**

Key questions for the course committee to consider:

* Do any modules stand out, either as having a particularly high or low pass or fail rates?
* Are all the modules equally demanding? Are they all being taught and assessed at level 8?
* How many students are there on each module (this effects how meaningful the mean score is)?
* On the basis of this analysis is any action required?

**4. Extensions**

Key questions for the course committee to consider:

• How many extensions beyond the expected registration periods have been

granted in the past year? Give reasons. Are there any implications of this?

• Is this similar across Colleges, and across different types of research degrees’ provision? If not, is there a reason why this may be the case?

• Is this similar to provision at collaborative partners? If not, if there a reason why this might be the case?

• On the basis of this analysis is any further action required?

**5. Withdrawals**

Key questions for the course committee to consider:

• Are patterns of withdrawal similar across the last three years? If they are different, why might this be the case? Are there any implications of this?

• Are patterns of withdrawal similar across Colleges, and across different types of research degrees provision?

• Are patterns of withdrawal similar to those at collaborative partners?

• On the basis of this analysis is any action required?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy owner** |  |  |
| CADQ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Change history** |  |
| *Version:* | *Approval date:* | *Implementation date:* | *Nature of significant revisions:* |
| Sept 2016 | 13.07.16 (URDC) | 01.10.16 | Minor revisions on (a) Reflection on the currency of the course, adding the need to reflect on the research environment; and, (b) Consideration of supervision to reflect on the quality and efficacy of supervision of students.  |
| Sept 2017 | 12.09.17 | 01.10.17 | None |
| Sept 2018 | 12.09.18 | 01.10.18 | None |
| Sept 2019 | 11.09.19 | 01.10.19 | None |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Equality Impact Assessment** |  |
| *Version:* | *EIA date:* | *Completed by:* |  |
| Sept 2016 | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |