

## **STUDENT JOURNEY**

### **REVIEW OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENT ADMINISTRATION**

#### **REPORT ON FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

##### **1. Introduction**

The Review of Postgraduate Research Student administration commenced on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2013 and closed on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2013. A range of discussion meetings were conducted throughout the Review with key stakeholders from within the University, and the findings are detailed in this report together with recommendations on the future administrative support for consideration by the Head of the Graduate School as service owner.

##### **2. Background and Scope of the Review**

The Student Journey Service Owner Consultation which took place in May/June 2013 confirmed the recommendation that the Graduate School should be the service owner for postgraduate research (PGR) administration. This decision recognised the particular support needs of PGR students and the benefits that could be realised by one service owner with responsibility and accountability for delivering a consistent support service to PGR students.

The Review therefore needed to address the changes which might result from the Graduate School having service ownership and the optimum operating model to deliver the best support service to students. Alongside this it needed to look at the impact of the new IT monitoring system for PGR students, ResearchPAD. The system will bring changes to the administrative work and processes undertaken by the Research Administrators, to PGR students and research supervisors who will also be using the new system. Finally, BU2018 has set the objective to increase the number of PGR students to a ratio of 1PGR: 1FTE academic member of staff by 2018. It was also important that the Review considered the impact of this growth on PGR administration.

The scope of the Review was therefore to consider the current provision of PGR Administration, future requirements of this support, changes arising from the implementation of ResearchPAD and the optimum model for future delivery of PGR administrative support.

The Review briefing document detailed a number of key questions that would be addressed through the Review, these being:

- Does the scope of postgraduate research administration identified by the Student Journey Project cover all of the services necessary for ensuring excellent support to students?
- What are the operational changes expected as a result of implementing the new IT system ResearchPAD?
- How will ResearchPAD change current and future administrative processes and the support needed to deliver them?
- What impact might the planned growth in Postgraduate Research Student numbers have on administrative support needed going forward?
- The Target Operating Model Design Group recommended local delivery as the operating model for postgraduate research administration, i.e. administrators to be

located within academic schools where students are also located. Is this the optimum model?

In this report are details of the information gathered during the Review work with respect to these questions. The Review discussion also drew out a number of suggestions for improvements to PGR support which, although not of direct relevance to the Review, may be of interest to the Graduate School. These will be shared with the Graduate School separately.

### **3. Overview of Review Process**

A briefing document detailing the purpose of the Review and its objectives was circulated to all of the current postholders providing administrative support to postgraduate research students. This took place on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2013 and was accompanied by an email advising staff that the Review had commenced. The document was prepared by the Student Journey Organisational Change Lead in conjunction with the Head of the Graduate School as the service owner of postgraduate research administration.

During the course of the review, the briefing document was also shared with Deputy Deans Research and Enterprise, the Graduate School, School Directors of Operations, a number of Academic Administration Managers, PGR student representatives and a number of staff with research supervisory responsibilities.

A range of meetings took place during the review. The Student Journey Organisational Change Lead and HR Manager met with each School and their appropriate representatives, this was a combination of the Director of Operations, Academic Administration Manager, or Deputy Dean Research and Enterprise and in one School the Director of PhD Studies. The Student Journey Organisational Change Lead and HR Manager also held a separate meeting with Deputy Deans Research and Enterprise and a number of meetings with academic staff who supervise postgraduate research students. The Student Journey Organisational Change Lead and HR Manager also met with a number of postgraduate research student representatives.

In addition to these meetings, two discussion sessions were offered to the postgraduate Research Administrators during the review. One of these was a staff development workshop, "Engaging with Change", which considered the process of change and how best to engage with it. The other was a meeting to discuss the questions raised in the review briefing document, in particular the administrative support currently provided to PGR students, the future role and scope of this support and the recommended operating model for the service given that it has been confirmed the Graduate School is the service owner for PGR administration.

All of this work took place during the Review period and was concluded by 4<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

### **4. Review Findings**

In the details following under each area considered by the Review, the findings from the discussions with staff and students are provided.

#### ***4.1 Does the scope of postgraduate research administration identified by the Student journey Project cover all of the services necessary for ensuring excellent support to students?***

It was evident from all of the discussion meetings that the core tasks currently undertaken by the Research Administrator role were captured within the list of responsibilities provided in

the Review briefing document. It was also clear that additional tasks are carried out across the different Schools and there is variation in practice and the range of support involved. This included the level of support as a few of the Research Administrators emphasised that they often made decisions on behalf of academic staff and managed PGR support rather than just administering it.

The core administrative support for PGR students are the administrative processes involved from first point of contact from a prospective student through to successful completion of the PhD. This therefore includes the application process, student arrival and induction, tracking milestones and progression, support to PGR and related School research committees, arrangements for vivas and external examiners. In addition to these activities it was clear from the review discussions that other tasks are incorporated and these vary across the different Schools. The additional tasks identified by all of the different stakeholders involved in the Review are as follows.

### **Administrative Support for Research Activity**

It was evident from the Review discussions that the Research Administrator role is also being utilised in some Schools to support wider research activity. This can include providing support when a School has external research funds, when visiting researchers and academics spend time at BU and letters of invitation and resources need to be organised. In discussions with the DDREs and the Research Administrators it was apparent that Schools see a gap in administrative support for research activity and in some cases this gap is filled by using the Research Administrator role.

In discussion with staff it was apparent that some of the tasks being undertaken are ones which fall within the remit of RKEO and in others they wanted more support from the RDU. In some Schools the Research Administrator is providing this support to help with these tasks in addition to the core requirements needed to support PGR students. The DDREs advised that they occasionally have to pick up administrative activities to support research initiatives originating from the RDU as they reported that there is no one else to provide the support needed from within the School. Research Ethics training was given as an example of this.

From the Review work undertaken it is evident that there is a need to understand the gap in support requirements for research activity further. Although this is not part of the PGR Review what it also emphasises is the need for the scope of the Research Administrator role to be well-defined.

### **Financial Administrative Support**

Another area of additional activity being supported by Research Administrators relates to financial support. A PGR student can have access to development funds and Schools reported that it is unclear who is responsible for monitoring these and processing any financial transactions relating to them. In some Schools the Research Administrator maintains records about the activity undertaken and then is also involved in making travel arrangements, ordering equipment and similar financial transactions. In one School the Research Administrator advised that they also keep financial records. All Schools, however, have finance and resources support staff with responsibility for providing financial support which would include the PGR students. Similarly the finance and resources staff can run reports from the finance system to show what expenditure has been made. The School Business Accountant and RKEO support officer also have responsibility for tracking financial activity and any orders or payments that are made against external research and enterprise funds. This is another area therefore where clarity is needed on the tasks that the Research Administrator role undertakes.

All of the various discussions with staff also requested greater clarity of the processes and support for BU funded and match-funded PhD studentships. The Schools reported uncertainty as to who has responsibility for administering the financial support provided to PGR students through this funding. This point was also made by the PGR student representatives. They asked for clarity over the development funds that they have access to, advising that there is uncertainty about what these can be used for. The student representatives asked if they can use the funds for other resources if they are not attending conferences or undertaking other development activities. Although this issue is not specifically related to the Research Administration tasks, the Review identified that this is an area of confusion for staff and PGR students and greater clarity would be welcomed.

### **Matters of academic responsibility**

In discussions with the Research Administrators it was noted that in some Schools the postholder is carrying out tasks that are the responsibility of academic staff. This appears to have developed over time and because the Research Administrator is trying to ensure that all aspects of support to PGR students are completed. Another contributory factor might be the need for academic staff to balance a range of different demands on their time. A Research Administrator advised that they carry out a managing role as well as administrative, often in effect chairing meetings, taking part in studentship interviews and making other decisions necessary to ensure the timely progression of the student. It is clear that in some Schools there is a blurring between the roles and responsibilities of the Research Administrator and those of academic members of staff.

The issue of academic responsibility was discussed with the DDREs and Research Supervisors in order to ascertain whether or not the Research Administrator role needs to contribute to tasks that are part of academic support. Their view was that the Research Administrator role is not required to undertake academic tasks. There are academic responsibilities for tasks such as signing documentation, taking decisions on student progress and similar which are the remit of academic staff. They suggested this Review could provide an opportunity to clarify processes and responsibilities and also saw central ownership and management of PGR administrative support assisting in this.

It will be important therefore to address this issue so that the Research Administrator role does not have to cover academic issues and there is a clear distinction between the administrative support the role should provide and the academic matters which are the responsibility of the academic. It will also be important to ensure that the Research Administrator has effective support so that in such instances they can refer the matter appropriately on.

### **Pastoral Support to Students**

The requirement for “pastoral” support to students is another area where it was very evident from all the Review discussions, that there is a need for clarity as to what support is needed by PGR students and who provides it. It was also evident that there is no single definition of what constitutes pastoral support, it can range from answering quite straightforward questions through to more personal support to the student.

The Research Administrators reported that they provide pastoral support. This can be time-consuming and they can spend a lot of time dealing with issues brought to them by PGR students. The type of pastoral issues varied, but the time consuming issues related to things that might impact on their studies, issues with research supervisors, advising and supporting in personal issues. These matters went alongside the more operational issues relating to accommodation, visas, national insurance numbers, bank accounts and similar.

In discussion with academic staff it was evident that DDREs and research supervisors make a clear distinction between what the Research Administrator role should be assisting with and the issues which should be addressed by academic staff. The view of the Schools was that any issue which could impact on a student's academic progress should be a matter that is supported by the research supervisory team. The Research Administrator focus is needed to assist in resolving operational matters such as enquiries about national insurance numbers, visa issues and/or signposting PGR students onto other parts of the organisation who provide specialist support, such as immigration support or the accommodation service.

In discussion with the PGR student representatives they advised that it is important for students to know who can answer their queries so that they aren't referred onto multiple people. Students need their questions answered either by the person they go to, or to be directed onto someone else who will know the answer, they don't want to be sent to many different people. This was particularly the case for questions relating to visas, immigration support, accommodation and similar. They see their research supervisor as the support for issues relating to their studies but also suggested having a separate person outside of the School that they could talk to if they needed, someone different to the administrator and research supervisory team, who could provide support in more personal matters. They suggested that this might be something that the Graduate School could consider providing.

It is evident therefore from all the discussions that clarity is needed with respect to pastoral support – what it means and where the responsibilities lie. It is important for the student that there are clear and consistent channels of support that they can access. It is important for the Research Administrator to have clarity in respect of what pastoral support they provide and where matters need to be referred onto the supervisory team and/or other parts of the University with the specialist knowledge necessary to deal with the issue. Finally it is important for research supervisors to understand what they can expect Research Administrators to take responsibility for.

Related to this is the issue of a culture or community for PGR students. In the discussions with staff and the student representatives, all noted this was lacking and inevitably this will have an impact on the support the students have. Suggestions in relation to this could be to improve the online community through dedicated web/intranet pages, and in addition the Graduate School could consider other activities to facilitate a stronger PGR student community. This could also provide a support network for some of the issues the students raised and their suggestion that there is a separate person they can talk to outside of the School. This issue was not something the PGR review was specifically considering, but a need has clearly been identified through the discussion sessions.

### **Current Level of PGR Admin Support within Schools**

The final dominant theme related to the current level of PGR administrative support and the provision of cover within the academic Schools. In all of the Schools the current Research Administrator role is fractional, ranging from 0.5fte through to 0.8fte in terms of the support provided to PGR students. In some Schools the role is combined with other responsibilities, e.g. one School has a 1fte post which is split to cover Postgraduate Research and Postgraduate Taught student support. In another School there is a 1fte post whose responsibilities include dedicated support to the DDRE as well as the PGR admin support. Across the Schools the number of PGR students varies. One School has in excess of 120 students, two Schools are approaching 100 students and in the other Schools numbers are much lower with the lowest number being 41 students. (Figures cited are student headcount as at October 2013).

The view of the Schools with the highest student headcount was that if the number of PGR students within their Schools should significantly change, then the current level of administrative support would not be enough. This point is addressed again below in relation to the impact of the planned growth in PGR student numbers by 2018. The majority of the Schools advised that the current level of administration resource can support the current student numbers, one School advised that their numbers are growing and they have sought some small additional support which has not been approved.

Another related issue raised by academic staff and PGR student representatives is the lack of cover provided when their respective Research Administrator is absent. As the Research Administrators are either employed on a fractional basis or have split responsibilities, if they are absent for any reason no-one else in the School provides support. The Graduate School can offer some support but this is limited and the implementation of ResearchPAD will help in some respects but this is not yet in place. The PGR student representatives noted that they are often contacted by PGR students who need guidance or advice if the Research Administrator is not available. Similarly academic staff reported the difficulties that lack of cover sometimes provides, especially if the Research Administrator is absent for any significant period of time.

The issue of cover and support is considered again below in relation to the optimum future operating model for PGR administrative support.

#### ***4.2 What are the operational changes expected as a result of implementing the new IT system ResearchPAD? How will ResearchPAD change current and future administrative processes and the support needed to deliver the?***

At the time the Review work was undertaken, ResearchPAD was still undergoing testing ahead of implementation which is now due to take place in November 2013. The system is expected to deliver a number of benefits, although some of these will be realised over time as users become more familiar with the system and its operation. It was the view of those in all the review meetings that it would take the remainder of the 2013/2014 academic year to fully embed the system and realise its benefits.

However, it is already apparent that benefits of the new system can be identified, especially with respect to having a single PGR monitoring system which all users can access, including the PGR students themselves. The system will be the single source of all information relating to PGR students, improving management information, producing standardised reports, facilitating consistent monitoring processes, systems and information across all Schools. This system can realistically be expected to reduce the amount of time currently involved in preparing information for School Research Committee (and similar) meetings. It will remove the need for Research Administrators to keep their own records and manually compile information on PGR students.

Another benefit will be the fact that the system will enable anyone using it to access student information, therefore providing scope for cover to be provided when a PGR administrator is absent. The present situation where no one else provides cover if a Research Administrator is away will be improved as ResearchPAD will mean that certain aspects of the work can be picked up by another member of staff.

The system will also enable PGR students and their supervisors to enter information. The student will be expected to maintain information as will the supervisor; the system will send reminders when information updates are needed. This will assist the work of the Research Administrator who will not need to be solely relied on to chase up information.

Although it is recognised that the full implementation of ResearchPAD is yet to be realised, it is nevertheless evident that it will change the amount of time involved in administrative support for PGR students. A single IT system accessible by all key stakeholders involved in PGR support will reduce the time involved in compiling reports and information on student progress, enable students and supervisors to access and update information themselves, remove the need for separate records to be maintained and enable standardised processes and reports across all the Schools.

#### ***4.3 What impact might the planned growth in Postgraduate Research Student numbers have on administrative support needed going forward?***

As part of the review discussions all Schools were asked if they had agreed strategies for increasing their ratio of academic staff to postgraduate research students. The Review team wanted to establish if there are any specific changes in the number of PGR students planned for the next academic year. From the discussions it was clear that Schools note the strategy for growth and individually they vary with respect to how close they are to achieving this. However, no School reported any particular activity which they were undertaking separate to the Graduate School planned number growth. It is not anticipated therefore that there will be any significant change in PGR numbers over the next academic year other than that planned by the Graduate School.

In all of the discussions staff agreed that any significant change in student numbers would impact on the resource required to support them. (This also relates to details provided in section 4.1 above and 4.4 following).

#### ***4.4 The Target Operating Model Design Group recommended local delivery as the operating model for postgraduate research administration, i.e. administrators to be located within academic schools where students are also located. Is this the optimum model?***

During the Review meetings the question was asked as to whether the proposed operating model in which the Graduate School would both own and manage all PGR administration, was the optimum model. This model would also include the Research Administrator role being located within Schools. This model was recommended by the Student Journey Target Operating Model Design Group in Phase 1 of the Student Journey. The rationale for this being that PGR students and research supervisors need support where they are located and that an enhanced support service could be provided by having one service owner and manager of the service.

The feedback provided across all the Schools from DDREs, Directors of Operations, Academic Administration Managers and research supervisors did not identify any concern with this operating model, *provided* the Graduate School effectively communicate and engage with Schools as they are a key stakeholder in the administrative support provided. They also saw benefits from this model as it would enable the Graduate School to establish, implement and maintain common processes supporting standardised administrative support for PGR students and research supervisors. It would also support clearly defined Research Administrator roles with clear expectations of what administrative support is needed and provided to PGR students. This would also be complemented by having a team of administrators who could provide support during staff absences and work together to share knowledge and expertise.

The only concern expressed by Schools with this model related to how the Graduate School would work with academic Schools. As the owner and manager of the Research

Administrator role, it would be essential for the Graduate School to regularly communicate and engage with Schools on the support provided, and work collaboratively to understand the needs of the Schools. It was also considered important that there is a consistent dotted line into each School for the Research Administrator to ensure that operational matters are covered i.e. who the Research Administrator advises if they are unwell, feedback for appraisals and other related matters.

The PGR student representatives saw the main benefit of this model being its potential to provide cover in the School if the Research Administrator was absent.

In discussion with the Research Administrators, there was general agreement of the need for the support to be located in the School. The potential benefits which could be gained from providing cover was also recognised and that ResearchPAD would assist with this. However, a number of the Research Administrators expressed concern that central management with location in the School could mean that they are caught between the needs of the Graduate School and also the academic School. For example, it could be difficult being located away from the line manager and potentially having “two masters”. The view of the Research Administrators present when this model was discussed, was that they needed to be located in the Schools and managed by the DDRE as they need to report to someone who understands research and the support role they are providing.

## **5. Recommendations**

As a result of this Review and the findings presented in this document a number of recommendations are brought forward for consideration by the Head of the Graduate School as Service Owner.

**5.1** It is evident from all of the information gathered in the Review discussions that the scope of the Research Administrator role needs to be clarified. There are clearly a range of tasks that the role needs to undertake, but this has become blurred over time and needs to be re-established particularly as PGR administration moves to a new ownership model. In particular there needs to be a clear distinction between administrative and academic responsibilities as well as finance and resources support. It is also essential to clarify what is meant by “pastoral support” and what the Research Administrator role needs to contribute to that. Whilst there are common tasks and responsibilities across the range of support the different Research Administrator roles provide, it would be beneficial to harmonise this to ensure a consistent service to PGR students and academic staff.

***It is therefore recommended that a standard Research Administrator job description is defined and evaluated to take into account the need for a harmonised approach to the administrative support to PGR students.***

**5.2** From the discussions undertaken, it is evident that there are benefits to be gained from the proposed operating model. This model is for the Graduate School to both own and manage PGR administration, including the Research Administrators. It is also evident that there is a need for the Research Administrator role to be located within the Schools they are supporting. It was a common concern that if support was not locally delivered, PGR students and staff would end up calling on the DDRE for support.

It is recognised that there are some concerns about how the model would operate, but on balance these concerns do not outweigh the benefits that can be gained through the proposed model. At present the Research Administrator role operates in isolation within the academic School, and there is no cover provided if the postholder is absent which impacts negatively on the support provided to PGR students and academic supervisors. There is also

variation across the Schools in the way Graduate School processes and procedures are applied which is a concern.

Centrally owned and managed support can address these issues and enhance the service that is provided, also further facilitating the sharing of best practice and developing areas of expertise. The DDREs, Director of Operations, Academic Administration Managers and research supervisors who contributed to the Review also identified these as benefits to be gained.

*It is therefore recommended that the Graduate School owns and manages the Research Administrator roles but that these are locally based in academic Schools.*

*It is critical in this model that the Graduate School establishes effective communication processes with the Schools as stakeholders in the support provided, and engages with them in how the service operates and any future changes or developments. It is also essential that to ensure that the role of Research Administrator remains an integral part of the School, the post holder has a dotted line into the DDRE in the school.*

### 5.3 FTE Resource Requirements

From the discussions carried out with academic Schools, no School indicated any detailed plans for a significant growth in PGR student numbers over the next academic year. From the Schools with the largest numbers of PGR students, two Schools reported that the current Research Administrator FTE resource in their School could support the current student numbers, but noted that this would not be the case if student numbers significantly changed. The other School with the largest number of students advised that their numbers are growing and they have sought some additional support.

As at October 2013 the numbers of PGR students were as follows, this therefore does not include any changes that have taken place since that date:

| School        | PGR Student Headcount |                |            |            |            | PGR FTE       |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|
|               | FT                    | PT (not staff) | PT (staff) | PT Total   | Total      |               |
| App Sci       | 51                    | 5              | 1          | 6          | 57         | 54            |
| BS            | 35                    | 8              | 12         | 20         | 55         | 45            |
| DEC           | 64                    | 8              | 6          | 14         | 78         | 71            |
| HSC           | 18                    | 36             | 49         | 76         | 94         | 56            |
| MS            | 64                    | 30             | 29         | 59         | 123        | 93.5          |
| ST            | 19                    | 11             | 11         | 22         | 41         | 30            |
| <b>TOTALS</b> | <b>251</b>            | <b>98</b>      | <b>99</b>  | <b>197</b> | <b>448</b> | <b>349.50</b> |

*(Details provided by Graduate School)*

In considering the current and future resource requirements there are a number of factors to be taken into account. From the details outlined in this report it is evident that the current Research Administrator role is undertaking tasks not specifically within its remit. This varies across the Schools but it is a common theme and the recommended refresh of the job description will address this. With more clearly defined responsibilities, particularly in relation to pastoral support, finance and resources support and academic supervision, the scope of the role going forward will be well-defined and postholders supported in focusing on the essential requirements of the role. In addition the introduction of ResearchPAD will

streamline reporting information and reduce the amount of time currently involved in chasing up information, maintaining files and management information. All of these factors support the view that the overall current level of FTE resource does not need to be increased.

In light of the operating model recommendation made in 5.2 above, it is recommended that an agreed FTE per PGR student numbers should be established in order to have an agreed level of resource support common across Schools and against which future requests for additional support can be measured. It should also be noted in relation to this, that the Review discussions identified that part time students have different needs to full time and the time involved in supporting them can often be as involved as for full time students. For this reason it is recommended that the FTE support does not differentiate between full and part time students for administrative support. It should be noted that the Review did not consider whether there is any variation in the support needed for part time students who are members of staff.

An examination of the support provided at a number of other UK Universities has been undertaken. A total of 7 HEIs supplied information on their number of PGR students, their support model and the administrative fte supporting PGR students. (The details were supplied on agreement it would be treated anonymously). The information is shown in the table following:

| <b>HEI</b> | <b>PGR Headcount</b> | <b>Admin FTE</b> | <b>SSR</b> | <b>Support Model</b>   |
|------------|----------------------|------------------|------------|--|
| A          | 700                  | 7.7              | 90.9       | Central model, provides all PGR support, no online monitoring system.                          |
| B          | 280                  | 4                | 70         | Central model, provides all support.   |
| C          | 1000                 | 10               | 100        | Mixed model, all support including UKBA, complaints and appeals. Has online monitoring system. |
| D          | 540                  | 12               | 45         | Central model, provides all support.   |
| E          | 700                  | 9                | 77.8       | Central model, all support. No online monitoring system.                                       |
| F          | Not given            | Not Given        | 100-125    | Central model, all support including events. No online system.                                 |
| G          | 750                  | 6                | 125        | Central model, all support. Online system.   |

As the details indicate the student staff ratio varies across the different Universities, most of the HEIs operate a central model and those who have moved to this in the last few years state that it does provide more consistent support to the students as well as harmonising processes. Only two of the Universities already have an online PGR monitoring system and all the others are looking to implement one.

At present, based on October 2013 PGR student numbers, BU has a total headcount of 448 students supported by an administration base of 4.5 fte which gives a SSR of 99.5, which falls within the range of support identified in other Universities. (It should be noted that there is a 1 fte Research Administrator who also provides support to the School DDRE and therefore an adjustment needs to be made to reflect this).

In the Review discussions, the School with the largest individual number of PGR students advised that they needed some additional administrative resource, and the two Schools with the next largest number of students advised that their level of support was currently adequate. Given this, together with the rebalancing of duties that will come from a more

clearly defined Research Administrator role and the benefits from the introduction of ResearchPAD (although these wont be fully realised until the 2014/15 year), it is recommended that a benchmark of 0.8fte per 100 students is adopted. It is also recommended that this operates with a +/- 20 student number tolerance if there is the need to consider any future adjustment to resource support should student numbers change.

For clarity this recommendation only applies to support for PGR students and is separate to any administrative resource requirements that could arise due to externally funded research projects.

*It is therefore recommended that a benchmark of 0.8fte per 100 students is adopted and an assessment made of the changes in support across the academic Schools which would follow. This would also need to take into account the anticipated integration of Applied Sciences and Design, Engineering and Computing.*

## **6. Concluding Comments**

This report and recommendations are presented to the Head of the Graduate School for consideration and decision as the Service Owner of postgraduate research support.

Jackie Molnar  
Organisational Change Lead – Student Journey  
October 2013