

# Postgraduate Research Progression Reviews: Criteria and Submission Guidelines

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 In accordance with the [Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision](#), Schools will bring to the attention of research students and relevant staff, clearly defined formats of assessment which inform Progression Reviews, including the criteria to be used for defining outcomes from Progression Reviews.
- 1.2 Progression reviews must be sufficiently rigorous to provide an adequate test of the research student's knowledge and understanding of the subject material, of progress to date, and of plans for the remainder of their candidature.
- 1.3 As a minimum, research students must submit a written report which should summarise progress made since the last report. Any particular problems encountered by the research student (e.g. access to resources or facilities or other additional disability-related or language support requirements) should be indicated in this report and appropriate action taken. The report should also indicate whether any additional support requirements or facilities already being provided for a particular research student are continuing to meet that research student's needs, or if any adjustments for the coming period are required.
- 1.4 The Progression Review must also include a viva voce (oral) examination and a review of the Academic Needs Analysis.
- 1.5 Following a Progression Review, a research student will be given written feedback by the panel and, if necessary, guidance on actions to be taken to support progress in their candidature.
- 1.6 The procedures and timings for Progression Reviews are given in the Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision and generic criteria required for progression are given below. However the precise format of the assessment is the responsibility of the School. This flexibility is in recognition of the varying nature of the research culture between disciplines.
- 1.7 The following generic guidelines for the criteria and submission requirements for Progression Reviews have been recommended by the PGR QME Subcommittee, and endorsed by Academic Standards and Quality Committee (AQSC). Faculties should determine the precise format of submission and criteria to be used to define the outcomes from Progression Reviews. These should be considered by School Programmes Committee and approved by Faculty Graduate School Committee. In deciding whether to approve the precise format of submission from each School, the Faculty Graduate School Committee should take into account the requirements of the Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision, the criteria below, and whether there is any valid justification for a variation between Schools. The criteria and submission formats should be reported annually to PGR QME subcommittee.

## 2. Criteria and Submission requirements for 1<sup>st</sup> Progression Review

### Criteria

- 2.1 During the first Progression Review, the Progression Review Panel must satisfy itself that the research student:

- is undertaking a viable research project;
- has made satisfactory progress to date;
- has developed an adequately detailed plan of work to enable the research degree to be completed within the allowable registration period;
- has defined the preliminary objectives and scope of the research project adequately;
- has made an appropriate survey of the relevant literature and demonstrated an ability to make critical evaluation of published work;
- has acquired an appropriate knowledge and understanding of applicable research methods;
- has begun discussing the ethical implications of their research with their supervisory team and can articulate how these are incorporated into their research plans.

## Submission

2.2 As a minimum, the research student should submit a written report which:

- defines the aims and objectives of the research project;
- describes how the proposed research relates to other work in the area;
- presents the work that has been carried out to date;
- presents a plan for progression to confirmation.

## 3. Criteria and Submission requirements for Confirmation of registration for PhD

### Criteria

3.1 During the second Progression Review, and in accordance with the University's Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision, the Confirmation Panel must satisfy itself that the research student has demonstrated the ability to:

- manage the research project;
- become proficient in the special field of research involved;
- achieve success at PhD level given adequate motivation and perseverance.

3.2 The panel must also satisfy itself that:

- the project being undertaken is of sufficient scope, originality and theoretical interest to constitute a genuine contribution to the subject in the form of the understanding of a problem, the advancement of knowledge or the generation of new ideas.

### Submission

3.3 In accordance with the University's Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision, the Confirmation Panel must have reviewed a sufficient body of written work in order to make a judgement on the criteria detailed above. This body of work should include:

- an overview of the research problem and rationale for the project;
- a substantial literature review;
- well-developed plans for fieldwork and data analysis (if applicable).

## 4. Criteria and Submission requirements for 3<sup>rd</sup> Progression Review

### Criteria

4.1 During the third Progression Review, the Progression Review Panel must satisfy itself that the research student:

- has made satisfactory progress to date;
- has developed an adequately detailed plan of work and is on track to enable the research degree to be completed within the allowable registration period.

## Submission

4.2 As a minimum, the research student should submit a written report which:

- outlines the thesis structure
- summarises work that has been carried out to date
- summarises work still to be done
- outlines a plan for submission of the thesis

## 5. Criteria and Submission requirements for Interim Progression Reviews

### Criteria

5.1 During the Interim Progression Review, the Progression Review Panel must satisfy itself that the research student:

- has made satisfactory progress to date;
- has developed an adequately detailed plan of work for next progression review;
- is on track to enable the research degree to be completed within the allowable registration period.

### Submission

5.2 As a minimum, the research student should submit a written report which:

- presents the work that has been carried out to date
- presents a plan for the next stage of the PhD
- outlines a plan for submission of the thesis (as applicable)

## 6. Exceptional Progression Reviews

6.1 The Exceptional Progression Review usually follows the procedures for confirmation (see section 3 above).

Document Information	
Author	Quality Standards and Accreditation Team
Owner (committee)	Academic Quality and Standards Committee
Approved Date	August 2016 [Chair's Action], October 2018
Last Revision	October 2018
Type of Document	Guidance