

## WSA PhD Progression Review 1

### Progression Review 1

The first review takes place within a period of 8-10 months from enrolment. The review includes a viva, which is conducted by an internal independent assessor, proposed by the supervisor, and approved by the Director of the Faculty Graduate School. A member of the supervisory team will normally be in attendance. In exceptional circumstances, with the permission of the Director of the Faculty Graduate School, an external independent assessor may be appointed.

Prior to the review, the student is required to submit **written work**. This should be done at least **four working weeks in advance of the decision deadline** to allow the panel to consider the material, hold a viva, and make a recommendation within the specified timeframe. For instance, in the case of the full-time PhD programme, for the First attempt review, the respective written report must be submitted at least 4 weeks before the end of Month 10.

Failure to submit a written report by the specified deadline will result in a failure of the respective progression review attempt.

The written work will provide:

- Between 3,000 – 5,000 words providing an overview of the research problem, its critical context and the rationale and/or approach of the project, as well as detailed plans for practice-based work and/or data analysis. It is also useful to think of this written component as developmental the overview required at the second progression review (see below) and for the final introduction of the PhD thesis.
- Minimum 5,000 words literature review.

For the first progression review, it is necessary to show that the candidate:

- \*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 registration period
- \*Has defined the preliminary scope of the 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 plan

NB. For practice-based research, candidates should arrange to show work in progress, which is in addition to the above written submission. This can be installation of work or documentation of work. If the former, candidates must make the arrangements to display work appropriately.

The review will assess the written report and academic needs of the candidate. If the mandatory Ethics 1 module has yet been completed it should be included in the student's training plan, with the view of completing it before the 2<sup>nd</sup> (Confirmation) Review.

The recommendation from the First Progression Review can be one of the following:

1. to progress to the next stage of candidature;
2. to re-assess.

If re-assessment is recommended, the research student will be given written guidance on preparation for their second (and final) attempt. The second attempt at the first Progression Review will have the same format as the first attempt, and will usually be conducted by the same panel as for the first attempt. In exceptional circumstances, the Director of the Faculty Graduate School may wish to appoint a third panel member and/or an independent note taker. The second attempt will involve a re-viva. An independent chair for re-viva will be appointed by the Director of the Faculty Graduate School. However, if the assessors deem that the revised written submission is sufficient to progress, the re-viva may not be necessary. The assessment of the second attempt will lead to one of the following recommendations:

1. to progress to the next stage of candidature;
2. to terminate the student's candidature.