

PGR School Progression Ammendment

Simon Harper

Apr 10, 2017

Contents

1	The Short Version	1
2	The Long Version	2
2.1	For PhD	2
2.1.1	1st year ‘Research Progress Review’:	2
2.1.2	1st year ‘Progression’:	2
2.1.3	2nd year ‘Progression’:	3
2.1.4	3rd year ‘Progression’:	3
2.1.5	Submission:	3
2.2	For CDT	4
2.2.1	1st year ‘Progression’:	4
2.2.2	2nd year ‘Research Progress Review’:	4
2.2.3	2nd year ‘Progression’:	4
2.2.4	3rd year ‘Progression’:	5
2.2.5	Submission:	5

Contents:

Progression Transfer trust to Supervisory Teams (but responsibilities include quality and logistics). Cut workload for staff and students and do not hinder progress of successful students with false hurdles. Streamline the process. Assume (as the data suggests) that all students will be successful, create safety for exceptional cases.

1 The Short Version

For PhD: The long report may not be required based on the outcome of the Research Progress Review (month 9). Only one Examiner will be present for the 1st year progression, and progression will be a collaborative decision between the team and the Examiner. The supervisory team will assess, justify, and record second year progression.

For CDT: The first year rules are unchanged. The long report may not be required based on the outcome of the Research Progress Review (month 21). Only one Examiner will be present for the 2nd year progression, and progression will be a collaborative decision between the team and the Examiner. The supervisory team will assess, justify, and record third year progression.

2 The Long Version

2.1 For PhD

2.1.1 1st year ‘Research Progress Review’:

- [Month 8] Research Progress Report

1. (prompted by eProg), the supervisor informally recruits the Independent Assessor, who should be a domain expert or in a closely related domain to the student.
2. The Student submits Research Progress Report (via eProg) comprising a research proposal, a brief summary of the research so far, and a research plan, and also emails to both the Independent Assessor and the Supervisory Team.
3. This report should be 1500 words excluding references – 500 words to include the social / technical / research impact explicitly (along with the student's ORCID). The supervisory team and the assessor will check the format and length and can return this to the student unread if it does not meet specification.

• **[Month 9] Research Progress Review:**

1. This is organised by the supervisor and could take place in the supervisor's office or a small meeting room. The review times and locations are set between the interested parties (the independent assessor will inform SSO of the time/date/location). The review gauges the fitness of a student for continued PhD study and assesses progress to date (see Section 4.1¹).
2. This event will last about one hour with 15-20 min presentation given by the student, followed by questions and discussions led by the independent assessor. The outcome is documented via eProg and can be 2-fold:
3. Progress is as expected, student is on good path towards PhD: no further action required.
4. Progress is unsatisfactory/questionable: the student will have to submit additional work (via eProg), which is assessed by the independent assessor. This work is by default the Long Report³, however, the independent assessor can assign remedial action (any reasonable additional work if it is explicitly documented), such as writing a paper, performing a critical review, etc. The remedial action being stored in the student's eProg document store, and emailed to the supervisory team and internal assessor 1 month before the progression interview. This is reevaluated by the independent assessor for Progression. This assessment report being available one week preceding the progression interview and sent to SSO (who will pursue reports not returned) for onward distribution to the Progression Examiner.

2.1.2 1st year 'Progression':

- **[Month 11] End-of-year interview** Research Progress Report - uploaded via eProg, with 15 min presentation, followed by 30 min Q&A – with 1 examiner, student, supervisor(s). Organised by the supervisor/examiner, reported in eProg.
 1. If additional work has been requested by the Independent Assessor, then two examiners are required;
 2. If no additional work has been requested by the Independent Assessor, then one examiner is required;
 3. If the the examiner is new to the duty, then two examiners are required;
 4. Examiners are randomly allocated to a student (and their supervisory team), by Student Support. In this case, it should be assumed that the examiner is not an expert in the particular research field, and the technical level should be pitched accordingly.
 5. The Supervisor and Examiner arrange a time/date/location between themselves and at a minimum the examiner and supervisor are present (optimally the supervisory team is present) to conduct the examination (the Examiner will inform SSO of the time/date/location). SSO will issue prompts if arrangements have not been made, and the student will not progress or be able to register without this interview.

¹ http://studentnet.cs.manchester.ac.uk/pgr/2016/handbook/PGR_Handbook2016.pdf

³ Long Report: The long report is in the order of 50-60 A4 pages, which presents an abstract, introduction chapter, background and related work chapter, progress so far chapter (these can be descriptions of pilots, embryonic theories etc and will vary by student/topic but must show novelty and technical depth), and a Future Directions chapter.

6. The student will give a 15 minute oral presentation describing the goals of the research, why the research is important, a summary of work complete, work underway, and future direction. This will be followed with questioning by the examiner and supervisory team and include technical question by the supervisory team. The interview is not intended to be a rubber stamp but an in depth presentation, Q&A, and discussion which both assesses the student's progress and gauges the student's ability to complete, while also providing the student with a learning experience of answering detailed questions in examination conditions.
7. The student will leave and the examiner and supervisor, informed by the supervisor and independent assessor reports, will reach a conclusion. If any remedial action was given at the Research Progress Review, the supervisor will inform the panel whether it was satisfactorily completed (and the work stored in eProg may be accessed). The goal of this examination is to ascertain whether the student has made sufficient progress and is on track to succeed at producing a PhD in time.
8. If they are satisfactory, the student progresses to the 2nd year. If not, the student may be offered the opportunity to complete an MPhil, otherwise if progress is not sufficient for an MPhil then the student is not able to progress. There is no 'conditional progression' subject to remedial action at this stage.

2.1.3 2nd year 'Progression':

- **[Month 23] All students submit a short report only.** via eProg, and repurposing that created in year 1.
 1. Examined via a 20 minute interview by the supervisory team. A decision is generated and recorded in eProg. All other details are unchanged ¹.
 2. Progress is as expected, student is on good path towards PhD: no further action required. If not, the student may be offered the opportunity to complete an MPhil, otherwise if progress is not sufficient for an MPhil then the student is not able to progress. There is no 'conditional progression' subject to remedial action at this stage.

2.1.4 3rd year 'Progression':

- **[Month 35] All students submit a detailed plan for completion** and discuss this with the supervisory team (recorded via eProg).
 1. The document will be uploaded to eProg but will also be emailed – by the student – to the supervisory team and the Director of PGR.
 2. At the request of the Supervisor or the Director of PGR the student will also have a 1 to 1 interview with the Director of PGR (or their nominated representative), also recorded via eProg.
- **[Month 42] All students** who have not yet completed a 'Notice to Submit'
 1. Have a 1 to 1 interview with the Director of PGR also recorded via eProg.

2.1.5 Submission:

- **[Month 48] The student will submit.** The only exception is for an interrupt period.

2.2 For CDT

2.2.1 1st year 'Progression':

1st year Review and Progression Rules are unchanged see Section 4.1.2 ².

² http://studentnet.cs.manchester.ac.uk/pgr/2016/handbook/CDT_Handbook2016.pdf

2.2.2 2nd year 'Research Progress Review':

- **[Month 20] Research Progress Report**

1. (prompted by eProg), the supervisor informally recruits the Independent Assessor, who should be a domain expert or in a closely related domain to the student.
2. The Student submits Research Progress Report (via eProg) comprising a research proposal, a brief summary of the research so far, and a research plan, and also emails to both the Independent Assessor and the Supervisory Team.
3. This report should be 1500 words excluding references – 500 words to include the social / technical / research impact explicitly (along with the student's ORCID). The supervisory team and the assessor will check the format and length and can return this to the student unread if it does not meet specification.

- **[Month 21] Research Progress Review**

1. This is organised by the supervisor and could take place in the supervisor's office or a small meeting room. The review times and locations are set between the interested parties (the independent assessor will inform SSO of the time/date/location). The review gauges the fitness of a student for continued PhD study and assesses progress to date ².
2. This event will last about one hour with 15-20 min presentation given by the student, followed by questions and discussions led by the independent assessor. The outcome is documented via eProg and can be 2-fold:
3. Progress is as expected, student is on good path towards PhD: no further action required.
4. Progress is unsatisfactory/questionable: the student will have to submit additional work (via eProg), which is assessed by the independent assessor. This work is by default the Long Report ³, however, the independent assessor can assign remedial action (any reasonable additional work if it is explicitly documented), such as writing a paper, performing a critical review, etc. The remedial action being stored in the student's eProg document store, and emailed to the supervisory team and internal assessor 1 month before the progression interview. This is reevaluated by the independent assessor for Progression. This assessment report being available one week preceding the progression interview and sent to SSO (who will pursue reports not returned) for onward distribution to the Progression Examiner.

2.2.3 2nd year 'Progression':

- **[Month 23] End-of-year interview** Research Progress Report - uploaded via eProg, with 15 min presentation, followed by 30 min Q&A – with 1 examiner, student, supervisor(s). Organised by the supervisor/examiner, reported in eProg.

1. If additional work has been requested by the Independent Assessor, then two examiners are required;
2. If no additional work has been requested by the Independent Assessor, then one examiner is required;
3. If the the examiner is new to the duty, then two examiners are required;
4. Examiners are randomly allocated to a student (and their supervisory team), by Student Support. In this case, it should be assumed that the examiner is not an expert in the particular research field, and the technical level should be pitched accordingly.
5. The Supervisor and Examiner arrange a time/date/location between themselves and at a minimum the examiner and supervisor are present (optimally the supervisory team is present) to conduct the examination (the Examiner will inform SSO of the time/date/location). SSO will issue prompts if arrangements have not been made, and the student will not progress or be able to register without this interview.

6. The student will give a 15 minute oral presentation describing the goals of the research, why the research is important, a summary of work complete, work underway, and future direction. This will be followed with questioning by the examiner and supervisory team and include technical question by the supervisory team. The interview is not intended to be a rubber stamp but an in depth presentation, Q&A, and discussion which both assesses the student's progress and gauges the student's ability to complete, while also providing the student with a learning experience of answering detailed questions in examination conditions.
7. The student will leave and the examiner and supervisor, informed by the supervisor and independent assessor reports, will reach a conclusion. If any remedial action was given at the Research Progress Review, the supervisor will inform the panel whether it was satisfactorily completed (and the work stored in eProg may be accessed). The goal of this examination is to ascertain whether the student has made sufficient progress and is on track to succeed at producing a PhD in time.
8. If they are satisfactory, the student progresses to the 2nd year. If not, the student may be offered the opportunity to complete an MPhil, otherwise if progress is not sufficient for an MPhil then the student is not able to progress. There is no 'conditional progression' subject to remedial action at this stage.

2.2.4 3rd year 'Progression':

- **[Month 35] All students submit a detailed plan for completion** and discuss this with the supervisory team (recorded via eProg).
 1. The document will be uploaded to eProg but will also be emailed – by the student – to the supervisory team and the Director of PGR.
 2. At the request of the Supervisor or the Director of PGR the student will also have a 1 to 1 interview with the Director of PGR (or their nominated representative), also recorded via eProg.
- **[Month 42] All students** who have not yet completed a 'Notice to Submit'
 1. Have a 1 to 1 interview with the Director of PGR also recorded via eProg.

2.2.5 Submission:

- **[Month 48] The student will submit.** The only exception is for an interrupt period.