

- ii) an exposition and analysis, of approximately 10,000 words, of the work contained in the publications. The exposition document is regarded as central in enabling the student to demonstrate achievement in relation to the following criteria:
  - it shall identify the main problems or issues under discussion; and
  - it shall indicate the direction and thematic consistency of the publication(s); and
  - it shall provide an authoritative critique of the work; and
  - it shall locate the work in the context of the relevant literature; and
  - describe and assess the original contribution represented by the publications submitted;
  - in the case of conjoint publications, detail the extent and scope of the student's contribution in relation to the other authors. In the case of conjoint work, the contribution of a student will be rigorously scrutinised, particularly in the oral examination;
  - indicate a sustained contribution in a coherent field of research.
  -
- j) the criteria for assessing a student in this situation are the same as for a student submitting a conventional thesis under the Research Degree Regulations.

## **12. Monitoring of Research Student Progress and Feedback**

**12.1** Progress for research degree students (excluding MA/MSc by Research) is subject to annual review by a panel of at least three research active and relevant academics, including representation of the supervisory team and at least one member who is independent of the supervisory team. Feedback shall be part of this process. If a student requires an extension at the time that annual review is due then this shall form part of the discussion.

Full-time students who are registered on the Doctoral Researcher Programme will not be required to have an annual review in year one, and part-time students on either of these routes will not be required to have an annual review panel meeting in year two. In both these cases the Formal Review process will replace the annual review.

If a student receives a viva voce outcome of 18.2c) and is permitted to re-submit for the degree sought, the student is required to resume participation in the annual review process, which the first supervisor will arrange.

The annual review shall also include consideration of:

- a) the student's progress with the Researcher Development Programme, as informed by the initial Training Needs Analysis, see regulation 4.1;

- b) any necessary change in the Training Needs Analysis consequent on the progress of the project;
- c) where applicable, a review of the student's Personal Development Plan.

For further guidance on the Annual Review Panel please refer to the 'Guidance Notes for Annual Review Panels'.

All students registered for a research degree programme shall be expected to pass the usual annual review stage. Students should be aware that failure in performance at the annual review could result in termination of their registration or the requirement for a PhD student to submit for MPhil.

- 12.2** The 'Progress Report' form outlined in 6.4 and 6.5 provide an additional means by which progress can be monitored and should be used to determine whether actions agreed by supervisor(s) and the student are satisfactorily carried out.

If a student feels that the project is not proceeding satisfactorily for reasons outside his/her control, or that he/she does not have an effective working relationship with the supervisor(s), he/she could feel it is inappropriate or undesirable to wait for the annual monitoring process. In this case, the student is advised to contact the Graduate School for guidance. It would normally be expected that the student discuss the matter with the First Supervisor (if possible). Failing this, he/she should approach the relevant Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role. Should the matter still not be resolved, he/she should report his/her concerns to the Chair of Research Degrees Committee to make a final decision.

### **13. Formal Progression From Doctoral Researcher Programme to PhD**

- 13.1** All research degree students registered for on the Doctoral Researcher Programme and who enrolled after 1<sup>st</sup> September 2012 shall submit a **formal review** between 12 and 15 months of full-time registration or 18 months and 24 months of part-time registration. These deadlines are calculated from the original enrolment date.

It is imperative that the 15 month (or part-time equivalent) deadline is adhered to. Students who miss this deadline must submit the formal review in month 17 (full-time) or month 28 (part-time). Failure to do so will result in the registration reverting to Registration for Master of Philosophy.

There might occasionally be cases of mitigation which could justify extension of the deadline. These should be requested in good time by the student and supervisory team on the appropriate form on myResearch for consideration by the Faculty Head of Research Students or equivalent role (or nominee).

- 13.2** The formal review must, except in exceptional circumstances, take place at least one year before examination.