

Annual Reviews

process booklet for Students.

What is the Annual Review?

This is a formal progress meeting and it should review and record a student's progress to date.

Students will be assessed for satisfactory progress which demonstrates a good understanding of the research context. The student should also be able to demonstrate they have developed, in consultation with the supervisory team, a suitable research plan and approach for carrying out the research, and that they have attained the skills and experience necessary to achieve the research plan. Meetings must be arranged in sufficient time before the end of the academic year to allow consideration of suitability for continuation and registration for the following year. Completion of the formal review process each year is a condition of registration for the following year. Students will not be permitted to register for subsequent years unless they have completed the annual review process for that year.

1. The Panel formation for the Annual Review

An annual review meeting must take place in all years of registration and in attendance must be the student and either the supervisory team and at least 1 independent reviewer or the student and at least 2 independent reviewers. If the supervisor does not attend the meeting with the student and the 2 or more independent reviewers, they must be fully consulted in relation to the student's progress and the standard of the progress report before the meeting and involved in discussions after the review regarding the final recommendation. The format must be robust for every annual review and should, where possible, be consistent across every year of study. The panel make a recommendation; the final outcome is ratified by the school or discipline level PGR Director.

2. Review meeting attendance and presentations

Students must be in attendance for their annual review and the review should not be held via skype or email unless the student has a justified argument as to why they cannot be on campus for the annual review. Distance learning students are exempt from being on campus.

3. Work to be submitted

A written piece of work must be submitted for consideration, as a minimum, for every annual review, at least two weeks before the review is due to take place.

As per the [Policy on the Progress and Review of Postgraduate Research students](#) (please note the policy is under review and maybe subject to change) the students must be assessed for satisfactory progress against criteria which should typically include a clearly identified and accepted research topic and a thorough review of relevant literature which demonstrates a good understanding of the research context. The student should also be able to demonstrate they have developed, in consultation with the supervisory team, a suitable research plan and approach for carrying out the research, and that they have attained the skills and experience necessary to achieve the research plan. Good practice would be for the student to submit a recognised piece of work, as to be agreed, that contextualises how this fits into the thesis - for example a chapter.

A timeline for completion should also be completed. The purpose of the timeline is two-fold. One to act as a guide to students in terms of planning for completion and so that they can readily see how far they have already progressed in terms of work completed [but also visualise what remains to be done]. Second it provides a clear illustration to those assessing the student's progress what has actually been achieved, when the majority of the review might be focussed mainly on a current

project/piece of research. Though students complete a similar question in the current annual review form, a table / more illustrative approach is useful in highlighting actual progress.

A minimum and maximum word count or length should be stipulated and a clear deadline provided. The students should submit their work to their supervisor before the review and be given feedback and support to revise the work accordingly before it is submitted for consideration. Supervisors should ensure that the standard of work expected is explained and discussed.

Work should be submitted to eprog at step 1 on the eProg page, please note the format of the file should follow – ‘MoniqueJones.docx’ or ‘LucyJones.pdf’ please do not include multiple ‘full stops’ as the document will not upload. Please contact the PGR Office should you have any difficulties.

Pgr-seed@manchester.ac.uk

4. Responsibilities

Student: to attend the annual review meeting; to submit the work required on time; to engage with the process; to complete their sections of the annual review form before the annual review meeting in a timely manner allowing the panel enough time to consider all inputs on the form. Students should also ensure they are available following the annual review meeting to discuss the outcome with either supervisors or school level PGR Director and/or discipline level PGR Directors.

Main Supervisor: must complete the annual review form in conjunction with the co supervisor. Either attend the annual review meeting with the student and independent reviewer or meet with the student after the meeting to discuss the final report. Supervisors should be providing feedback on the work submitted before the review and give feedback and support to the student to revise the work accordingly before it is submitted for consideration. Supervisors should ensure that the standard of work expected is explained and discussed with the student. The supervisors should also ensure that they meet with the student following the annual review meeting to discuss the outcome.

Co Supervisor: complete the annual review form in conjunction with the main supervisor; either attend the annual review meeting with the student and independent reviewer or meet with the student after the meeting to discuss the final report; if required provide feedback on the work submitted before the review and give feedback and support to the student to revise the work accordingly before it is submitted for consideration. The supervisors should also ensure that they meet with the student following the annual review meeting to discuss the outcome.

Independent Reviewer/s: to read the work submitted; to write the report following the annual review meeting giving constructive comments on the work submitted and the performance in the annual review meeting; to provide the report to the supervisors.

5. Timings of reviews

All unnecessary layers in the process should be removed. For example if a student has a meeting with supervisors and an independent reviewer or just the independent reviewers earlier in the year they should not then be expected to have another meeting in the summer because the first meeting was too early to recommend re registration. The annual review for both full time and part time students should not take place any earlier or later than month 9 (July) of the year of study. If a resubmission is required and a further review, resubmissions should normally be submitted within 6 weeks of the first submission. Further reviews should be completed within 8 weeks of the first submission.

It should be decided at the final year annual review if the student is permitted to apply for submission pending registration. The Submission Pending Application Form must be then completed by the student and supervisors and considered by the PGR Director.

Normally, if a student provides notice to submit before the year 3 annual review is due the review should still take place unless the student submits the thesis before the review.

6. Unsatisfactory progress

Where a student's progress is unsatisfactory they may be required to have their progress assessed more than twice a year. This must be clearly communicated to students at the start of their degree and thereafter. Exit awards are not applicable for PGR students except in the 2+2 Economics programme where students are awarded an Master of Research (MRes) after year 2 if they meet the requirements.

Whilst it is always good practice to record all supervisory meetings, where progress is unsatisfactory or there has been an issue identified before the annual review it is especially important that discussions in supervisory meetings are recorded.

7. Outcomes and resubmissions

Resubmission - Where resubmission work is recommended and a 'second attempt' annual year review is required, a specified time will be given to the student for submitting the work. This should be uploaded in **eProg to section 3**. 'Document upload box for resubmitted work if recommended by the panel.

For registration purposes a PGR student will be permitted an extra 4 weeks to complete the registration process and will not be charged a late registration fee during this 4 week period.

Students initially registered on a doctoral degree:

CONTINUATION - The student has met the required doctoral standards and the recommendation is made for the student to continue registration on the doctoral degree

TRANSFER - The student has not met the required doctoral standards and a recommendation is made for the student to be transferred from the doctoral degree to MPhil.

WITHDRAWAL – The student has not met the required standard for doctoral degrees or MPhil and the recommendation is made for the student's registration to be terminated

RESUBMISSIONS

Where resubmission work is recommended and a 'second attempt' annual year review is required, a specified time will be given to the student for submitting the work, resubmissions should normally be submitted within 6 weeks of the first submission. This should be uploaded in **eProg to section 3**. 'Document upload box' for resubmitted work if recommended by the panel.

Further reviews should be completed within 8 weeks of the first submission. The outcome of the resubmission should be discussed by the panel and will be provided to the student.

The outcome of a resubmission is the same as above – **Continuation, Transfer or Withdrawal**.

If for any reason the resubmission review takes place in September, for registration purposes a PGR student will be permitted an extra 4 weeks to complete the registration process and will not be charged a late registration fee during this 4 week period.

8. Terminology

We will adopt the following terminology:

Annual review and annual review meeting

Independent reviewer (IR) – the panel member/s independent of the supervisory team

Panel – comprises of the independent reviewer /s and supervisory team

Discipline Level PGR Director

School Level PGR Director