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# Introduction

Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committees are responsible for monitoring student progress, approving the recommendations of review and examination panels and mediating in the cases where review and progression panels are unable to reach a consensus. This section of the Code of Practice sets out detailed requirements in relation to these responsibilities. The Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience will normally act on behalf of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee, except where the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience is a member of the student's supervisory team, where another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the Committee. All decisions made under delegated authority will be reported to the Committee.

# Student Progress Reports

2.1 Records of formal supervision meetings should be maintained (see [Annex H](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-research-courses#annexh) for details).

2.2 The Division is responsible for ensuring that there is a record of the research student’s candidature including the supervisory record, progress review report sand any other information related to the candidature of the research student including formal communications to and from the research student.

# Student Progress Reviews

There will be the following progression monitoring stages for research students:

## 3.1 Initial Meeting

Main Supervisors should hold an initial meeting with their research students within the first two weeks of registration to set out what they will require to have been completed by the end of the induction period. Where there is a tradition of team or laboratory research, this supervision meeting may not take place on a one-to-one basis.

## 3.2 Induction Review

* **Progression Stage:** Induction Review - PhD Students (full-time and part-time students): This should be completed within six weeks of registration.
* **Progression Stage:** Induction Review - Master’s by Research (full-time and part-time students): This should be completed within six weeks of registration.

3.2.1 **Description of review**

The induction review should involve the student and Main Supervisor. The induction review should focus on the following:

1. Consideration of the student’s research topic as set out in their initial application.
2. Drafting of a work plan and targets to meet ahead of the next review (probation).
3. Identification of key publications and/or sources relevant to the research topic.
4. Identification of skills training opportunities (supervisors should ensure that their researchers are aware of: (i) any obligatory training which must be undertaken within the academic School and (ii) the Graduate and Researcher College’s Researcher Development Programme and the requirement for all new PhD students[[1]](#footnote-1) to complete a Researcher Development Assessment, which they are introduced to at a Researcher Development Assessment Workshop. This must be completed by the end of the probation period.
5. Discussion of any initial concerns.
6. Discussion of any work the student is undertaking in addition to their research which may impact on progress.
7. Identification and discussion of potential resources and facilities available to the student both internally (within the School/Division and through central services) and externally during their research.
8. Consideration of any additional support which the research student may require (e.g. English language support). Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the student has mental health problems, the appropriate advice and support should be sought from Student Support and Wellbeing.
9. Discussion and identification of the ways in which the supervisory team-student relationship will work (e.g. preferred means of contact (email, phone etc), feedback mechanisms and turnaround times).
10. The Main Supervisor should complete the induction review form on KentVision within a week of the meeting. The form should then be reviewed and approved by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience or their nominee (except where they are a member of the student's supervisory team, where another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the Committee).

Divisions will report on the completion of the induction review process as part of the annual monitoring process (see [Annex E](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-research-courses#annexe)).

## 3.3 Probation Review

* **Progression Stage:** Probation Review - PhD Students

Full-time students: This should be completed within ten months of registration

Part-time students: This should be completed within twelve months of registration

* **Progression Stage:** Probation Review - Master’s by Research Students

Full-time students: This should be completed within four months of registration

Part-time students: This should be completed within nine months of registration

3.3.1 The probation review will involve a meeting between the student, Main Supervisor and Supervisory Chair (in cases where the Main Supervisor is not the Supervisory Chair) and the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies or their nominee (who will act as Chair). Where the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee.

The principal function of the probation review is to ensure that the student has embarked on the main body of their research and to address any issues of concern to student or supervisors. The probation review should focus on the following:

1. Consideration of a portfolio of work (prepared by the student) which includes:
	1. summary of work carried out to date
	2. planned schedule of future work
	3. a sample of written work[[2]](#footnote-2)
	4. completed review forms
	5. record of supervisory meetings
	6. completed Researcher Development Assessment (for PhD students only)
2. Formal review of targets and work plan set at the induction review.
3. Identification of future targets and work plan. This should include a description of research milestones required for the completion of a project in the particular discipline concerned. The supervisor should ensure that the researcher is aware of what the next scheduled review will entail and what needs to be prepared by the student in anticipation of this.
4. Skills training:
	1. Record of skills training undertaken since the induction review (including a check to ensure that PhD students[[3]](#footnote-3) have attended a Researcher Development Assessment Workshop and completed a Researcher Development Assessment);
	2. Review of the researcher’s completed Researcher Development Assessment and identification of future skills training opportunities.

Note: Completion of a Researcher Development Assessment is compulsory for all PhD students prior to the probation review. Researchers are introduced to the Researcher Development Assessment through attendance at a Researcher Development Assessment (part of the Graduate School’s Researcher Development Programme).

1. Identification of key publications and/or sources relevant to the research topic.
2. Ethical consideration of the project.
3. Consideration of any work being undertaken in addition to the research degree to ensure that this is not adversely affecting progression of the research.
4. Review and discussion of the efficacy of the current working relationship between the supervisory team and the student (e.g. means of contact (email, phone etc), meeting format/frequency, feedback mechanisms and turnaround times);
5. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the student has mental health problems, the appropriate advice and support should be sought from Student Support and Wellbeing;
6. Review of publishing opportunities (if considered appropriate).

3.3.2 The probation review may end with the panel recommending one of the following:

1. That the researcher is making good progress for the award for which they are registered and should proceed with their registration.
2. That there are concerns about the researcher’s progress but they may proceed with their registration subject to review during the next academic year (the panel should set a date for a mid-year review. The date of the mid-year review should be set at the panel’s discretion but this should normally take place within six months of the next end of year review).

3.3.3 If the panel determines that the student has not made adequate progress and/or has not produced work of a sufficient quality to enable them to complete their current research degree, it may make one of the following recommendations:

* 1. That the researcher transfer their registration to the award of MPhil and submit a thesis for the degree of MPhil (this is applicable for PhD students).
	2. That the researcher transfer their registration to the award of MA/MSc/LLM and submit a thesis for the degree of MA/MSc/LLM (this is applicable for PhD and MPhil students).
	3. That the researcher should withdraw from the University.

The researcher will have the opportunity to appeal against decisions iv-vi under the Standing Orders Governing Research Appeals.

* + 1. The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or, exceptionally, within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience or their nominee.
		2. Divisions will report on the completion of the probation review process as part of the annual monitoring process (see [Annex E](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-research-courses#annexe)).

## 3.4 Mid-year Review

* **Progression Stage:** Mid-year Review:The mid-year review will be conducted in cases where there were concerns about a research student’s progress at the end of year review and the panel selected recommendation iii (“that there are concerns about the researcher’s progress but they may proceed with their registration subject to review”). The mid-year review will be scheduled to take place on a date agreed by the panel at the previous end of year review.

3.4.1 The mid-year review will involve a meeting between the student, Main Supervisor, Supervisory Chair (where they are not the Main Supervisor) and Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience (DGSSE) or their nominee (who will act as Chair). Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee. The panel will need to make one of recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5 or 6 below from the end-of-year-review recommendation options.

The mid-year review will focus on the following:

1. Formal review of targets and work plan set at the end of year review;
2. Skills training undertaken since the end of year review;
3. Identification of any further areas of concern;
4. Identification of targets and work plan for review at the end of the current year. Review and discussion of the efficacy of the current working relationship between supervisory team and student (e.g. means of contact (email, phone etc), meeting format/frequency, feedback mechanisms and turnaround times);
5. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the student has mental health problems, the appropriate advice and support should be sought from Student Support and Wellbeing.

3.4.2 At the mid-year review the panel may recommend one of the following:

1. That the researcher is making exemplary progress for the award for which they are registered and should proceed with registration.
2. That the researcher is making satisfactory progress for the award for which they are registered and should proceed with registration.
3. That there are concerns about the researcher’s progress but they may proceed with registration subject to review during the same academic year (the panel should set a date for a further mid-year review).

3.4.3 If the panel determines that the student has not made adequate progress and/or has not produced work of a sufficient quality to enable them to complete their current research degree, it may make one of the following recommendations:

1. that the researcher transfer their registration to the award of MPhil and submit a thesis for the degree of MPhil (this is applicable for PhD students);
2. that the researcher transfer their registration to the award of MA/MSc/LLM and submit a thesis for the degree of MA/MSc/LLM (this is applicable for PhD and MPhil students);
3. that the researcher should withdraw from the University.

3.4.4 The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or exceptionally within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience (DGSSE), or their nominee. Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee.

3.4.5 The researcher will have the opportunity to appeal against decisions iv-vi under the Standing Orders Governing Research Appeals.

5.4.6 Divisions will report on the completion of the mid-year review process as part of the annual monitoring process (see Annex E).

## 3.5 End of Year Review

* **Progression Stage:** End of Year Review:The Probation Review fulfils the purpose of an end of year review (or main first-year review for FT Master’s by Research Students) during the first year of research.

Thereafter research students are subject to end of year reviews (see schedule of reviews in the appendix).[[4]](#footnote-4)

3.5.1 The end of year review will involve a meeting between the student, Main Supervisor, Supervisory Chair (where they are not the Main Supervisor), and the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience (DGSSE) or their nominee (who will act as Chair). Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee. Divisions/Schools may require other members of the supervisory team (e.g. second supervisor) to be present at the end of year review. The end of year review should be used to ensure that that the quality of research undertaken to date is of sufficient quality for the research degree for which the student is registered and that the plan for completion of the research project is on target.

The end of year review will focus on the following:

1. Consideration of a portfolio of work (prepared by the student) which includes:
	1. summary of work carried out to date
	2. planned schedule of future work (including a timetable)
	3. a sample of written work[[5]](#footnote-5)
	4. completed review forms
	5. record of supervisory meetings
	6. completed skills audit (for PhD students only)
2. Any other subject-specific requirements set by the individual School (this should be outlined in the relevant research course specification).
3. Formal review of targets and work plan set at the previous review.
4. Setting a future work plan and targets.
5. Review of work being undertaken in addition to the research degree to ensure that this is not adversely affecting the progression of the research.
6. Review of publishing opportunities (if considered appropriate).
7. Review and discussion of the efficacy of the current working relationship between supervisory team and student (e.g. means of contact (email, phone etc), meeting format/frequency, feedback mechanisms and turnaround times).
8. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the student has mental health problems, the appropriate advice and support should be sought from Student Support and Wellbeing.
9. Completion of the end of year review form(accessed via KentVision).

3.5.2 At the end of year review the panel may recommend one of the following:

1. That the researcher is making exemplary progress for the award for which they are registered and should proceed with registration.
2. That the researcher is making satisfactory progress for the award for which they are registered and should proceed with registration.
3. That there are concerns about the researcher’s progress, but they may proceed with registration subject to review during the next academic year (the panel should set a date for a mid-year review. The date of the mid-year review should be set at the panel’s discretion, but this should normally take place within six months of the end of year review).

3.5.3 If the panel determines that the student has not made adequate progress and/or has not produced work of a sufficient quality to enable them to complete their current research degree, it may make one of the following recommendations:

1. that the researcher transfer their registration to the award of MPhil and submit a thesis for the degree of MPhil (this is applicable for PhD students);
2. that the researcher transfer their registration to the award of MA/MSc/LLM and submit a thesis for the degree of MA/MSc/LLM (this is applicable for PhD and MPhil students);
3. that the researcher should withdraw from the University.

3.5.4 The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or exceptionally within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the Panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience (DGSSE), or their nominee. Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee.

3.5.5 The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or exceptionally within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the DGSSE or their nominee. Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee.

3.5.6 The researcher will have the opportunity to appeal against decisions iv-vi under the Standing Orders Governing Research Appeals*.*

3.5.7 Divisions will report on the completion of the end of year review process as part of the annual monitoring process (see [Annex E](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-research-courses#annexe)).

Note 1: A review panel should only make recommendation vi (withdrawal from the University, see sections 3.3; 3.5; 3.6) in cases where a research student has been warned about their progress on two previous occasions (see section 4 of Annex K for details). If withdrawal is recommended, the two formal warning letters and any other relevant information should be sent to the Quality Assurance and Compliance Office.

Note 2: The outcome and recommendation of a review panel should be communicated to the student formally in writing. In cases where concerns have been noted at the end of year review, this communication should include a record of actions which the student is required to take in order to improve their performance.

## 3.6 Submission Review

* **Progression Stage:** Submission Review - PhD Students[[6]](#footnote-6) (full-time and part-time students): Normally three months prior to the end of the minimum period of PhD registration.
* **Progression Stage:** Submission Review - Master’s by Research Students

Full-time students: This should be completed within ten months of registration.

Part-time students: This should be completed within 18 months of registration.

3.6.1 It is the expectation of the University that the student will undertake a programme of supervised research and training during the minimum period of registration (e.g. first three years for full-time PhD students and for the first five years for part-time PhD students). The principal function of the Submission Review is to ensure that the student is in a position to complete and submit their research in the allotted time.

3.6.2 The review will be undertaken by the Main Supervisor, another member of the supervisory team and the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience or their nominee (who will act as chair). Where the Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee. The panel may make one of the following recommendations:

1. That the candidate has made good progress and will be in a position to submit at the end of the minimum period of registration (e.g. three years for full-time PhD students and five years for part-time PhD students).
2. That the researcher has made sufficient progress to proceed to a continuation category of registration. This recommendation should only be made when a researcher: (a) is only making use of the University’s general facilities, (b) will no longer be using laboratories or other specialist facilities and (c) will only be receiving advice related to the finalisation of their research and thesis. The candidate will qualify for a lower rate of fee (25% of the part-time research home/EU rate). Continuation category fees should be charged as monthly payments on a sliding scale.

3.6.3 If the panel determines that the student has not made adequate progress and/or has not produced work of a sufficient quality to enable them to complete their research degree, it may make one of the following recommendations to the Division:

1. That the candidate has made insufficient progress to proceed to the continuation category of registration and should have their period of supervised research and training extended for a set period (during which time the student should be charged full fees. This period should be between one and 12 months only). In cases where the period of supervised research and training is extended, the School should schedule a second submission review to review progress. If it is determined that the candidate can proceed to the continuation category of registration at the second submission review, they may be transferred to this status for the remainder their fourth year (for FT PhD students) or sixth year (for PT PhD students). In cases where the period of supervised research and training is extended for a period of 12 months, it is recommended that there should be both a mid-year review and second submission review scheduled.
2. iv. That the candidate transfer registration to the award of MPhil and submit a thesis for the degree of MPhil.
3. That the candidate transfer registration to the award of MA/MSc/LLM and submit a thesis for the degree of MA/MSc/LLM.
4. That the candidate should withdraw from the University
5. The researcher will have the opportunity to appeal against decisions iv-vi above under the Standing Orders Governing Research Appeals.
6. The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or exceptionally within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience (DGSSE). Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee.
7. The Submission Review Panel will use this review as an opportunity to explain the different options available for final deposit of the thesis into KAR (i.e. (a) open access; (b) temporary embargo for one year or three years or (c) permanent restriction to electronic public access) following successful completion of the research degree, and the student will be referred to appropriate guidance.
8. Once the recommendations have been approved by the DGSSE the Divisional PG Office should be informed. The Divisional PG Office will be responsible for: (a) checking that the status of full-time PhD students (entering the 4th year of registration) and part-time PhD students (entering their 6th year) are correct and (b) changing the category of the researchers on the student records system when they are approved to transfer to the continuation category of registration (recommendation ii).
9. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the student has mental health problems, the appropriate advice and support should be sought from Student Support and Wellbeing.
10. **Oversight**: Divisions will report on the completion of submission reviews[[7]](#footnote-7) as part of the annual monitoring process (see [Annex E](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-research-courses#annexe)).

## 3.7 Completion Phase Reviews for PhD Students

3.7.1 It is the expectation of the University that the supervisor should be in contact with their PhD researchers on a monthly basis during the continuation year, however, there will be two more formal opportunities to review progress during the continuation year.

* **Progression Stage:** Continuation Year Review 1 for PhD Students (if required) (full-time and part-time students): Five months into the Completion Phase.

3.7.2 If the researcher has not submitted their thesis by the fifth month of the continuation year there should be a formal review with the supervisor and GGSSE or their nominee to consider the researcher’s progress towards submission. The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or exceptionally within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies (except where the DGSSE is a member of the student's supervisory team, where another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the Committee).

* **Progression Stage:** Completion Phase Review 2 for PhD Students (if required) (full-time and part-time students): 10 months into the Completion Phase.

3.7.3 If the researcher has not submitted their thesis by the tenth month of the continuation year there should be a formal review with the supervisor and DGSSE or their nominee to consider the researcher’s progress towards submission. The review should be used to determine if the researcher will be in a position to submit their thesis by the end of the continuation year. In extraordinary circumstances the panel may recommend to the Division that the researcher proceed to a final writing-up period for a set period. This period should not extend beyond 12 months. The outcome of the review should be agreed by the panel and the recommendation communicated to the student on the day of the review itself or exceptionally within a couple of days of the review if there is a need for further discussion by the panel. The review form should be completed by a representative of the panel on KentVision within a week of the meeting itself and be approved by the DGSSE or their nominee (except where the DGSSE is a member of the student's supervisory team, where another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the Committee). The Division will report statistics which relate to these students to the Graduate and Researcher College Board as part of the annual monitoring process.

## 3.8 Upgrading Review

In cases where students originally registered for one type of research degree may be eligible for upgrading to a higher level research degree, Schools may use an end of year review or a specially convened review to determine this.The principal function of this review is to make judgements on the capabilities of the student and the viability of the project for an award at a higher level. The review should involve the student, Main Supervisor (as an observer), an academic staff member independent from the supervisory team and the DGSSE (who will normally act as Chair). Where the DGSSE is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the Divisional Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee. The principal function of this review is to make judgements on the capabilities of the student and the viability of the project for an award at a higher level. If appropriate, the panel for this meeting may also include an external member. This review must be completed at least six months prior to the end of the student's current period of registration.

The decision to upgrade should be based on a portfolio which includes a summary of the work carried out, a planned schedule of work, a substantial piece of written work, progress report forms and a statement from the supervisor indicating whether or not they support the upgrade. The student should be interviewed by the panel and this should take the form of a *viva voce* examination. The recommendation of the panel may be one of the following:

1. the student may transfer to the PhD or MPhil;
2. the student may not transfer but may proceed with their registration, with one further option to upgrade being allowed within a specified period of time;
3. the student be not permitted to transfer but may continue their registration and submit a thesis for the degree for which they are registered;
4. the student should withdraw from the course.

#  Concerns about Progress

4.1 This Annex identifies set points at which the progress of research students will be reviewed by their Division. Research students should also be meeting regularly with their supervisors as per the requirements of [Annex H](https://www.kent.ac.uk/education/regulatory-framework/codes-of-practice-for-research-courses#annexh).

4.2 From time to time, a Division may identify a case where a research student is failing to perform satisfactorily. If a formal review is imminent, concerns about poor progress should be raised formally at this time. If a review is not imminent and less formal attempts to resolve issues relating to unsatisfactory progress have not been successful (e.g. meetings with supervisors), the Division is advised to send a warning letter to the research student (i) outlining the issues, (ii) inviting them to a meeting to discuss them and (iii) advising them of the possible outcomes should their progress fail to improve. The letter should be sent from the DGSSE with responsibility for research courses of study.

4.3 The Regulations for Research Courses of Study provide for the termination of a research student’s registration in the event of unsatisfactory progress. However, in cases where termination of registration is recommended to the University by a Division either at a formal review stage or during the course of the academic year, it is essential for the Division to be able to show that it has a clear record of all communications with the student. The University will normally wish to see that the student has received **two** formal warnings about their progress prior to making a recommendation for termination of registration. The Graduate and Researcher College Board will wish to see evidence that the research student has had the issues explained to them on two occasions and been advised of the consequences should the School fail to see an improvement in their progress or attendance in the future. The two formal warnings could include a letter about unsatisfactory progress sent to the research student during the course of the year or a letter sent to the student following a formal end of year review in which the review panel has identified concerns about the research student’s progress. Example templates for first and second warning letters can be found in Appendix 1 to this Annex.

4.4 If a student fails to improve following two warnings from the Division, the Division may recommend to the University that their registration be terminated (this recommendation may be made as part of an end of year review or during the course of an academic year). The case will be considered by the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience or their nominee who will provide the student with an opportunity to appeal the recommendation. An example template for the letter which would be sent out is provided in the Appendix. If withdrawal is recommended, the two formal warning letters and any other relevant information should be sent.

# Examination

5.1 It is the responsibility of the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience to ensure that all students are examined in accordance with the appropriate University Regulations.

5.2 The University will publish detailed criteria for the assessment of each of its research awards.

**Progression Review Stages**

**FT PhD Student**

Review Stage: 1. Induction Review (6 weeks)

2. Probation Review (10 months)

3. End of Year 2 Review (24 months)

4. Submission Review (33 months)

5. Continuation Year Review 1 (41 months)

6. Continuation Year Review 2 (46 months)

**PT PhD Student**

Review Stage: 1. Induction Review (6 weeks)

2. Probation Review (12 months)

3. End of Year 2 Review (24 months)

4. End of Year 3 review (36 months)

5. End of Year 4 review (48 months)

6. Submission Review (57 months)

7. Continuation Year Review 1 (65 months)

8. Continuation Year Review 2 (70 months)

**FT Master’s by Research Student**

Review Stage: 1. Induction Review (6 weeks)

2. Probation Review (4 months)

3. Submission Review (10 months)

**PT Master’s by Research Student**

Review Stage: 1. Induction Review (6 weeks)

2. Probation Review (9 months)

3. Submission Review (18 months)

Note: In cases where a research student intermits from their period of research for a set period, the timings above would need to be adjusted accordingly.

1. Please note that this is not a requirement for MA, MSc or MPhil students. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The School/Division will need to specify what is required for the subject area in question. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Please note that this is not a requirement for MA, MSc or MPhil students. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In the case of a f-t MA or MSc by research student whose registration period is only one year in length, they will have an induction, probation and then finally a submission review at nine months (e.g. three months prior to the end of the period of registration). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The School will need to specify what is required for the subject area in question. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. **Submission Reviews for MA/MSc by Research Students:** this review should normally take place approximately two months (full-time) or three months (part-time) prior to the end of the student's period of registration. The principal function of this review is to ensure that the student is in a position to complete and submit their research in the allotted time. The panel must decide if the student should be advised to submit. Should the student's progress prove to be unsatisfactory, the panel must recommend to the Divisional Director of Graduate Studies and PG Student Experience that the student should be granted an extension to their registration period. Should the student's progress prove to be unsatisfactory, this review may be repeated. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See [Guidance for supervisors and Directors of Graduate Studies on the digital deposition of theses](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)