Progression Monitoring 1: Initial Submission

The assessors should complete this form and return it to the PGR administrators within the following timescales:

* If the outcome is to progress – 5 working days from the viva examination.
* For all other outcomes - 10 working days from the viva examination.

**To be completed by the PGR administrator**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student name** |  | |
| **Student number** |  | |
| **Intended award** |  | |
| **Main and co-supervisor names** |  | |
| **Name of assessor 1** |  | |
| **Name of assessor 2** |  | |
| **Name of assessor 3**  ***(External assessor - staff only)*** |  | |
| **Date of viva examination** | Select | |
| **Confirm authenticity statement has been provided by the student** | |  |

Assessor Checks

**To be completed by the assessors**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Turnitin originality report**  [Link](https://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/current-students/pgr/pgr-res-conduct/) to the research conduct regulations and misconduct procedure. |
| **Insert % match:** |
| **Please confirm that you have reviewed the authenticity statement that the candidate submitted with their report:**  Yes  No |
| The progression assessors are responsible for carrying out a Turnitin review prior to examination. If an investigation is required, it must happen before the viva.  **Please give a brief explanation below of either:**   * Why the individual matches are not problematic (this should make reference to specific source matches); **OR** * Concerns that may be classed as research misconduct and require investigation. |
| **Explanation:**  *(This box will expand as you type)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Security sensitive research** |
| Does this project require the candidate to access security sensitive materials in their research?  **Yes**  **No**  For example, research that:   * Concerns terrorist or extremist groups; * Has been commissioned by the military; * Has been commissioned under an EU security call; * Involves the acquisition of security clearances; * Involves anything else that the University considers as putting researchers at risk. |
| **If the answer is yes** to any of the above, please notify the Chair of School Research and Ethics Committee and note that requirement here. Security sensitive research documentation must be completed as part of the ethical review. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. Ethical approval** | |
| Does this project involve consultation or engagement with human participants in any capacity?  **Yes**  **No**  Does this research require ethical scrutiny according to the stated criteria of the School Research and Ethics Committee?  **Yes**  **No**  If ethical approval has already been provided, has the research project changed and ethical approval needs to be updated?  **Yes**  **No**  **Not applicable**  **If the answer is yes to either of the above**, please ensure the project has been submitted to the School Research and Ethics Committee for review. | |
| Please confirm whether a, b or c applies:   1. Ethical approval has been granted; **OR** 2. Ethical approval is not needed; **OR** 3. Ethical approval is in progress or will be sought at a later date in line with the researchtimeline. | |
| **4. Alternative format thesis submission** |
| Does the thesis include elements of practice or performance as research?  **Yes**  **No**  Does the work include material in addition to the written thesis (for example, submission of a  website; composition; software; a robot)?  **Yes**  **No**  Will the additional elements need to be demonstrated to the examining team by the candidate at final submission stage?  **Yes**  **No**   **Not applicable**  **If the answer is yes to any of the above questions, please notify the Director of Graduate Education.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Review of external assessor’s report (staff only)** |
| We have reviewed the external assessor’s report and have incorporated their comments into the viva examination and report feedback below.  **Yes**   **No**  Did the external attend the viva (either in person or via video conferencing)?  **Yes**  **No** |

Assessor Report

**Please comment as appropriate on the follow aspects of the written submission and viva:**

* Clarity of the research purpose, questions or objectives;
* Understanding and appropriateness of the research methodology;
* Adequacy of research project planning, skills and management, and their potential for producing a doctoral thesis, including timetable for completion of research;
* Demonstration of appropriate research skills;
* Degree of progress towards doctoral-level expertise in the field and its literature;
* Appropriate level of critical analysis of the relevant literature;
* Satisfactory progress of any fieldwork and/or practice-based element;
* Quality of written and oral work in academic English (please note: you can refer candidates to undertake formal training in this area, in addition PGRs whose first language is not English, can be referred to make an appointment with the [Academic English Centre](https://students.hud.ac.uk/grad/graduate-school/students/support-international-pgr/the-academic-english-centre/));
* Potential for original contribution to knowledge;
* Completion of training and development identified in the Skills Audit.

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Strengths of the work** |
| *(This box will expand as you type)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **7. Areas for improvement**  This should be completed for all students. Where a resubmission is required, please additionally complete the amendments table in Section 9. |
| *(This box will expand as you type)* |

Assessor Decision

|  |
| --- |
| **8. Assessors’ decision on the candidate’s progression** |
| **Progress** (Please complete Sections 1 - 8)  A candidate may progress where the assessors are satisfied that any areas for improvement are minor and the candidate can make the improvement with the supervisor; **OR**  **Rework the report and resubmit with amendments** (Please complete Sections 1 - 9)  The assessors need to indicate whether they will require a second viva.  Second viva required?  Yes  No  Where major changes are required, to assure the assessors that the project is on track, is viable, and that the candidate is able to meet doctoral requirements, the candidate must complete amendments and resubmit their report. Any amendments must be achievable within **6 weeks for full-time/12 weeks for part-time** students; **OR**  **Complete further work and submit for the award of MA by Research/ MSc by**  **Research** (please complete Sections 1 - 8 and Section 10)  In this case, the candidate will be allowed a **maximum of 6 months** to write-up the work for a lower award.  The assessors need to explain clearly and fully why the candidate may not progress. They should also recommend any amendments that are required for the lower award. If this option is selected, the work must already be at Master’s level and any amendments must be achievable **within the 6 month timeframe allowed**.  **May not proceed** (please complete Sections 1 - 8 and Section 11)  In this case, the candidate has failed and will be withdrawn. |

If the assessors require the candidate to make amendments and to resubmit the report, they should complete the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9. Table of amendments required following examination** Please ensure this is typed and not hand written  On resubmission of the report, the student must also submit a copy of this table and complete the ‘student response’ column. | |
| **Assessors’ comments** | **Student response** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

If the assessors require the candidate to complete further work and submit for the award of MA by Research/MSc by Research they should complete the table below:

|  |
| --- |
| **10. Decision to submit for the award of MA/MSc by Research.** Please ensure this is typed and not hand written  There must be sufficient evidence that the work to date shows potential to meet the necessary level of scholarship for the award |
| **10.1** Please provide an overview of the examination, including a rationale for the recommended outcome  *(This box will expand as you type)* |
| **10.2** The PGR will be required to meet with their supervisor to discuss, plan and prepare their work to submit for the lower award. Please provide any recommendations or suggestions that may provide a useful area of discussion.  *(This box will expand as you type)* |

If the assessors’ decision is that the student may not proceed, please provide a detailed explanation of the reasons for the decision in the table below:

|  |
| --- |
| **11. Decision to fail the candidate.** Please ensure this is typed and not hand written |
| Please provide an overview of the examination, including a rationale for the recommended outcome  *(This box will expand as you type)* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessor 1 signature |  | Date | Select |
| Assessor 2 signature |  | Date | Select |
| Director of Graduate  Education signature |  | Date | Select |

**A copy of the full report will be sent to the student and their main supervisor.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PGR Administration** | |
|  | If the student has received a lower award or a fail, check to establish if the student is UKRI funded, if this is confirmed - consult with Kirsty Taylor (Head of Research Intelligence) before processing the outcome to the student  Student informed of outcome with a copy of the assessor report, cc Main Supv  Update ASIS RDS ‘Stage’ and ‘Stage Comp’ fields  If the outcome is a lower award update ASIS RDS ‘Int Award’  If the outcome is fail update ASIS RDS ‘Stage’ to either ‘EF-PM1’ or ‘EF-PM2’  Upload to Wisdom a copy of the assessor report and the outcome sent to the PGR |