Progression Monitoring 2: Resubmission

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**  ***(if applicable)*** | Select date | |
| **Confirm authenticity statement has been provided by the student** | |  |
| **Confirm the ‘Table of Amendments’ has been provided by the student** | |  |

Assessor Checks

# **To be completed by the assessors**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Turnitin originality report**  [Research conduct regulations and procedure](https://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/current-students/pgr/pgr-res-conduct/) |
| **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. 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 (if applicable) and report feedback below.  **Yes**  **No**  If a viva took place, did the external assessor attend (either in person or via video conferencing)?  **Yes**  **No** |

Assessor Report

**The assessors should offer an assessment of how the candidate has addressed the amendments required following the initial examination. Where the candidate has not fulfilled the assessors’ requirements, please provide further details.**

|  |
| --- |
| **3. Assessment of progress report and viva examination (if applicable)** |
| **3.1 Has the candidate fully addressed all amendments required by the assessors as detailed in the table of amendments?**  *(This box will expand as you type)* |
| **3.2 Strengths of the work:**  *(This box will expand as you type)* |
| **3.3 Areas for improvement:**  *(This box will expand as you type)* |

Assessor Decision

|  |
| --- |
| **4. Assessors’ decision on the candidate’s progression:** |
| **Progress** (Please complete Sections 1 - 4)  A candidate may progress where the assessors are satisfied that any areas for improvement are minor and the candidate can make the improvements with the supervisor; **OR**  **Complete further work and submit for the award of MPhil** (Please complete Sections 1 - 5)  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 recommended any amendments. 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; **OR**  **May not proceed** (Please complete Sections 1 - 4 and Section 6)  In this case, the candidate has failed and will be withdrawn. |

# **If the assessors require the candidate to complete further work and submit for the award of MPhil they should complete the table below:**

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Rationale of decision to submit for the award of MPhil and further work to be completed.** 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 |
| **5.1** Please provide an overview of the examination, including a rationale for the recommended outcome.  *(This box will expand as you type)* |
| **5.2** 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 of further work that may be of help in these discussions.  *(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 in the table below:**

|  |
| --- |
| **6. 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 date |
| **Assessor 2 signature** |  | **Date** | Select date |
| **Director of Graduate Education signature** |  | **Date** | Select date |

**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 |