**This document contains guidance on the Submission and Criteria Requirements for Interim Progression Reviews**

Generic guidelines for Progression Reviews have been recommended by the PGR QME Subcommittee and endorsed by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. The Interim Progression Review is for Part-time students who have registered from 1 August 2016 onwards.

All members of the supervisory team will form the assessment panel for the Interim Progression review. There is no standard outcome, but as a minimum, students will be given written feedback, and guidance on any actions to be taken to support progress. An unsatisfactory review may lead to an exceptional progression review.

**Submission**

Part-time students who have not undergone a Progression Review in the last twelve months should have an Interim Progression review. The Progression Review time-window for the first attempt of the First Progression review is 18-21 months; Confirmation of Status is at 30-42 months; Third Progression review is 61-66 months. However, if a Progression Review is due in the next month, the Director of the Faculty Graduate School may waive the Interim Progression Review.

The student should submit a written report 4 weeks before the holding of the Interim Progression review viva event. This will form part of the assessment process along with a review of the student’s academic needs analysis.

**Criteria**

The Progression Review Panel drawing on the evidence presented in the written report, the viva and a review of the Academic Needs Analysis must satisfy themselves that (as appropriate to the stage of candidature) the student:

* Is undertaking a viable research project
* Has made satisfactory progress to date
* Has developed an adequately detailed plan of work to enable the research degree to be completed within the allowable registration period
* Has started working towards the next formal progression review’s criteria
* Has submitted an appropriate amount of written work to the supervisory team over the past 12 months
* Has begun discussing the ethical implications of their research with their supervisory team and can articulate how these are incorporated into their research plans
* Has undertaken appropriate training over the past 12 months
* Has given seminar/conference papers and/or performances appropriate to the stage of the candidature
* Has produced publications/recordings or submitted for consideration/acceptance these outputs appropriate to the stage of the candidature

**Format**

The written report should be within the range of 2,500 words to a maximum of 5,000 words. It should set out the academic progress since the beginning of the Candidature, or since the last Progression Review. Where relevant, it should also detail the student’s plan to submit the thesis. It should also address the criteria appropriate to the stage of the candidature. For distance learning students, the viva can be conducted via skype.

Alternative Format Subjects:

English (Creative Prose)

A written report totalling 2500-5000 words, consisting of:

* An extract from the creative component of the student’s PhD of 2500-3000 words AND
* A critical analysis of the student’s creative and critical process of 750-1000 words

English (Scriptwriting)

A written report consisting of:

* An extract from the creative script of 10-20 minutes AND
* A critical analysis of the student’s creative and critical process of 750-1000 words

English (Poetry)

A written report consisting of:

* An extract from the poetry manuscript of 1000-1500 words AND
* A critical analysis of the student’s creative and critical process of 750-1000 words

Film (Creative/Practical)

* A written piece (of research, analysis and reflection) of 2500-3000 words length discussing the creative and critical process of the practical element of the PhD and a plan for progressing to confirmation, demonstrating discernible and coherent aims and objectives. It should include a bibliography of primary and secondary sources, both read and noted for future reading, which thus demonstrates the scope of the project AND
* A practical audio-visual piece of not more than 15 minutes’ duration.

Music (Performance)

This will follow the relevant Faculty guidelines (see above) with the exception that it will include an additional critical analysis (750-1000 words) of the candidate’s creative work in musical performance, including details of their performances related to the thesis during the period under review. It will also include an update on the projected nature and extent of each component to be submitted to subsequent progression reviews and/or the final examination.

Music (Composition)

This will follow the relevant Faculty guidelines (see above) with the exception that it will include an additional critical analysis (750-1000 words) of the candidate’s creative work in composition, including details of their performances, workshops etc. in which their compositions have been performed, during the period under review. It will also include an update on the projected nature and extent of each component to be submitted to subsequent progression reviews and/or the final examination.
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