UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Please find attached the agenda and papers for the Postgraduate Research Committee meeting which will be held on Wednesday 10 February 2016 at 2pm in Lower College Hall with tea and coffee available from 1:30pm.

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Paper Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apologies for Absence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minutes of 25 November 2015 &amp; Matters Arising</td>
<td>For formal approval: • minutes of previous meeting</td>
<td>Paper A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Risk Assessment Procedures</td>
<td>To discuss the procedures in schools for conducting risk assessments with PGR students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policies and Regulations</td>
<td>To discuss the following policy and regulatory updates: • Parental Leave Policy • Doctor of Performing Arts Senate Regulations • Award of Posthumous Qualifications</td>
<td>Paper B Paper C Paper D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Working Group Reports</td>
<td>To discuss reports from the following Working Groups: • Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) • Progress Reviews</td>
<td>Paper E Paper F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discussion Topic</td>
<td>To hear from the School of Chemistry about the steps which were taken to secure the Athena Swan Silver Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Next meeting: Wed 13 April 16, 2pm-4pm, Parliament Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

25 January 2016
1. Internship Report: The Burn and Student Reading Parties

PGRC received a report from Louis Schirmacher. The Burn offers a unique opportunity to increase student engagement and satisfaction through organised student outings, but was currently not as well utilised across the University as it could be. There was a brief discussion about how different Schools make use of The Burn and members were encouraged to think about how they might use it in the future, especially for postgraduate research students.

2. Minutes of 14 October 2015 and Matters Arising

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

**Supervisor Training:** The minute stated “It was noted that although CAPOD provided a course for new supervisors there was a need for continuing support. A request was made not to refer to this as new supervisors training as it could discourage some colleagues from attending who might otherwise benefit from attending.”. It was clarified that the training was called PGR Supervisor Training and was listed as essential for all new supervisors of postgraduate research students, but is open to all supervisors.

3. Website Update

PGRC received an update on the redevelopment of the University’s webpages, with a focus on postgraduate pages. The Digital Communications team was currently working with individual Schools to migrate local the PGT webpages to the new style with work expected to continue through to June 2016. Work on PGR content is still under design and discussion. Schools or staff members seeking additional training or support were encouraged to contact digitalteam@st-andrews.ac.uk.

4. Working Group Reports

PGRC received oral update reports from the following Working Groups.

Length of Study
A summary of key recommendations from the Length of Study Working Group was presented and discussed. The provisional recommendations from the Working Group included:

- a PhD would be broadly defined as four years’ of study (3 years plus a continuation year);
- after the continuation year, students could request up to one additional year of extension (ie five years’ maximum to complete a PhD);
- requests for extensions would be granted on a quarterly basis.

It was agreed that the Working Group consider:

- the difficulties quarterly reviews may create for overseas students applying for visas;
- linking the timing of quarterly extensions with progress review.

There was discussion about the appropriate fee levels for the continuation and extension years and it was noted that PGRC is not a body with powers to set fees. Any recommendation about fees would therefore be routed by the Proctor to the appropriate process for consideration and approval.

**Progress Reviews**

Preliminary recommendations from the Progress Reviews Working Group were presented and discussed. Key recommendations from the Group included:

- minor amendments to the policy to bring it in line with QAA guidelines;
- the introduction of a 4-tier review outcome chart;
- a revised MMS system that stores records by student rather than by year;
- increased guidance for Schools, students and reviewers.

Some members raised concerns about the changes to the review panel make-up and frequency of reviews for students in their extension year. The Working Group agreed to give further consideration to these concerns.

**Fieldwork**

Preliminary recommendations from the Fieldwork Working Group were presented and discussed. The key recommendation was for the continuation of reduced fees for students on fieldwork but that the reduced fee not be tied to part-time student status. Some PGRC members argued that students continue to engage in full-time academic work while on fieldwork. Members raised various concerns regarding the proposal and its implications for other policies and issues, including Location of Studies and students on Tier 4 visas. The Working Group was asked to give further consideration to these concerns and to consider overlap with the findings of the Length of Study and Progress Review Working Groups.

5. **Papers for Information**

Circulated and noted.

6. **Discussion Topic**

There was a discussion of PGR Tutor marking, and a concern raised by some tutors that the rate of pay was not adequate for the amount of time which they required to mark coursework. It was agreed that increased marking speed comes primarily from practice, but that some additional training and guidance could be provided for tutors. The Dean of Arts & Divinity invited Schools to share examples of good practice with him via email.

7. **Date of Next Meeting**
It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday 10 February 2016 at 2pm in Lower College Hall (tea/coffee available from 1:30pm).
## POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
**ACTIONS ARISING FROM MEETING HELD ON 25 NOVEMBER 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items: (25 Nov 15)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report on The Burn and Student Reading Parties</td>
<td>• Consider ways to use The Burn more to increase PGR student engagement and satisfaction</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Update</td>
<td>• Schools seeking additional training/support with new webpages to contact digitalteam@</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Length of Study Working Group | • Consider the difficulties quarterly reviews in extension year may create for overseas students applying for visa; consider linking the timing of quarterly extensions with progress review.  
• Submit recommended changes to fee structure to the Proctor (route through the appropriate process for consideration and approval). | Length of Study WG |
| Progress Reviews | • Give further consideration to the make-up of the review panel and the frequency of reviews for students in the extension year. | Progress Reviews WG |
| Fieldwork | • Consider implications for other University policies, such as Location of Study, and other issues, such as students on Tier 4 Visas.  
• Consider overlap with findings of the Length of Study and Progress Review Working Groups. | Fieldwork WG |
| Discussion Topic – Marking training for PGR Tutors | • Share examples of good practice with the Dean of Arts via email to deanarts@ | All DoPGs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items: (14 Oct 15)</th>
<th>Actions (still pending)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Student Satisfaction Surveys | • Give thought about developing guidelines for Schools on how to communicate the value of the PRES to students and consider better ways of circulating survey link.  
• Consider how the university might count good supervision towards promotion. | Proctor  
Proctor |
| Discussion Topic – Supervisor Training | • Establish more guidance for internal and external Viva examiners | PGR Pro Dean |

Emily Feamster  
Postgraduate Administrative Officer  
30 November 2015
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
PARENTAL LEAVE POLICY

There is a need to introduce a Parental Leave Policy to enable research students to take time away from their studies while remaining registered with the University. This would allow students to maintain links with their research supervisor, continue to use University facilities, and remain exempt from Council Tax if they remain resident in St Andrews. The University’s existing Maternity Leave Policy is directed at employees, not students.

A Parental Interruption Policy would apply to students who become pregnant, have partners who are pregnant, and students who are adopting a child.

The policy outlined below is based on consultation with colleagues in HR, Finance, and Academic Registry, and includes guidance from colleagues with expertise in UKVI requirements.

Alison Sandeman
Assistant Registrar

25 January 2016
Parental Leave Policy (Postgraduate Research Students)

The University is committed to accommodating appropriate adjustments to postgraduate research students to support them in their studies due to pregnancy or adoption of a child. This policy enables postgraduate research students to take time away from their studies while remaining registered with the University, thereby allowing students to maintain links with their research supervisor and make use of University facilities including the Library. Postgraduate research students would not undertake teaching or tutoring during a period of Parental Leave. The policy intends that research supervisors and students can keep in touch; normal levels of supervision would resume at the end of the Parental Leave period. Students would be exempt from Council Tax if they remain resident in St Andrews.

The policy applies to postgraduate research students who become pregnant, have partners who are pregnant, and students who are adopting a child.

1. Notification
   Any student who has their pregnancy confirmed by a GP, has a partner who is pregnant, or is to adopt a child, is encouraged to report this to their Research Supervisor and Director of Postgraduate Studies so that appropriate academic advice and guidance can be provided.

   The following issues should be addressed:
   • Whether an interruption of studies is required and, if so, for how long (Parental Leave would not normally exceed one year);
   • Any time-off or adjustments that might be required so that the student can attend medical appointments.
   • Residence during the period of Parental Leave.

   A written record of agreed arrangements should be produced and retained by the Supervisor and a copy should be sent to the Registry Postgraduate Team by emailing researchpg-reg@st-andrews.ac.uk so that the student record can be updated accordingly. Any relevant period of agreed Parental Leave up to one year will be discounted from the student’s record. The student should be encouraged to keep in touch with the Supervisor during the period of Parental Leave.

   If a student is in receipt of funding from an external sponsor, the student has the sole responsibility to inform their sponsor of their change of circumstance. If a student is funded by a UK Research Council, the Research Supervisor must liaise with the Research Support Office at the University to ensure that the Research Council is informed.

   The student should contact their Research Supervisor and the Registry Postgraduate Team at the end of the agreed period of Parental Leave to confirm their date of return. If further leave is required, this should be dealt with by requesting a Leave of Absence.

2. Visas
   Postgraduate students studying at the University under University Tier 4 visa sponsorship will need to consider the length of maternity/paternity/adoption leave depending upon:
   • The timing of any interruption of studies;
   • The due date of the birth;
   • The decision the student has made about progressing with their studies after the birth of the child.
The visa implications of a maternity/paternity/adoption leave should be considered at the earliest possible opportunity and it is vital therefore that contact be made with the International Student Adviser by emailing advint@st-andrews.ac.uk.

3. Finance
Postgraduate research students who are in receipt of funding from external bodies should contact them for advice on funding related matters. UK Research Councils normally pay a maternity stipend.

Postgraduate research students in receipt of a maintenance grant from the University may be entitled to receive a maternity stipend grant from the University if they intend to remain resident in St Andrews. The maternity stipend grant is available for up to six months; the stipend must be returned to the university if the student does not re-engage with their studies.

It is recommended that any postgraduate student taking a period of Parental Leave should contact the Fees and Funding team in Registry about the possible effect on the fees to be charged when study resumes (fees@st-andrews.ac.uk).

4. Health and Safety
The study environment must be assessed for risk while students are pregnant, within 6 months of the birth (if the student has returned to study) and for as long as the student continues to breastfeed. Both the University and the student have an obligation to ensure that research and study are not carried out in an unsafe environment. This is particularly important where the student may be in close proximity to complex apparatus, chemicals etc. The Head of School must arrange for an assessment to be carried out and a copy of this should be returned to Environmental, Health and Safety Services (EHSS).

January 2016
## PGR Parental Leave
### Draft Implementation/Action Plan
*(following Academic Council approval on 9 March 2016)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication of Policy &amp; Guidance</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post policy and guidance to University’s webpages (policy to come into immediate effect from start of AY 16/17 and for all PGR cohorts)</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to the summary of all new/revised policies published at end of academic year</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>By mid Jun16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and Raising Awareness</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification to PGRC</strong>&lt;br&gt;Advise PGRC members that policy has been approved by Academic Council</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>Apr16 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification to Schools and Units</strong>&lt;br&gt;Email to be circulated to:&lt;br&gt;Heads of School, Directors of Postgraduate Studies, School Secretaries&lt;br&gt;Faculty: Pro Dean PGR&lt;br&gt;Professional Services (Directors of Registry, CAPOD and Student Services), Senate Office&lt;br&gt;Students: Director of Representation, Iain Cupples</td>
<td>Emily Feamster to draft email to WG Convenor for approval then send out on behalf of the Proctor’s Office</td>
<td>By end Apr16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification to Students</strong>&lt;br&gt;Issue Wednesday memo to all students.&lt;br&gt;Communicate the changes to students via the PG Student Representatives.</td>
<td>Emily Feamster&lt;br&gt;DoRep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Developments</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with SITS Team to ensure appropriate codes are available</td>
<td>Alison Sandeman</td>
<td>By end March16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation and Review</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After second year of implementation</td>
<td>Pro Dean (PGR)</td>
<td>Apr 18 report to ABC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emily Feamster<br>Postgraduate Administrative Officer<br>Proctor’s Officer

25 January 2016
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

SENATE REGULATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF DPERF (DOCTOR OF PERFORMING ARTS)

Background

Research degrees at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland (Glasgow) are presently validated by St Andrews. RCS therefore follows St Andrews regulations and policies, adapted where necessary. If RCS want to offer new programmes, they must be approved by St Andrews and have necessary regulations created.

The Proposal

RCS would like to expand its provision by offering the degree of DPerf, which is recognised as a ‘professional doctorate’ in the performing arts. Students taking the degree focus on developing professional practice through research. The degree itself is modelled on an internationally-recognised programme offered by the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki. RCS hope to increase their recruitment through offering the degree and already have three excellent candidates lined up to start a programme of research.

In order for St Andrews to validate the degree, Regulations must be drawn up. The attached regulations have the approval of the Academic Business Committee and are now presented for PGRC approval. Following PGRC approval they will be sent to the 9 March 2016 meeting of Academic Council for final approval.

James Palmer
PGR Pro Dean
15 December 2015
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PERFORMING ARTS

I Interpretation

“Dean of Faculty” means the “Dean of the relevant Faculty or such other Faculty Officer to whom the responsibility has been delegated”.

“D. Perf.” means “Doctor of Performing Arts”

“M.F.A.” means “Master of Fine Arts”

“portfolio” means “body of work submitted for the Degree of D. Perf., including any assessed performances”.

II Admission

1. The Senatus Academicus may admit as candidates for the Degree of D.Perf. persons who have been admitted as research students of the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland and who have been recommended to register as D.Perf. students by the Dean. In exceptional circumstances the Senatus Academicus may admit as a candidate for the degree of D.Perf. a student who can satisfy the Dean of Faculty that (s)he has adequate qualifications and for whom a supervisor can be appointed.

2. A DPerf student shall matriculate and pay the appropriate fee each year.

III Full-time and Part-time Study

1. Candidates in full-time employment may only register as full-time students where there is written confirmation from the employer that a candidate will have sufficient time to dedicate to their studies, for instance where the DPerf is part of the candidate’s professional development.

IV Duration and Place of Study

1. Every candidate for the degree of DPerf at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland will pursue a course of professional projects and supplementary studies and written work as set out in Regulation VI.1 during a period of not less than three years or its equivalent for part-time or flexibly programmed students.

V Nature of Study

1. The degree of DPerf is granted only for the submission of a body of work judged by the examiners to represent an outstanding level of professional development by a performing artist. The work will make a significant contribution to the candidate’s chosen
artistic sphere. The candidate will be able to articulate the context for the work and how it enhances their artistic practice.

2. All students and supervisors are required to comply with the requirements of the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland’s Policy for Supervisors and Students in the Doctor of Performing Arts Programme.

3. The work of all students will be reviewed annually and the results reported to the Research Degrees Committee at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland.

4. Where a student’s progress is not considered satisfactory at the annual review, they will receive a letter outlining the concerns in detail, and details of work to be submitted for a second review within 2-6 months as appropriate. If progress at the second review is not considered satisfactory, the Research Committee will request termination of studies in accordance with the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland’s Policy for Supervisors and Students in the Doctor of Performing Arts Programme.

VI Methods of Presentation

1. Candidates for the degree will be examined on the basis of a portfolio comprising (A) a series of professional projects and (B) supplementary studies and (C) written work. The portfolio will take the form of:
   A. A series of professional projects (normally 4 major artistic projects and 1 development project). They will demonstrate an appropriately wide and deep professional practice at this level. They will form a coherent artistic unit.
   B. A collection of taught supplementary studies, chosen to complement the Professional Projects and designed to enrich and deepen the candidate’s artistic practice. These may be theoretical, practical or research-related studies as appropriate.
   C. A body of written work which articulates the context for professional projects, and which reflects the student’s artistic development and synthesises work undertaken in the supplementary studies. The written component will normally be 12,500-15,000 words (excluding bibliography and appendices).

2. The three elements are credit weighted. Across three years or part-time equivalent successful candidates will gain 360 credits for professional projects, and 120 credits for supplementary studies, and 60 credits for the written work. Credits for the supplementary studies may be awarded upon completion of approved taught modules but the credits for the professional projects and the written work will only be awarded following a successful viva voce examination. All credits must be obtained in order for the degree to be awarded.

3. The introduction to the portfolio will be prefaced by:
   A. A declaration that the work has been undertaken by the candidate and has not been presented for any other degree.
B. A statement of the date of the candidate’s admission as a student.
C. A statement by the supervisor that the Regulations have been fulfilled.
D. A statement of access to or embargo of the print and/or electronic parts of the submission.

VII The Examination

1. The examination of the portfolio shall follow the same rules and procedures as laid down in the University of St Andrews Senate Regulations for PhD, except that:
   a. The Research Degrees Committee of the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland will appoint one internal convener and two external examiners.
   b. The examining committee shall make one of the following recommendations to the Senatus Academicus:
   A. That the portfolio submitted be approved and the degree of D. Perf. be awarded; or
   B. That the portfolio submitted be approved and the degree of D. Perf. be awarded, subject to the making of any purely typographical corrections and revisions; or
   C. That the portfolio submitted be not accepted in its present form but that the candidate be given the opportunity to make minor corrections within a period of three months of the date of the examination and that, upon the convener of the committee being satisfied that these minor corrections have been effected, the work be approved and the degree of D. Perf. be awarded; or
   D. That the portfolio submitted be not accepted in its present form but that the candidate be given the opportunity to revise the submission and to resubmit it within twelve months from the date of intimation to the candidate of the decision of the Examining Committee – this recommendation meaning that the candidate must resubmit a revised body of work, pay a re-examination fee, and be re-examined, though the examiners have the right to waive a further oral examination; or
   E. That, the portfolio submitted not being of sufficient merit, may be awarded the degree of MFA or an appropriate equivalent postgraduate diploma, where it meets the relevant criteria; this recommendation may be offered to the candidate at the same time as recommendation (D) as an alternative option, but may not be the only recommendation at the first presentation of the work; or
   F. That, the portfolio submitted not being of sufficient merit, the candidate may resubmit the portfolio within twelve months for a further examination for the award of MFA or appropriate equivalent postgraduate diploma – this recommendation meaning that the candidate must resubmit a revised body
of work under the regulations for the degree of MFA or postgraduate diploma, pay a re-examination fee, and be re-examined, though the examiners have the right to waive a further oral examination; this recommendation may be offered to the candidate at the same time as recommendation (D) as an alternative option, but may not be the only recommendation at the first presentation of the work; or

G. That the portfolio be rejected and no award made. This may not be the recommendation at the first presentation of the portfolio.

VIII Resubmission

1. If a recommendation to the Senatus Academicus is made for resubmission by an examining committee, the candidate shall receive in writing from the convener of the committee a detailed list of corrections and revision deemed to be necessary by the examiners. The candidate shall be expected to take these into account in any resubmission of the work.

2. On resubmission of the work and payment of the appropriate fee, the examining committee shall be reconvened and a further examination be conducted. The convener of the committee may recommend to the Dean of Faculty that the requirement of any oral examination be waived, if that is the unanimous opinion of the examining committee.

3. In the event of an oral examination being required, the Dean of Faculty may recommend the appointment of an appropriate neutral third party observer.

4. If the original examining committee cannot be reconvened, then the Senatus Academicus shall have the power to appoint a new committee to exam the work submitted.

5. The examining committee shall make one of the following recommendations to the Senatus Academicus:
   A. That the work submitted be approved and the degree of D. Perf. be awarded.
   B. That, the work submitted being of sufficient merit, the candidate be awarded the degree of M.F.A. or appropriate equivalent postgraduate diploma; or
   C. That the work submitted be rejected.
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

POLICY ON THE AWARD OF POSTHUMOUS QUALIFICATIONS

Court Resolution 1 of 1973 allows the University to confer a Degree posthumously on any candidate who ‘has satisfied all the conditions prescribed by or under the relevant Ordinances or Resolutions for the Degree in force at the time’.

However, although the University has a clear set of procedures to be followed in the unfortunate event of the death of a student, there is currently no more detailed policy governing the possible award of a posthumous qualification. As a result, such matters have been dealt with in an ad hoc manner for the last few years. Additional clarity is desirable in the interests of parity of decision-making and to frame the relevant necessary communications for the offer and possible award of a posthumous Degree.

The attached draft policy is deliberately brief and simple. It largely codifies current practice.

The only new suggestion is that the possibility of an Honours Degree without classification is introduced. This could be considered by the Dean in exceptional circumstances and offered to the student’s family as a possibility to be accepted or rejected by them. This may be appropriate when, for example, the only possible Honours classification outcome that can be calculated is seen by the academic School not to reflect the student’s real ability.

PGRC members are invited to comment on the attached draft new policy and to suggest any amendments.

Professor Lorna Milne
Vice-Principal (Proctor)

22 January 2016
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

POLICY ON THE AWARD OF POSTHUMOUS QUALIFICATIONS

1. This policy should be read in conjunction with the regularly-updated procedural Guidelines entitled “When a Student Dies...”. If in doubt, members of staff should contact the Chaplaincy or the Proctor’s Office.

2. In the unfortunate event of a student death, the University will investigate whether a posthumous qualification may be awarded. It will be for the student’s next of kin to decide whether to claim such an award. Academic Schools may not enter into any communications with bereaved families about the possibilities relating to posthumous awards, but must refer the matter to the Dean.

3. For undergraduate and taught postgraduate students, the usual rules will be applied, including years of study, number of credits, student’s academic performance, credit weighting, the potential for S-Coding and the Deans’ authority to waive certain minor requirements. For research postgraduate students, if the thesis has been submitted then it may be assessed in the usual way with the examiners making a recommendation whether or not an award should be made. Where the thesis has not been submitted but work has been completed, the Head of School may recommend to the Dean that an award be considered at a level commensurate with the amount and quality of work available for examination.

4. A student who is on Leave of Absence at the time of death will be considered under this policy.

5. The student will be awarded the highest qualification that can be approved in the circumstances (Certificate or Diploma of Higher Education, General or Honours Degree, MLitt, MSc, MPhil, PhD etc). Only an award that has genuinely been earned and can be considered under the University’s usual rules will be made.

6. The final arbiters of any award will be two Deans, including the Dean of the relevant Faculty. They will be advised by Registry and the relevant academic School, which may be required to hold a module board or examination committee as part of this process.

7. At Honours level, the default award will be a classified Degree as calculated by the Honours algorithm. In exceptional circumstances however, the Dean may decide to approve an Honours Degree without classification: this award is available as a posthumous qualification only. If the Dean so decides, the student’s family will be offered this award as an alternative to a classified Degree and may choose their preference.

8. Degrees that can normally be awarded ‘With Distinction’ may also be so qualified as posthumous awards. If appropriate, a student may be posthumously included in the Dean’s List but may not normally be nominated for other prizes and awards.

9. If a family chooses not to claim a posthumous award, the offer will be held open for five years, after which the student’s file will be closed.

10. A posthumous Certificate, Diploma or Degree will be awarded at the June or St Andrews Day Graduation Ceremonies.

Professor Lorna MILNE
Vice-Principal (Proctor)

22 January 2016
Award of Posthumous Qualifications: Draft Implementation Plan (only if amendment is supported by LTC and PGRC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit paper to Academic Council for approval: (policy would come into immediate effect)</td>
<td>Nicola Milton</td>
<td>By 29 Feb 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post policy to the University’s webpages</td>
<td>Lynn Balfour</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise LTC &amp; PGRC members that policy update has been approved by Academic Council</td>
<td>Nicola Milton</td>
<td>Apr16 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to the summary of all new/revised policies published at end of academic year</td>
<td>Lynn Balfour</td>
<td>By mid Jun16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email all Schools to advise them about the new policy</td>
<td>Lynn Balfour</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up appropriate award within SITS</td>
<td>Ester Ruskuc</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update procedural Guidelines to include:</td>
<td>Donald MacEwan</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In weeks and months following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaises with the next of kin about whether they want the award certificate presented to them as part of a private event or alternatively sent by post as soon as possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures that the word ‘posthumous’ is listed on the award certificate and on all formal documents and records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A sector-led initiative to develop a Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) for postgraduate research students (PGRs) was launched in 2014 and a national template was developed. A Working Group was established to consider how to take this forward in St Andrews to ensure that we give something to our PGRs that describes their time in a rich and appropriate way.

This paper provides an update on the findings of the Working Group and is presented to PGRC for information. The Academic Business Committee has approved continued work to develop a HEAR for postgraduate research students.

Alison Sandeman
Working Group Convenor

2 December 2015
POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

HEAR (R) WORKING GROUP: INTERIM REPORT

Remit of the Working Group
• Consider the types of achievement/information (both academic and professional development) that should be recorded on the HEAR (R)
• Consider how to collect, verify and store the information

Membership
Alison Sandeman (Assistant Registrar), Convenor
Jane Money-Boyd (Awards Officer, Registry)
Petr Killian, Chemistry (supervisor, Science Faculty)
Roger Rees, Classics (supervisor, Arts Faculty)
Tania Struetzel (Postgraduate Convenor)
Bonnie Hacking (Careers)
Nicola Milton (Proctor’s Office)
Heather McKiggan-Fee (CAPOD)

Approach
The Working Group agreed the following principles. The HEAR (R) should:
• Adhere to a standard template and contain a clear, consistent and specified core element
• Conform to the data fields for the European Diploma Supplement
• Measure and record achievement of verifiable outcomes from learning and student experience
• Provide students with a record of achievement that is unique to them and is broader than the traditional degree certificate
• Provide context to and highlight the unique aspects of the St Andrews PGR experience
• Capture data from existing electronic systems
• Ensure that employers have better information about the distinguishing qualities of different graduates
• Be issued on graduation as an electronic document, a maximum of 6 pages long (in hard copy terms), which stands alone but with hypertext to more detailed information, as appropriate.

The Group met three times between September and November 2015. Further meetings and discussions took place with colleagues in the Library (Janet Aucock and David Collins: Digital Repository, Research @StAndrews), Research Policy Office (Helen Reddy: PURE), Research Finance Office (Research Grants database), MMS, and Registry colleagues including Curriculum and Academic Data Team.

Using the national template as a starting point, the Group prepared a mock-up of what a St Andrews HEAR report might look like (Annex A). The draft report outlines the proposed data source for each element of the report and includes a number of recommendations. The majority of information can be extracted from SITS, using functionality that was developed for the undergraduate HEAR report. New approaches will be required to capture PGR specific information including the thesis abstract, subject-level PhD programme requirements, PGR publication data, PhD scholarships held on FUND, and training and skills data. It is important that information recorded on the HEAR must be verifiable and must record achievement, not participation.

The Academic Business Committee is invited to consider the recommendations on the attached draft HEAR.
Next steps

1. Resolve outstanding questions
   a. Clarify process to extract or link to the thesis abstract stored on the digital repository.
   b. Publication data can only be included if PURE is rolled-out to PGR students; is this likely and, if so, it will be important to establish when the functionality might be available.
   c. Clarify if meaningful data can be extracted from a student’s GradSkills record (on achievement, not only course attendance)

2. Finalise draft template and consult more widely. The Group recommends that a group of PGRs be asked to act in an advisory capacity as the development progresses.

3. Assess resource requirements to develop the HEAR (R).

4. Prepare a business case for implementation, to include timescale for development.

If approved, Registry colleagues will undertake much of the development work so members of the Working Group can be released.
### CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

This Higher Education Achievement Report incorporates the model developed by the European Commission, Council of Europe and UNESCO/CEPES for the Diploma Supplement adapted for the needs of research students. The purpose of the Supplement is to provide sufficient recognition of qualifications (diplomas, degrees, certificates etc.). It is designed to provide a description of the nature, level, context and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed by the individual named on the original qualifications. It should be free from any value judgements, equivalence statements or suggestions about recognition. The distinctive features of a UK doctorate are outlined in a Qualification Characteristics Statement published by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA): [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Doctoral-Degree-Characteristics-15.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Doctoral-Degree-Characteristics-15.pdf).

### 1. HOLDER OF THE QUALIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Family name</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>Information held on SITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Given name(s)</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Date of birth</td>
<td>22/03/1988</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Student identification number</td>
<td>110100001</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 HESA identification number</td>
<td>0311805670401</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. QUALIFICATION ACHIEVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Qualification achieved</th>
<th>Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)</th>
<th>Information held on SITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Main field(s) of study</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Name and status of awarding institution</td>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Institution administering studies</td>
<td>As awarding institution</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Language(s) of instruction/examination</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. QUALIFICATION LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Level of qualification</th>
<th>Doctorate Degree mainly by Research – SCQF 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Official length of programme</td>
<td>4 years (amend as required) Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Access requirement(s)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/prospectus">http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/prospectus</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. QUALIFICATION: MODE OF STUDY, PROGRAMME REQUIREMENTS AND RESULTS GAINED

#### 4.1 Mode of study

To be entered as appropriate: Full time, part-time. Information held on SITS

#### 4.2 Programme requirements

*Recommendation of working group*: this section should contain subject-specific requirements and learning outcomes i.e. replicate the format used for UG HEAR which links to web descriptions. The content for this section should be written and approved by each Academic School/department.

#### 4.3 Programme details, and the individual grades/marks/credits obtained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme start date</th>
<th>Enter Date e.g. 27/09/2011</th>
<th>Information held on SITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of Research Candidate:</td>
<td>Postgraduate Research Student</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme end date</td>
<td>Enter Date</td>
<td>Information held on SITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrolment History and Mode of Study by Academic Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Research undertaken at University of St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>Research undertaken at University of St Andrews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This programme was based on solely on research work and did not incorporate a formal taught element.

Note: a full enrolment history for each student is stored on SITS. The history will include periods of fieldwork and extension periods. As part of the investigatory work for the HEAR, we have identified that Leaves of Absence for PGRs are not displayed on the Electronic Record Card (they are for UGs and PGTs). Further work is needed to see if the same functionality can be used to translate information from the ERC onto the HEAR.

4.3.1 Thesis Title
Enter title Information held on SITS

4.3.2 Supervisory Team
Primary Supervisor: Information held on SITS
Secondary Supervisor:
External Supervisor:

4.3.3 Summary of research thesis
Recommendation of working group: this section should contain the thesis abstract, which is stored in the Digital Repository, Research @StAndrews. Each PhD candidate has a unique URL on the Repository, which could be stored in a user-defined field in SITS, and published as a hyperlink on the HEAR. Alternatively, the full abstract could be published. Further discussions with Library colleagues (Janet Aucock and David Collins) are required to identify ways to improve student engagement in timely upload of thesis to Digital Repository.

4.4 Overall classification of the qualification (in original language)
Pass – degree awarded on xxxx Information held on SITS

5. RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENT PROFILE

Recommendation of working group: this section should include a generic institutional-level statement highlighting the achievement of obtaining a PhD degree from the University of St Andrews (research intensive university, highly ranked etc.). Two to three sentences to capture the research achievement.

5.1 Publications Recommendation of working group: publications in peer-reviewed journals should be captured. PG students were consulted and also support this recommendation. There is no central repository for PGR publication data. We have liaised with RPO and understand that there is a possibility that PURE may be extended to capture publication data for PGRs. We support this proposal although recognise that it is dependent on additional resources in RPO. Timing is therefore unknown.
If ‘None to Report’ consider removing the sub-heading from the HEAR or state ‘None to Report at time of graduation’.

5.2 Conference Presentations: Recommendation of working group: delete this section as information is not currently collected or verified. Consider for future release of HEAR.

5.3 Supplementary Experiences (e.g. fieldwork, lab work): Recommendation of working group: delete this section as information is not currently collected or verified. Consider for future release of HEAR.

5.4 Scholarships, Research grants and awards Recommendation of working group: link to FUND to capture if the PhD was funded by a Research Council, other external sponsor, or by a University Scholarship e.g. St Leonards College Scholarship.
We are unable to capture information on research grants as postgraduate students are not currently listed as grant holders on the Research Finance Office system. A small number of PGRs are awarded small grants (mainly travel funds) but these are recorded under academic PIs (usually Head of School).

5.5 Engagement with the Academy Recommendation of working group: delete this section as information not currently collected or verified.

6. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

6.1 Professional Development & Training

6.1.1 Training and Skills: Recommendation of working group: include information on modules that have been taken either for credit or audit. The Group also recommend capturing courses that are currently stored on MMS e.g. courses designed by School of Chemistry. Module codes for these MMS courses can be created and the information can be copied to SITS to enable extraction to the HEAR. The Registry Curriculum Officer is exploring options.
Also, discussion is ongoing regarding a possible link to a student’s GradSkills record. However, as this currently confirms only course attendance (and most students participate in over 10 courses), it may be more appropriate to link to a list of available courses on the CAPOD webpage rather than to an individual student record.
6.1.2 Placements (Industrial and Overseas)  Recommendation of working group: include information on approved Study Abroad and Work Placements

6.1.3 Teaching Experience or qualifications.  Recommendation of working group: teaching activity is not currently stored. Schools could be asked to provide a statement outlining the type/extent of teaching that is usually undertaken by PGRs in their subject. In addition, it could be noted that research postgraduates complete mandatory training before engaging in teaching activities.

6.1.4 Other achievements (Prizes and Awards)  Recommendation of working group: include information of achievements from approved list of prizes and awards (academic and extra-curricular achievements e.g. sabbatical posts such as the PG Convenor).

6.2 Further information sources  
Recommendation of working group: Include reference to University of St Andrews website and Postgraduate Prospectus.  
University of St Andrews: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/  
Postgraduate Prospectus: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/study/pg/prospectus/research/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. CERTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Progress Reviews Working Group was asked to:

- Gather and compile information on progress reviews across schools and departments, including timing and frequency of reviews, attendance at review meetings, and mechanisms for keeping appropriate records of the outcomes of reviews.
- Create policy and guidance for steps to be taken when a progress review is reported as satisfactory with concerns or unsatisfactory.
- Ensure practices are in line with UK Quality Code guidance in Chapter B11, Indicator 13.

The group surveyed DoPGs to discover current practice and concerns. Relevant PGR appeal cases were also looked at to determine where the current procedure has failed in the past. The group then developed an extensive guidance document for students, supervisors, reviewers and schools, as well as a stand alone policy. While this document largely retains the current policy, a new 4-tier classification system for review outcomes is suggested. Additionally, the current MMS system was a reoccurring concern raised by DoPGs, so a redesign has been suggested to improve both the annual review process and general PGR administration.

These proposals are presented to Postgraduate Research Committee for feedback and approval.

Membership:

- Riccardo Bavaj (History) – Convenor
- Emmy Feamster (Proctor’s Office) - Coordinator
- Ishbel Duncan (Comp Sci)
- Jonathan Keeling (Physics & Astronomy)
- Alex Griffiths (Registry)
- Dawn Hollis (History PGR Rep)

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

27 January 2016
## UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

**POLICY ON PROGRESS REVIEWS FOR RESEARCH POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Policy on Progress Reviews for Postgraduate Research Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Applies to all Postgraduate Research students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with other policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Proctor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving Committee</td>
<td>Postgraduate Research Committee (PGRC) &amp; Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy approved date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy effective from date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy review date</td>
<td>Session 2016/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POLICY ON PROGRESS REVIEWS FOR RESEARCH POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

Principles

The QAA Quality Code for Research Postgraduate degrees stipulates that universities must “put in place clearly defined mechanisms for monitoring and supporting research student progress, including formal and explicit reviews of progress at different stages”. “The main purpose of the monitoring process is to provide overall support for the research student to maximize his or her likelihood of completing the research programme successfully within an appropriate timescale.” The purpose and frequency of progress reviews, as well as the relevant arrangements for the reviews, must be “made clear from the outset, so that both the research student and the supervisor can plan adequately for them, prepare relevant documents, and consult other individuals as appropriate.”

Purpose

The annual progress review should:

• Ascertain whether the research student has progressed satisfactorily in their programme of study.
• Be a useful feedback exercise.
• Give the student formal practice in talking about their work (the subject of their dissertation, its importance to the field, and its methodological approach) to an interested audience that may include a non-specialist.
• Promote the timely and successful completion of postgraduate research degrees.
• Identify problems early, and help resolve problems where possible.
• Ascertain whether any decision is required concerning the re-registration of a student for a higher or a lower degree than the one for which they are registered, or concerning leave of absence, extension, withdrawal, or termination of studies.
• Serve as an opportunity for the student or supervisor to raise any concerns, and as a checkpoint to ensure school and supervisory provisions are satisfactory.

Procedure

Every postgraduate research student, including part-time students, will undergo a formal progress review at least once in each year of registration, normally by month nine. The school must make the requirements, timing, style, assessment criteria and potential outcomes of these reviews clear to students from the beginning of their programme.

Schools are responsible for assigning a review panel for each student. Review panels will normally include at least two members of the School designated by the Director of Postgraduate Studies (DoPG). If supervision duties for a student are shared between two schools, then both schools should normally be represented on the review panel. The panel should not include any member of the research student’s academic supervisory team, but

1 UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B11: Research Degrees, Indicator 13 (p. 21).
may include the second supervisor if this role is restricted to the provision of pastoral care. In case of a re-review, at least one member of the review panel should be an experienced member of staff.

While each school is responsible for setting its own requirements for progress review submissions, the following documents must be included:

- A supervisor’s report
- A student self-assessment form
- A completion plan (from year 2 onwards, recommended from year 1)
- Reviewers’ reports from any previous reviews

Students are to be assessed on both the quality and quantity of their work. They should not be judged based on the review panel’s own preferences in regards to topic, method or findings, so long as the work produced is of an appropriate level.

Each student’s work will be classified according to one of four categories:

- Green – Satisfactory
- Yellow – Satisfactory with minor concerns
- Amber – Satisfactory with major concerns
- Red – Unsatisfactory

After the review meeting, the reviewers complete a feedback form and recommend one of the outcomes above. The DoPG is responsible for approving the feedback and submitting it to Registry, as well as to the student and the supervisor as appropriate. Students should always receive written feedback regarding the outcome of their review, preferably within one month of the review meeting. The DoPG may consult the PGR Pro Dean on any reviews of particular concern.

In situations where a re-review is recommended, the DoPG is responsible for approving and overseeing the arrangements for the re-review. Reviewers’ comments from the initial review must be made available for the re-review. Any re-reviews should normally take place between two and five months after an initial review. In a situation where an unsatisfactory progress review serves as the first indication of a possible termination of studies, the period between the initial review and the re-review must be at least two months. This will serve as the probationary warning period. If the student’s progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory at the re-review, then their case will be referred to the PGR Pro Dean to begin the termination of studies process, unless the student decides to withdraw from the programme.

First-year reviews take on particular importance, as they determine whether students will be upgraded from a probationary status to full status of the relevant research degree. If third- or fourth-year reviews raise significant doubts about timely completion, the next review should take place within six months. If students are within three months of the submission of their thesis, they may be excused from the review, provided they have the support of their supervisor. In case an extension is granted, students in their fifth year should be regularly monitored and actively supported, but will not normally undergo a full review. Completion plans should include clear milestones with an indication of the quantity, nature and envisioned stage of readiness of work to be undertaken.

The DoPG should recuse themselves for any cases where they are also the supervisor and refer these back to the Head of School for approval and oversight.
**PROGRESS REVIEW OUTCOME CODES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour coding</th>
<th>Review Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resulting actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Satisfactory.</td>
<td>The student demonstrates a clear understanding of the context and aims of the project, and has demonstrated a capacity to complete it in a timely fashion. In a first year review they can describe an achievable concrete goal, situate the work in the context of previous literature, and have produced work that displays the skills necessary to complete the relevant research degree in their discipline. Where relevant they will have clearly established research questions and begun to develop an appropriate methodology. Where required, they have also completed taught courses as required in their department. In later-year reviews they have completed work over the preceding year that is proportional with timely completion. Their plans for completion are practical and well thought-out. Where relevant they will have a developed and nuanced sense of the argument or arguments of their thesis. This category does not preclude reviewers from having advice or suggestions which may aid the student.</td>
<td>The result of the review, including any suggestions for improvement from the reviewers, is to be shared with the student and their supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Satisfactory with minor concerns.</td>
<td>The project is realistic and the student has demonstrated that they have the capacity to complete it. However, the reviewers have noted some areas of potential improvement which might further enable timely completion. For example, they may have failed to complete required taught courses, or their research questions may be either too broad or too narrow. This category may also be used in cases where the reviewers think that the student would benefit significantly from further skills training, reviewing further literature, developing their analysis more deeply, considering alternative methodologies, or undertaking further practice in presenting their work.</td>
<td>A re-review is unlikely. The DoPG will, at their discretion, correspond with the student and/or their supervisor regarding the recommendations made by the review panel, and any specific actions the student may need to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Satisfactory with major concerns.</td>
<td>The reviewers have concerns regarding the viability of the project and/or of the student’s ability to complete on time. In a first-year review, they may lack important skills, demonstrate poor understanding of the context of their work, or have a limited view of the direction of the research. Research questions may be ill-defined. The piece of work produced for review is incomplete or does not demonstrate the level of skills necessary to the relevant research degree in their discipline. In a later-year review the quantity of work completed over the preceding year does not seem to be in line with timely completion, and they have no clear sense of the argument or purpose of their research. Their plans for completion may also be impractical or unrealistic.</td>
<td>A re-review is likely, with the possibility of a re-registration to a lower degree path should problems continue to be evident. Even if a full re-review (including interview) is not scheduled, a new submission by the student is required, which needs to be assessed by both the supervisor and the initial reviewer team. If an amber outcome is returned regarding a student in their third-year then a re-review should take place within six months in order to strongly support timely completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory.</td>
<td>The reviewers have significant doubts regarding the project and/or the student’s ability to complete it. In a first-year review, expected aspects (basic research skills, understanding of context and a sense of direction) may be lacking entirely. The piece of work produced for review is partial and demonstrates none or few of the skills necessary to complete the relevant research degree in their discipline. In a later-year review the student appears to have done little work over the preceding year, and plans for completion are either vague or highly unrealistic.</td>
<td>Pending approval from the DoPG, a re-review is scheduled, with the possibility either of re-registration to a lower degree path or termination of studies should the result be unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Guidance
University policy regarding the annual progress review can be found here [insert link]. The guidance provided in this document may (and should) be supplemented but not superseded or contradicted by School-Specific guidance for staff and students.

The annual progress review serves to ensure that all research postgraduates are successfully progressing towards timely completion. It enables both Schools and the wider university to offer advice and assistance to any students who may be struggling, whilst also providing valuable intellectual feedback to those with few or no problems with their progress. Finally, it serves as an important opportunity for students to reflect upon their progress and to raise any concerns which they might have.

The expectations of all participants in the review process are discussed below and are summarised in the diagram at appendix 2 of this document. Although this guidance contains specific sections designed for Schools, supervisors, reviewers, and students, all participants in the progress review process may benefit from familiarising themselves with the guidance given to all groups. The appendices are of potential relevance to all individuals involved.

Guidance for Schools
Schools are responsible for administering the annual progress review and for ensuring that the process is managed smoothly and in a timely fashion for all involved. The process will generally be overseen by the Director of Postgraduates.

Every research student (MPhil and PhD) will undergo a formal progress review at least once in each year of registration, normally by their ninth month of study. The School should ensure that the timings and assessment criteria of the progress review are made clear to incoming students when they begin their course of study. Schools should ensure that all participating staff and students are aware of University-wide regulations and guidance in addition to producing School-specific guidance documents. For example, Schools should set a consistent length of time for progress review interviews to take to ensure all students are treated fairly.

The Director of Postgraduates is responsible for allocating an appropriate review panel to each student being reviewed. In addition to referring to the policy regulations regarding the allocation of reviewers, Directors of Postgraduates are encouraged to use their discretion...
and familiarity with the relationships within their own School to ensure that there can be no conflicts of interest in the case of reviewers chosen. The Director of Postgraduates, in correspondence with reviewers and other appropriate members of university staff, will also confirm the final outcome of all progress reviews, and will oversee the smooth running of any ensuing processes, such as re-reviews. Any required re-reviews should take place between two and five months after the initial review, although where School guidelines allow for it students can request an earlier re-review.

The timeline at appendix 3 indicates the manner in which the review process should operate from the perspective of the School’s role in organising it.

**Guidance for Supervisors**

Supervisors should be familiar with the quality and quantity of their students’ work, and should read the entire review submission where possible. Supervisors should give guidance on preparing for the yearly review, including preparing the required documents, and complete the supervisor report form.

Following the review, supervisors should discuss the feedback from reviews with their students and agree a plan of action based on the outcome. Advising students on reassessing their approach is particularly important in cases where the student’s work is deemed less than satisfactory.

If a situation arises where it becomes clear that a student is not making adequate progress, the supervisor should be proactive in discussing alternative options with their students, including Leave of Absence, extension, re-registration for a lower degree, or withdrawal from study. Where necessary, supervisors should direct students to other sources of support and advice, for example the Registry Student Support Officer, CAPOD and Student Services.

**Guidance for Reviewers**

The progress review is, first and foremost, intended to track the progress of research students and to ensure that they both have the capacity and are receiving the necessary support to complete the relevant research degree in a timely fashion. Within the broad spectrum of students that reviewers will encounter during the progress review process, their most serious responsibility is to those who may be seriously struggling with the demands of research. In these cases, the reviewers’ feedback can begin a process in which students are given as much support as possible to enable them to continue or, where necessary, are guided through the process of transferring to an alternative degree or terminating their studies.

However, the vast majority of students going through the review process will not be in this situation. For these students, the review process serves a variety of purposes that reviewers should be sensitive to. It provides an opportunity for them to garner new perspectives on their work, outside of their supervisory team. It is also an opportunity for them to discuss, in confidence, any concerns they may have, for example with their supervisory arrangements.
The structure of the progress review
For a broader picture of the review process, please see appendix 3.

In first year, PhD students will submit a piece of work (the form of which is set by the School) alongside a self-assessment form. (Depending upon the structure of their programme this may also apply to other research students, although this is left to the discretion of the School). In later years, students will submit a self-assessment form plus any other materials required by the School (for example a calendar of anticipated completion). Reviewers will read this material and then conduct an interview with the student. After the interview reviewers will complete a report and will allocate one of four outcomes to the student under review: satisfactory, satisfactory with minor concerns, satisfactory with major concerns, and unsatisfactory.

The interview
Some Schools utilise the interview as an opportunity to provide students with a ‘practice viva’. Reviewers should only treat an interview as a viva if this is explicitly suggested by the School and is made clear to students in advance. They should also ensure that such an approach still leaves time for students to raise any concerns they may have. The interview should be a constructive experience for the student. Whilst reviewers may communicate a general sense of how well the interview has gone, they should not communicate their intended classification to the student during the course of the interview, as it is subject to confirmation by the Director of Postgraduates.

4-tier outcomes
The 4-tier outcome system (see appendix 5) is intended to enable reviewers to respond with sufficient nuance to students across the spectrum. The two lower tiers (‘unsatisfactory’ and ‘satisfactory with major concerns’) indicate a strong recommendation from the reviewer that the student undergo the re-review process, and are to be used when the reviewer has major concerns regarding their capacity to finish in a timely fashion. The two upper tiers (‘satisfactory’ and ‘satisfactory with minor concerns’) allow for reviewers to provide feedback and suggestions to students who seem to be reasonably well on track to complete.

Awarding a ‘satisfactory’ outcome does not preclude a reviewer from having comments or advice in their feedback to a student who is clearly doing well. ‘Satisfactory with minor concerns’ may be used to give more weight, where it is felt necessary, to advice that might be of significant benefit to a student’s project and their timely completion. Should the review process reveal significant methodological differences between a reviewer and a student, but these do not impact upon a student’s capacity to complete, ‘satisfactory’ and ‘satisfactory with minor concerns’ are appropriate outcomes to use.

Should a reviewer award an outcome of ‘unsatisfactory’ or ‘satisfactory with major concerns’, further decisions on the student’s status will be taken by the Director of Postgraduates in their School, in discussion with other appropriate individuals.

Expectations of reviewers
Reviewers are expected to read work and conduct interviews with students in a timely fashion. They should be responsive to the fact that different students may have a variety of
needs and may respond best to a variety of different approaches in terms of the interview and feedback provided. They should provide conscientious advice on a student’s project within their expertise to do so, and should treat seriously any concerns that individual students may raise. Reviewers should be sensitive to the dynamics of the student-supervisor relationship, and be aware of the need for discretion when discussing any potential supervisory concerns. At the same time, if issues of School and/or supervisory provision are identified, they should raise these with the DoPG or the PGR Pro Dean.

**Guidance for Students**

Students should make themselves aware of the requirements for each annual review from the beginning of their programme of study, and should work towards being well prepared for each review.

Students should approach the progress review as a valuable opportunity in a number of different ways. Firstly, it encourages students to reflect upon their own progress and to proactively manage their research in order to write the best thesis possible within the time allotted. It is also an opportunity for students to receive feedback on their work from academics outside of their supervisory team, and provides students with experience of discussing their project with interviewers who have read material relating to it but have not been closely acquainted with its development.

The annual progress review is also an opportunity for students to report how they feel things have been going – how their research, from their point of view, is progressing, and whether they are happy with the supervisory and other support arrangements provided by the School. Students should note that material submitted during the progress review does not confer credit, and as such does not fall under the university policy regarding multiple submission. As such, any relevant material (e.g. literature reviews, methodological discussions) may be incorporated into their dissertation should they so wish. Of course, the usual rules of Good Academic Practice still apply.

Following the progress review students will receive an outcome (see appendix 5) and a reviewers’ report. The review outcome and report may provide advice or recommend specific actions that the student might take to improve the progress of their research. Students should be proactive in taking any such suggestions on board and in discussing them with their supervisors. If a re-review is necessary, students will receive advice and guidance on the process from the Director of Postgraduates, their supervisor, and other members of staff where appropriate.

If students have any concerns or complaints regarding the review process, they should contact the Registry Student Support Officer (reg-support-pgr@st-andrews.ac.uk).
Appendix 1: Accommodating Different Circumstances

Although the guidance given above should apply to the vast majority of research students, certain circumstances may require adaptations to the process described above and flexibility on the part of the School and Director of Postgraduates. The notes below aim to clarify some of the circumstances in which this may be the case, but are by no means exhaustive. Schools should contact Registry for further advice if situations remain unclear.

Clarification regarding part-time students:
Part-time students should undergo a progress review in every year of enrolment, rather than in every year of FTE study. Therefore, assuming no leaves of absence, they should undergo review once every calendar year. Reviewers should, however, be sensitive to the different time-scales and expected progress rates involved.

Research degrees with a taught element:
Some research degree programmes — such as the EngD, or PhD programmes as part of Centres of Doctoral training — now contain significant taught components, and these are often concentrated in the first two years of the programme. In these cases, annual reviews in the first two years should make allowance for the time available for research, and assess progress on that basis. E.g., a taught course component equivalent to 60 undergraduate credits is estimated to require 16 weeks of 37.5 hours, and so at a nine month assessment, such a student would only have had at most five months to dedicate to research.

In cases where the first year of such a programme contains only full-time taught courses (and no research component), where it is not appropriate to review research progress, the annual review process may instead take the form of checking the student has attained the required grades in the taught courses.

In such cases it may also be appropriate to hold additional assessments after 15 or 18 months to check the transition from taught to research components. Where this is the case, students should be made aware of the full arrangements well in advance. See also discussion under joint programmes below.

Cross-School supervision:
In circumstances in which a student is supervised by academics in more than one School, they should undergo one progress review each year (i.e. they should not be reviewed separately by each School). Directors of Postgraduates from different Schools should correspond regarding which School it would be most appropriate for students to be reviewed in. All relevant Schools should normally be represented on the review panel.

Co-tutelles and other joint programmes:
In case of co-tutelles, the process for progress reviews must be clearly laid out in the individual co-tutelle agreement. This agreement should be consistent with University Policy. Normally, the lead institution is responsible for carrying out the review process. If St Andrews is not the lead institution, the School Postgraduate Committee should request a copy of the annual progress reports.

In addition to co-tutelles, some PhD or EngD programmes involve consortia of UK universities which impose their own annual review procedures, as required by funding bodies. If these reviews are consistent with the annual review policy, it may be possible for the DoPG to review the feedback from this review process and submit it to Registry. In cases where it is unclear whether the review procedure is consistent with University Policy, the DoPG should consult with the Pro Dean, who has authority to vary University Policy in such circumstances as necessary, in the interests of the student and the spirit of the Policy.

Re-reviews and government funding:
If a student in receipt of government funding receives an amber or red result in a progress review, any re-review should be completed by month 11 of that student’s academic cycle in order for re-registration or withdrawal to take place without financial ramifications. However, the period between the initial review and the re-review must be at least two months.

Extension period:
In case an extension is granted, students in their fifth year should be regularly monitored and actively supported, but will not normally undergo a full review. Students should submit updates on their work every three months, which will be monitored by both the supervisor and the DoPG. If there are doubts about timely completion, the DoPG may schedule a full progress review.
Appendix 2: Expectations

**Students should...**
- Familiarise themselves with relevant rules, regulations, and guidelines.
- Establish a successful working pattern.
- Produce the agreed amount of work.
- Complete the student self-assessment form.

**Supervisors should...**
- Familiarise themselves with relevant rules, regulations, and guidelines, and be equipped to answer student questions about them, and to provide guidance throughout the review process.
- Be available for, and encourage, regular supervision meetings.
- Be familiar with the quantity and quality of their student’s work.
- Provide realistic, constructive feedback on their student’s progress.
- Complete the supervisor report form.

**The Director of Postgraduates should...**
- Assign reviewers, with reference to subject coverage and any potential conflicts of interest.
- Ensure that reviews happen in a timely fashion.
- Review all outcomes and agree and communicate follow-up actions where necessary.
- Address any issues relating to supervisory arrangements that may have come to light during the review process.

**Reviewers should...**
- Read all submissions and conduct interviews with students in a timely fashion.
- Identify any areas for concern, including minor and non-academic concerns.
- Identify any additional training or supervisory needs.
- Provide constructive feedback for student and supervisor, and fill in the reviewers’ report with reference to appendix 5 (outcome codes).
Appendix 3: Process

ANNUAL REVIEW CYCLE

School, DoPG and supervisor make student aware of annual review requirements from matriculation

DoPG makes student aware of upcoming review approximately 6 weeks in advance

DoPG assigns reviewers, copied to student and supervisor for info, and circulates guidance and expectations

Student and reviewers confirm a review date

Student submits requested work samples and completes self assessment at least one week in advance of the review, or by school deadline

Supervisor submits supervisor’s report at least one week in advance of the review

Review takes place, ideally as a face to face meeting. Reviewers use guidance provided to fairly assess the student

Reviewers agree feedback and submit report to DoPG, via MMS, within one week of the review.

DoPG approves or amends the report if no re-review is necessary and sends feedback to student and supervisor

DoPG may consult PGR Pro Dean on any reviews of particular concern

DoPG escalates any failed re-reviews to the PGR Pro Dean for termination of studies or re-registration (in case of withdrawal, the student is asked to write to the PGR Pro Dean)

DoPG arranges re-review for red reviews, and ambers as necessary

Student is informed in writing of any changes to registration and their right to appeal. Any stipend is suspended only after student has exhausted their route of appeal or the initial appeal deadline has passed
Appendix 4: Information Sharing
The progress review is essentially an information-sharing exercise, ensuring that students, their supervisors, and the School are all working towards the same expectations and standards. However, it also involves the creation and distribution of material and information that may be of a sensitive nature. The process, therefore, also creates an opportunity for supervisor and student to share some information confidentially with the reviewers. This table indicates what information or documents should be shared with the different individuals involved at each stage of the review process. It should be noted, however, that all documents may be subject to freedom of information requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Director of Postgraduates</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before / during progress review, has access to or receives:</td>
<td>- Outcomes of and all documents relating to a student’s previous reviews.</td>
<td>- Outcomes of student’s previous reviews, and reviewer’s reports.</td>
<td>- Their own documents.</td>
<td>- Should see any supporting material submitted by the student (e.g. a sample chapter) and provide comments in advance of submission, but should not see the student’s report unless the student wishes to share it with them. - Their own report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The documents submitted in the current review by the student and supervisor.</td>
<td>- The student’s review documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After progress review, has access to or receives:</td>
<td>- Complete reviewers’ report.</td>
<td>- Their own report.</td>
<td>- Complete reviewers’ report.</td>
<td>- Reviewers’ report not including details relating to the student’s feedback on supervisory provision. - DoPG may correspond privately and directly with supervisor regarding a potential re-review or any other action a student may need to undertake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- DoPG may correspond directly with the student regarding supervisory concerns and how they might best be addressed before taking action (which is likely to involve discussing issues with the supervisor).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5: Outcomes**

Please note that the table below is incorporated into university policy for annual progress reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour coding</th>
<th>Review Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resulting actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Satisfactory.</td>
<td>The student demonstrates a clear understanding of the context and aims of the project, and has demonstrated a capacity to complete it in a timely fashion. In a first year review they can describe an achievable concrete goal, situate the work in the context of previous literature, and have produced work that displays the skills necessary to complete the relevant research degree in their discipline. Where relevant they will have clearly established research questions and begun to develop an appropriate methodology. Where required, they have also completed taught courses as required in their department. In later-year reviews they have completed work over the preceding year that is proportional with timely completion. Their plans for completion are practical and well thought-out. Where relevant they will have a developed and nuanced sense of the argument or arguments of their thesis. This category does not preclude reviewers from having advice or suggestions which may aid the student.</td>
<td>The result of the review, including any suggestions for improvement from the reviewers, is to be shared with the PhD student and their supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Satisfactory with minor concerns.</td>
<td>The project is realistic and the student has demonstrated that they have the capacity to complete it. However, the reviewers have noted some areas of potential improvement which might further enable timely completion. For example, they may have failed to complete required taught courses, or their research questions may be either too broad or too narrow. This category may also be used in cases where the reviewers think that the student would benefit significantly from further skills training, reviewing further literature, developing their analysis more deeply, considering alternative methodologies, or undertaking further practice in presenting their work.</td>
<td>A re-review is unlikely. The DoPG will, at their discretion, correspond with the student and/or their supervisor regarding the recommendations made by the review panel, and any specific actions the student may need to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Satisfactory with major concerns.</td>
<td>The reviewers have concerns regarding the viability of the project and/or of the student’s ability to complete on time. In a first-year review, they may lack important skills, demonstrate poor understanding of the context of their work, or have a limited view of the direction of the research. Research questions may be ill-defined. The piece of work produced for review is incomplete or does not demonstrate the level of skills necessary to the relevant research degree in their discipline. In a later-year review the quantity of work completed over the preceding year does not seem to be in line with timely completion, and they have no clear sense of the argument or purpose of their research. Their plans for completion may also be impractical or unrealistic.</td>
<td>A re-review is likely, with the possibility of a re-registration to a lower degree path should problems continue to be evident. Even if a full re-review (including interview) is not scheduled, a new submission by the student is required, which needs to be assessed by both the supervisor and the initial reviewer team. If an amber outcome is returned regarding a student in their third-year then a re-review should take place within six months in order to strongly support timely completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory.</td>
<td>The reviewers have significant doubts regarding the project and/or the student’s ability to complete it. In a first-year review, expected aspects (basic research skills, understanding of context and a sense of direction) may be lacking entirely. The piece of work produced for review is partial and demonstrates none or few of the skills necessary to complete the relevant research degree in their discipline. In a later-year review the student appears to have done little work over the preceding year, and plans for completion are either vague or highly unrealistic.</td>
<td>Pending approval from the DoPG, a re-review is scheduled, with the possibility either of re-registration to a lower degree path or termination of studies should the result be unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Rights</td>
<td>N.B. If DoPG or HoS are supervisors of the student then their status reverts to Supervisor and the HoS/DoPG or their deputies then take on the role of DoPG/HoS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student: Submission and Self Assess Form: R/W</td>
<td>Supervisor: Reviewer + Stndt submission: R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Report: R</td>
<td>Supervisor Report: R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical: R/W</td>
<td>Stndt SAF : No Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry: all files: R/W for all registry staff (+ProDeans)</td>
<td>HoS: R/W to all files except if the student's supervisor Reviewer: R/W for reviewed students files (for that year) DoPG: R/W all files except if a student's supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students 15/1111 Name.Surname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R/W:</strong> Supervisor Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters (Dir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Only Information (Dir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R:</strong> Student Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ReSubmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R/W:</strong> Student Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Self Assessment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters (Dir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student resubmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Information (Dir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R:</strong> Reviewer Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer Re-Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Information (Dir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Reviews (Dir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Colour Chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **R/W:** Reviewer Report |
| Letters (Dir) |
| Medical Information (Dir) |
| **R:** Reviewer Report |
| Reviewer Re-Report |
| Admin Information (Dir) |
| Previous Reviews (Dir) |
| Summary Colour Chart |

| **R/W:** Admin (Dir) |
| Medical (Dir) |
| Staff Only Files (Dir) |
| Letters (Dir) |
| **R:** Student Submission (Review Dir) |
| Medical Information (Dir) |
| **R:** Reviewer Report |
| Reviewer Re-Report |
| Summary Colour Chart |

| **R/W:** Admin (Dir) |
| Staff Only Files (Dir) |
| Letters (Dir) |
| Summary Colour Chart |

| **R:** Student Submission (Review Dir) |
| Medical Information (Dir) |
Supervisor

Admin Dir (R only)
Letters Dir (R/W)
Staff Only Information Dir (R/W)
Medical Dir (R)
Reviews Dir:
[read access to Student Submission
read access to Reviewer report
write Supervisor report
NO ACCESS to Student Self Assessment
Report Form and to supervisory concerns
comments]
Summary Colour Chart

Reviewers
Reviews:
[read access to Student Self Assessment Form
read access to Student Submission
read access to Supervisor report
read access to Colour Summary Chart
write access to Reviewer Report]

Reviews
Year 1
Year 2
Year 3

DoPG/HoS/Registry

Admin Dir (R/W)
Letters Dir (R/W)
Reviews Dir (R)
Medical Dir (R/W)
Staff Only Information Dir (R/W)
Colour Coding Summary (R/W)

All Students
Admin
Letters
Reviews
Medical
Staff Only Information
Colour Coding Summary

DOCMan

More Years to be added as required. Initial setup to Year 4.
## PGR Progress Review

### Draft Implementation/Action Plan

*(following Academic Council approval on 9 March 2016)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication of Policy &amp; Guidance</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post policy and guidance to University’s webpages (policy to come into immediate effect from start of AY 16/17 and for all PGR cohorts) • Working group to draft document highlighting differences between old policy and new</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to the summary of all new/revised policies published at end of academic year</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>By mid Jun16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and Raising Awareness</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification to PGRC</strong> Advertise PGRC members that policy has been approved by Academic Council</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>Apr16 meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification to Schools and Units</strong> Email to be circulated to: Heads of School, Directors of Postgraduate Studies, School Secretaries Faculty: Pro Dean PGR Professional Services (Directors of Registry, CAPOD and Student Services), Senate Office Students: Director of Representation, Iain Cupples (Notification will include prompt for Schools to update their local webpages, handbooks and other documentation).</td>
<td>Emily Feamster to draft email to WG Convenor for approval then send out on behalf of the Proctor’s Office</td>
<td>By end Apr16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification to Students</th>
<th>Emily Feamster</th>
<th>DoRep DoPGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue Wednesday memo to all students. Communicate the changes to students via the PG Student Representatives. Advise students at any start of session welcome session.</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Developments</th>
<th>Nicola Milton</th>
<th>Fri 22 Jan 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On behalf of the Academic Business Committee, commission the MMS Team to take forward the necessary system developments to MMS by agreed deadline date (cc IT Services). • Group suggests MMS system ready for testing by two schools from each faculty by Autumn 2016, with full roll out by early May 2017 (the ideal would be testing in May 16 and fully adopted for Autumn 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and Briefing Sessions</th>
<th>Emily Feamster and WG Convenor</th>
<th>As soon as possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set up briefing session: two reps per School (not DoPGs who already know about changes). Suggest Supervisors/Reviewer and School administrator. One representative must attend. Briefing session in late Sept 16: attendees to read policy and guidance in advance. Will cover implementation only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation and Review</th>
<th>Pro Dean (PGR)</th>
<th>Apr 18 report to ABC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ResearchFish
ResearchFish is a system being used by RCUK and other funders of research. All students directly funded by RCUK are being asked to report their outcomes (e.g., publications) via Researchfish in the 2016 collection: 1st February – 10th March 2016. Login details have already been provided to all current RCUK-funded students, as well as to those RCUK-funded students who finished their PhD in the last year. (Students who are in their first year of study at the time of the data collection period are excluded from the exercise.) Going forward studentship outcomes data should be provided throughout the studentship and for up to three years beyond graduation. Please be aware that the information provided may be made public on the Research Council’s Gateway to Research [http://gtr.rcuk.ac.uk/]. For further information see [http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/researchoutcomes/] and for assistance please contact rpo@st-andrews.ac.uk.

China Scholarship Council (CSC)– University of St Andrews Scholarships (PhD Programmes), 2016 Round
This programme provides Chinese students who demonstrate academic excellence and leadership with the opportunity to study for a PhD at St Andrews. The programme is jointly funded by the China Scholarship Council and the University. The scheme will fund up to 30 scholarships per year and 10 visiting PhD scholars to conduct their research here. The 2016 process involved applications to St Andrews in November 2015 after which unconditional offers were sent to high calibre candidates. The candidates then had to apply to CSC. Selected candidates are being interviewed in China in January 2016. The Vice Principal (Research) and Provost will give a verbal update on progress at PGRC.

Amendments to Academic Alerts Policy
A working group has been reviewing the University policy on academic alerts. Following feedback from DoPGs that the academic alerts for postgraduate research students are not fit for purpose and were not being used by schools, these alerts have been removed. The new policy will pertain to only undergraduate and postgraduate taught students.

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Office

25 January 2016
At the October LTC and PGRC meetings, a new Location of Studies policy was approved subject to the following amendments:

a) Change text under ‘Formal Approval Process’ to read: ‘Undergraduate or taught postgraduate students who wish their term address to be outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews or plan to be away from their term address for a period of more than 10 consecutive days must first seek approval unless they are participating in an approved Study Abroad, External Placement or Collaborative Degree Programme which requires them to study away from St Andrews, for which the university has established a written agreement that specifies the alternative location(s) of study. Permission can be granted by the Head of School (or delegate) for academic purposes such as research in another laboratory, placements, access to libraries, field work etc. For non-academic purposes, the request must be forwarded to the relevant Registry Officer who may refer complex cases to the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) or the Pro Dean (Undergraduate).’

b) minor updates to the flowchart;

c) replace ‘degree’ with ‘qualification’;

d) amend flowchart to show that the Registry Officer will assess any request in consultation with Student Services.

These amendments have now been incorporated into the final version of the policy which will now be submitted to Academic Council in March 2016 for formal approval.

The policy and draft implementation plan are attached for information.

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor

22 January 2016
Rationale

All students are expected to reside at a term address within a commutable distance from St Andrews during their study unless they have formal permission from the University of St Andrews for their study location to be outside St Andrews. This permission can be granted for academic purposes: for example, to conduct essential research. This permission can also exceptionally be granted for non-academic purposes at Undergraduate or at Taught Postgraduate level with the support of the School and with agreed mechanisms in place for continued academic support. The relevant Pro Dean can be involved when the request is complex or when the School refers a case to the Registry Officer.

The University has a duty of care to all students and therefore must be able to contact all students at any point during their programme of study. In addition, the University must hold the current address for all students as well as an historic trail of previous addresses. It is also expected that students can readily access academic advice throughout academic study and that agreed mechanisms are in place to support this.

For students requiring a visa to study in the UK, the Home Office has introduced regulations also requiring Tier 4 Sponsors to hold the latest address of study for students as well as an historic trail of previous addresses\(^1\). The University must be able to show that the address we hold for a student, who has leave to remain in the UK on a Tier 4 licence, is accurate and that where students are not resident in St Andrews in term-time, they have permission to be outwith St Andrews. We must also demonstrate that students can engage appropriately with their studies at this location. Non-compliance with these Home Office regulations could entail a loss of the University’s Tier 4 sponsor licence and seriously affect our ability to admit overseas students. In response to these requirements the University has introduced procedures to monitor where students are located during the course of their studies.

Policy

The address at which a student lives while pursuing academic study is known as the “term address”. The UK term address must contain a full valid postcode for reporting purposes. Students must ensure that their term address is up-to-date and accurately reflected on their student record.

Students who are “resident in St Andrews for the purposes of study” should reside at a term address within a commutable distance from St Andrews.

The University defines “commutable distance from St Andrews” as a distance from St Andrews permitting students to attend the University during core working hours on a daily basis if required to do so.

\(^1\) UK Visas and Immigration, Tier 4 PBS Guidance,
All students who require their term address to be outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews for any reason must seek formal approval prior to the commencement of their programme of study, or prior to changing address. All students who require to be away from their term address; for example, to engage in fieldwork or research away from St Andrews, for a period must have the permission of the relevant Pro Dean. This policy does not override the regulatory requirement\(^2\) for student attendance with respect to absence from taught modules.

Overseas students must seek expert advice on the conditions of their Tier 4 visa prior to leaving the UK for any reason, eg leave of absence, fieldwork. Students who are on fieldwork or undertaking a placement as part of their academic studies must be approved via the normal channels. See PGR guidelines at: [http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategypolicy/policy/postgraduate/research/](http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategypolicy/policy/postgraduate/research/) or for Undergraduates and Masters students at [https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/utrec/guidelinespolicies/riskassessment/](https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/utrec/guidelinespolicies/riskassessment/). All students who are on fieldwork for longer than 28 days must inform Registry of their intended location. A reliable local contact must be declared on the risk assessment form.

**Formal Approval Process for Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate students**

Undergraduate or taught postgraduate students who wish their term address to be outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews or plan to be away from their term address for a period of more than 10 consecutive days must first seek approval unless they are participating in an approved Study Abroad, External Placement or Collaborative Degree Programme which requires them to study away from St Andrews, for which which the university has established a written agreement that specifies the alternative location(s) of study.

Permission can be granted by the Head of School (or delegate) for academic purposes such as research in another laboratory, access to libraries, field work etc. For non-academic purposes, the request must be forwarded to the relevant Registry Officer who may refer complex cases to the Pro Dean (Taught Postgraduate) or the Pro Dean (Undergraduate).

The Registry Officer, acting on behalf of the Pro Deans, can grant approval only in exceptional circumstances for a student to be resident outside the commutable distance from St Andrews for non-academic purposes. Postgraduate taught students are expected to reside at their term address for the duration of their programme, including the dissertation period. If permission to reside outside the permitted distance is granted, on academic or non-academic grounds, an agreed mechanism for continued academic support must be in place. Once approved, the consent and new address must be placed on the student record maintained in Registry.

**Formal Approval Process for Postgraduate Research students**

Postgraduate research students who wish their term address to be outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews must seek approval prior to the commencement of their programme of study or prior to changing address. This approval must be sought in writing, stating the grounds, from the School’s Director of Postgraduate Studies. If the case is complex, the Director of Postgraduate Studies can refer the decision to the Registry Officer who can consult the Pro Dean (Postgraduate Research). Once approved, the consent and new address must be placed on the student record maintained in Registry.

Students who are away from their term address for any reason, for more than 5 consecutive working days and up to 28 days, should inform their supervisor and School as a matter of routine. The period

---

of absence from the term address can be extended to 38 days if this includes time when the University is closed.

Students who will be away from their term address, for longer than a period of 28 consecutive days (including weekends) must seek approval from the School’s Director of Postgraduate Studies (a period of 38 days will apply where this time includes time when the University is closed). Once approved, the consent and new address must be placed on the student record maintained in Registry.

**Appendix 1**

*Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Students - Requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews – process diagram*

Request includes:
- Start and end dates
- New address
- Reason for request

Student requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews providing academic or non-academic rationale and proposing the mechanism for continued academic support.

---

Academic grounds

Student request should be sent to Head of School (or delegate) who assesses the request

---

Head of School notifies the Registry Officer who communicates decision to student, with instruction that student must update address via eVision and notify Registry Student Support Officer when complete.

---

Decision communicated

---

Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School, with instruction that student must update address via eVision and notify Registry Student Support Officer when complete.

---

Yes

---

No

---

Yes

---

No

---

Yes

---

No

---

No

---

Yes

---
Appendix 2

Postgraduate Research Students - Requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews – process diagram

Student requests to be located outwith the commutable distance from St Andrews

School (DoPG) assesses the impact of the request on studies.

Approved

No

School communicates decision to student.

Yes

Registry Officer reviews School approval and has opportunity to consult with ProDean (PGR) and Student Services

Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School.

Approved

No

Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School.

Yes

Request includes:
- Start and end dates
- New address
- Reason for request
Registry Officer communicates decision to student and School, with instruction that student must update address via eVision and notify Registry Student Support Officer when complete.
## Location of Studies: Draft Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit paper to Academic Council for approval – policy to come into immediate effect</td>
<td>Nicola Milton</td>
<td>By 29 Feb 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post new policy to University’s webpages with new cover sheet and remove the current PGT/PGR version</td>
<td>Lynn Balfour</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise LTC &amp; PGRC members that policy has been approved by Academic Council</td>
<td>Nicola Milton</td>
<td>Apr16 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft appropriate School handbook entries for 16/17</td>
<td>Lynn Balfour</td>
<td>By end Apr16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to the summary of all new/revised policies published at end of academic year</td>
<td>Lynn Balfour</td>
<td>By mid Jun16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email all Schools about new policy with instructions on what actions need to be taken</td>
<td>Alison Sandeman</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email all students and post Wednesday memo</td>
<td>Alison Sandeman</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send implementation update report to Academic Business Committee</td>
<td>Alison Sandeman</td>
<td>End Apr16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review policy following first year of implementation</td>
<td>Pro Deans (PG)</td>
<td>End May17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The e-Vision tool has been developed for PGR Location of Study by the SER Change of Circumstances Project: this tool makes the process much easier in terms of approval and recording address changes. Alison Sandeman will seek resource from the SER Project Board to extend this tool to PGTs and UGs.
UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

PGR TUTORING WORKING GROUP

The Postgraduate Research Committee is advised that the following Working Group has been established to take forward work with regard to PGR Tutoring. Any outcomes will be reported to both the Learning and Teaching Committee, and Postgraduate Research Committee.

Background

Following the ELIR in February/March 2015, the University received a formal recommendation to ‘ensure all postgraduate students who teach receive support from their schools for undertaking this role. This would complement the well-regarded training already provided centrally by CAPOD.’

In addition to this, in February 2015 a student survey highlighted widespread inconsistency across Schools with regard to the time that tutors spend preparing and marking, and receiving training and support.

In response to these concerns, a Workshop was held in May 2015 where Directors of Teaching and Module Coordinators shared and discussed examples of good practice across Schools. This was followed up by further discussion at the Postgraduate Research Committee, Learning & Teaching Committee and the Proctor’s Office ELIR Away Afternoon held in September 2015. As a result of the Away Afternoon it was agreed that the various suggestions made around this topic were translated into guidance for Schools on what they could do to improve as well as a firmer instruction to do better in the form of a policy statement.

It was agreed that a small Working Group be created to take forward this work by drafting and/or reviewing policies and guidance to Schools and students.

Membership

Paula Miles (Psychology & Neuroscience) - Convenor
Emily Feamster (Proctor’s Office) - Coordinator
Heather McKiggan-Fee (CAPOD)
David Evans (Modern Languages)

Remit

1. Create one policy document which outlines the University’s expectations, processes and rights in relation to postgraduate tutoring. The key areas to be covered would be:

   - Recruitment and selection
   - Role outline & expectations (hourly paid staff but also professional development)
   - Level at which tutors may teach/teaching and assessment duties
   - Orientation/induction
   - Designated point of contact with School
   - Structured training (centralised and local)
   - Supervision and monitoring
   - Ongoing support, development/review and mentoring
   - Rights and responsibilities as staff members
   - Recognition: guidance on eg HEA accreditation
2. Develop online resources and guidance for staff who support PGR tutors and for PGR tutors themselves: see Edinburgh University’s resource http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/tutors-demonstrators

3. Consider how best to communicate the policy/guidance to staff and students.

Note that it is not in the remit of the Group to review or make any recommendations about the level of pay to PGR tutors.

**Timescales**
Policy and guidance submitted to May 2016 cycle of meetings or early AY 2016/17.

**References**
Policy for Supervisors and Students in PGR Programmes
Policy on School based training for PGR Tutors
Report from Heather McKiggan-Fee
Material from May 15 Workshop
HR guidance
HR Data (number of PGR tutors in Schools) – report awaited from Vice-Principal (Governance)

Nicola Milton
Executive Officer to the Proctor

22 January 2016
Introduction

There has long been a consensus that the PGR regulations are not fit for purpose. A team consisting of the Pro Dean (PGR) James Palmer, Nicola Milton and Emmy Feamster have been co-ordinating a restructuring of the information so that the right information is more easily identifiable to both staff and students.

Existing Problems to be Addressed

- Information is covered in Senate Regulations, PGR Policy, and a number of other policies, often without any clear cross-referencing. This makes it hard for staff and students to find relevant information.
- There is significant repetition of points within PGR Policy.
- There is overlap between sections of PGR Policy, sections of the Senate Regulations, and other policy documents.
- There are some minor contradictions between PGR Policy, Senate Regulations and other policy documents.
- The structure of PGR Policy, with 16 sections, can make it hard for people to find the information they need – a problem compounded by thin cross-referencing (e.g. termination of studies is governed by sections on progress and termination, but the two are not cross-referenced).
- Some sections are structured as long prose paragraphs, which can obscure the number and variety of distinct points made within them.

In short: PGR Policy as it stands is inefficient and occasionally problematic in the ways that it presents information. The problems with PGR Policy mean that it is hard for staff and students to understand expectations, processes and rights, which in turn means that it is hard to use it to guide quality provision for PGRs.

Principles and Aims of Restructuring

- To improve the clarity of PGR Policy so that it is more useful to staff and students for understanding obligations, processes and rights involved with a PGR programme.
- To re-divide PGR Policy into three sections covering the key areas of relevance: registration, supervision, examination.
- To remove anything from the PGR Policy which is covered adequately elsewhere e.g. details on ethics approval or location of study. Links to existing policies will be included where necessary.
- To delete sections which repeat information covered adequately elsewhere in the PGR Policy.
- To remove internal contradictions, and to remove contradictions with Senate Regulations and other policy documents.
- To ensure that information is presented clearly (e.g. no crucial information is buried in the middle of a long paragraph on a different subject).
- To incorporate new policies based on recent working groups (length of study, fieldwork and progression reviews).
- To move sections of PGR Policy to existing policy documents where more appropriate e.g. leave of absence.
Dr James Palmer
Pro Dean (Research Postgraduate)

2 December 2015

References

Policy for Supervisors and Students in Research Postgraduate Programmes
http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/staff/teaching/strategypolicy/policy/postgraduate/research/

Postgraduate Senate Regulations
SAMPLE

POLICY ON THE SUPERVISION OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS

Supervision of postgraduate research students varies enormously, depending on the subject area, the background and needs of the student, and the work patterns and personalities of the student and supervisors. Nevertheless, both students and supervisors have certain responsibilities that must be fulfilled. The responsibilities described below should be seen not as comprehensive but indicative.

1. Definitions and requirements

There must always be one clearly identified point of contact for the student, this will generally be the Principal (or main) supervisor who will be part of the supervisory team. Supervision of research degree students should involve at least two people.

At least one member of the supervisory team will be currently engaged in research in the relevant discipline(s), so as to ensure that the direction and monitoring of the student’s progress is informed by up to date subject knowledge and research developments. Breadth of experience and knowledge across the supervisory team will mean that the student always has access to someone with experience of supporting research student(s) through to successful completion of their programme.

**Principal Supervisor**
A member of the academic staff of the University appointed to supervise a Research Degree student. The Principal Supervisor normally will have relevant research expertise in the proposed study area. Principal Supervisors are normally full-time members of academic staff in the post of Lecturer and above. Exceptional arrangements for other academic staff may be allowed by agreement with the Pro Dean.

**Second Supervisor**
A member of the academic staff who primarily acts as a mentor to the student. They will provide advice and support independent from the Principal Supervisor as necessary and may also provide pastoral support. The Second Supervisor may also provide appropriate specialist subject expertise in the research area; provide continuity of support when the Principal Supervisor is absent and/or act as a mentor to the Principal Supervisor when the Principal Supervisor does not have the required experience of supporting a Research degree student through to graduation.

**Joint Supervisor**
May be appointed when the research expertise required to support the student spans two or more research areas and therefore the supervision of the student is shared between two members of academic staff. The proportions of supervision are normally agreed at the start of the arrangement, 50:50, 70:30 etc.

**Industrial Supervisor**
An individual who is responsible for the local supervision of a student whilst they are on an industrial placement. This individual will not normally be the Principal Supervisor.

2. Appointment of Research Supervisors

Supervisors for postgraduate research students are appointed by the relevant School usually at the time an applicant for admission to postgraduate study is formally accepted. Supervisors are normally full-time members of academic staff, although alternative arrangements may be allowed by agreement with the Dean of the relevant Faculty.
The University cannot guarantee continuity with a particular supervisor throughout the duration of any postgraduate degree. In exceptional circumstances, alternative supervisory arrangements may be necessary.

It is the responsibility of the Head of School to ensure that new supervisors are introduced to the content of this Policy, either by University induction courses or by School-arranged procedures. New supervisors should be knowledgeable about supervisory procedures required by the University and by the School and any other related matters deemed appropriate by the Head of School. Experienced supervisors should be briefed about new policies and procedures in a timely and effective way.

The number of research students assigned to any one principal supervisor must be closely monitored by the relevant Head of School, who must take into account the overall workload distribution of the supervisor. In cases where a supervisor has primary responsibility for more than six full-time equivalent research students, the Head of School must be able to provide satisfactory assurance to the Pro Dean that such supervision does not impose a level of responsibility upon the member of staff that may be detrimental to the progress of the research students concerned.

On occasion the mentoring role of the second supervisor may raise the prospect of dealing with difficulties in the student’s relationship with the principal supervisor. If there are any circumstances that might make it awkward for the student to discuss such difficulties with the second supervisor, the School Director of Postgraduate Studies should ensure that the student is put in touch with another member of staff, or the Pro Dean who can fulfil this pastoral role.

For the EngD, the Head of School shall appoint an academic principal supervisor and an industrial supervisor. The latter shall be a member of staff of the industrial organisation that is sponsoring the student. The organisation will be a participant in the Engineering Doctorate Scheme. External supervision may also be needed for CASE PhD students, periods of fieldwork or placement, and external PhD students. In all such cases, however, an academic member of staff at St Andrews should be designated as principal supervisor.

3. Frequency of Supervision

Supervisors have contact with research students at least 10 times per session for substantive discussions of the student’s work (contact can be both in person and / or email). Supervisors and students should keep a record of such contacts. In circumstances where it has not proved possible to have contact 10 times per session (or where this is anticipated), the principal supervisor is responsible for notifying the relevant Head of School as soon as possible and informing him/her of the circumstances. Contact may be more frequent than 10 times per session in the early stages of work, depending on the discipline.

Supervisors should give particular attention to overseas students in the early stages. Students whose first language is not English may be required to attend, prior to matriculation, a specified English language course in the University. It is the responsibility of the Head of School, in consultation with the supervisor, to monitor that the student attends this course and that the student’s knowledge of English is sufficient to enable the research to proceed satisfactorily. If a student requires further language support, the student should be referred to English Language Teaching, ideally as early as possible in his or her studies.

Part-time students may also require special attention from supervisors. They may find it difficult to meet regularly with supervisors and devote enough time to research. The supervisor should be aware of these problems and deal with them sympathetically, while still ensuring that the student gets launched on the project without undue delay and maintains good progress.

4. Responsibilities of Supervisor
Principal supervisors should:

- establish mutually agreed means of communication and contact with the student. Supervisors are expected to be accessible to research students at appropriate times when advice may be needed.
- give written as well as oral feedback on any submitted work within a reasonable period of time after submission. This written feedback should contain constructive criticism so that students are aware of potential problems.
- ensure that the student has received the appropriate ethical clearance from UTREC and the Child Panel prior to research commencing (see also student responsibilities).
- ensure that a risk assessment is undertaken, as appropriate, and that the student is fully aware of the risks and precautions that apply to the conduct of such research. Risk assessments also need to account for disabilities, where relevant.
- work with the student to ensure that they are taking an appropriate course of research skills training, to be reported at the annual progress review.
- ensure that students have adequate space (bench, desk) in the School, or elsewhere in the University, where they can work.
- inform Heads of School if they intend to be absent for any length of time so that alternative supervision may be arranged.
- attend at least one of the two annual supervision update sessions per year.

Principal supervisors are responsible for providing guidance about:

- defining a suitable research topic that can be completed in a timely fashion.
- the nature and techniques of research.
- the standard expected for the degree.
- the planning of the research programme.
- literature and sources.
- required attendance at taught classes.
- copyright implications of working on certain subject areas, in particular given the requirement for the electronic publication of theses, and about the embargoes of work where publication would have commercial, professional, legal or ethical consequences again in particular given the requirement for the electronic publication of theses.
- presenting work at appropriate conferences, and publishing papers and patents.
- career intentions, and assist them (as appropriate) to acquire skills relevant to their intended career development, and make referrals to the Careers Centre, CAPOD, or programmes offered by professional societies as appropriate.

The Director of Postgraduate Studies is responsible for completion of an annual report on the performance of their research students to be submitted to Registry by month nine (for full-time students).

5. Responsibilities of Research Students

The primary responsibility of research students is to pursue their research with diligence and according to the highest standards of their discipline, taking due account of the advice and criticism offered by their supervisors and other scholars in their field(s).

Students should:

- Live in accordance with the University’s Location of Study Policy.
- agree a schedule for obtaining research skills training in the areas identified by the supervisor. It is the responsibility of research students to adhere to this schedule for
training, and they should inform the principal supervisor without delay regarding any difficulties in doing so.

- establish mutually agreed means of communication and contact with the supervisor. Students who intend to be absent, on fieldwork, or who are not resident have a particular obligation to inform and maintain contact with their supervisor.
- Be responsible for keeping appointments punctually and are expected to be diligent in meeting deadlines for submitted work or the advancement of their projects.
- Be responsible for adhering to health, safety and security guidelines operative within their place of study or research. If working away from St Andrews, students must take due precautions appropriate to their place of study or research.
- Obtain any necessary ethics approval for their research.
- agree with their supervisors a mutually satisfactory means of communication and contact. Students who intend to be absent, on fieldwork, or who are not resident have a particular obligation to inform and maintain contact with their supervisor.
- take note of and respond to criticism of submitted work and all advice concerning the progress of their work made by supervisors.
- discuss with their supervisors opportunities for presenting their work within and outwith the University in order to obtain feedback from a wide range of scholars and in order to gain experience of making research presentations.
- submit annually (on the form provided) a personal progress report to Registry.
- have ultimate responsibility for the form and content of the thesis that they submit.
- have ultimate responsibility for deciding the appropriate time for thesis submission, having taken due account of the principal supervisor's opinion and regulations governing duration of study.

Students are entitled to reasonable periods of absence and holiday, provided that these are properly agreed in advance with the principal supervisor and conform to the stipulations of the funding body (if applicable).

6. Problems with Supervision

One of the most important functions of the supervisor is to provide constructive criticism of the student’s work. Students also should not hesitate to make known their concerns to supervisors. Open and frank discussion between supervisor and research student from the outset is encouraged in order to avert potential future difficulties or growing misunderstandings.

Occasionally the relationship between a student and the principal supervisor will break down. If the second supervisor is unable to resolve problems, then the student and/or supervisor should report difficulties in writing to the Head of School in the first instance, who may refer the matter, if necessary, to the Pro Dean. Prompt action must be taken to resolve the conflict. Where necessary, a student or a supervisor may request from the Head of School a change of supervisor. All such changes must be notified to Registry to be agreed by the Pro Dean. (see 9.7 Change of supervisor).

If a student falls ill for an extended period of time, s/he (or the supervisor where the student is incapable of acting on their own behalf) should submit relevant documentation to Registry requesting leave of absence (see 9.3 Leave of absence).

On occasion, it may be necessary to engage an external supervisor for an extended time. This is for cases where no other alternative is possible (e.g. departure of a supervisor prior to completion of a student’s PhD). The Head of School should propose the name of an external supervisor to the Pro Dean after consultation with the student. The Head of School must authorise payment by the School of any necessary travelling expenses, etc. for supervisors or students. The level of fee for an external supervisor should be calculated on a range related to external examiner fees. External supervisors are expected to meet the student at least three times per semester.
The PGR Policy review identified Leave of Absence as one instance where a PGR policy would be better situated in an already existing policy. The information below, which reflects current practice, has been drawn from the Policy for Supervisors and Students in Research Postgraduate Programmes and incorporated into the existing policy for UG and PGT students. No new policy is being introduced with this document, rather the current policy is being moved to a more appropriate location.

This policy will be submitted to Academic Council in March 2016 for formal approval. The policy and draft implementation plan are attached for information.

Emily Feamster
Postgraduate Administrative Officer
Proctor’s Officer

26 January 2016
Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Students

Principles
The term ‘Leave of Absence’ is used to denote a period of time where the University permits a student to disengage with their studies and return at a later date. Where a student is granted Leave of Absence during a semester, any progress in all modules within that semester will be removed from the student’s record and replaced with an indication that Leave of Absence was taken.

Leave of Absence can be applied for by a student but is not a guaranteed right, and falls within the scope of Senate regulations.

The granting of Leave of Absence may also alter the student’s circumstances in such a way that non-University legislation and policy are affected (such as funding body requirements, visa regulations and council tax liability). It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that they make themselves aware of the implications, and meet any additional requirements that a change of circumstances may impose upon them.

While the University cannot guarantee that the same programme of study will still be available following a Leave of Absence period, the University keeps a note of students on leave and will ensure when making such changes that there are acceptable pathways available for completion.

Conditions for Requesting a Leave of Absence
A student may apply to the Registry Officer (Student Support) for a Leave of Absence in any semester where exceptional circumstances have affected, are currently affecting, or will affect the ability of the student to engage with their studies. In addition the following circumstances are likely to apply.

- The student or University feels that these circumstances cannot reasonably be accommodated by other means such as allowance for absence or extensions or deferrals.
- The student has not completed all the assessments for the module.
- The request for a Leave of Absence has been made during the teaching weeks or in advance of the semester. Requests for a Leave of Absence that are made after the end of teaching will not normally be approved and will therefore be escalated to the Pro Dean (Undergraduate) for consideration.

If a student requesting Leave of Absence is not able, or permitted, to complete 20 credits in the semester affected by the request, substantial evidence will be required for a leave of absence request to be considered.

If a student fails two attempts to re-engage following an agreed leave of absence, e.g returns to study on an agreed date but fails to complete the expected period of study, they will be subject to the Termination of Studies process unless there are exceptional circumstances which the University considers merit a different outcome.

A student may apply for Leave of Absence for up to a maximum of four consecutive or non-consecutive semesters in total during their period of registration. Additional semesters may be requested in exceptional circumstances.

Duration of Leave of Absence

- For undergraduate students the minimum duration of a Leave of Absence is one semester.
• For taught postgraduate students during teaching weeks, the minimum duration of a Leave of Absence is one semester. Shorter periods of leave may be granted during the dissertation period of the PGT programme.
• Students on inbound study abroad or exchange programmes will only be granted a Leave of Absence if their programme of study specifies that they are to return after their Leave of Absence is due to finish, for a minimum of one semester.
• Non-graduating, credit-only lifelong learning students will not be permitted to take a Leave of Absence.

Compulsory Leave of Absence
If a student fails to meet the University Senate Regulations for attendance, a compulsory Leave of Absence will normally be required.

Date of Final Attendance
Leave of Absence is granted on the basis of the student’s last date of attendance, not the date the application is made or approved.

Other Implications
Students should note that Leave of Absence may have significant financial and visa consequences, as well as implications on the right to remain in University accommodation.

Re-engagement
Students wishing to re-engage must provide evidence to show that the circumstances for which they were granted a Leave of Absence have now been managed and that any conditions for re-engagement have been met. When a student is due to return in Semester One from a Leave of Absence, and has any deferred exams, they will be re-engaged in time to sit deferred exams in the August re-sit diet.

If a student has not re-engaged or re-registered at the end of a period of Leave of Absence, this will be handled under the Failure to Register policy.

Exceptions to policy
Any exceptions to the policy must be referred to the relevant Pro Dean.

Appeals and Complaints
Students have the right of appeal through the University’s appeals process: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/students/rules/appeals/policy/

Research Postgraduate Students

Principles
The term ‘Leave of Absence’ is used to denote a period of time where the University permits a student to disengage with their studies and return at a later date.

Leave of Absence can be applied for by a student but is not a guaranteed right, and falls within the scope of Senate regulations.

The granting of Leave of Absence may also alter the student’s circumstances in such a way that non-University legislation and policy are affected (such as funding body requirements, visa regulations and council tax liability). It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that they make themselves aware of the implications, and meet any additional requirements that a change of circumstances may impose upon them.

While the University cannot guarantee that the same programme of study will still be available following a Leave of Absence period, the University keeps a note of students on leave and will ensure when making such changes that there are acceptable pathways available for completion.

Conditions for Requesting a Leave of Absence
A student may apply to the Postgraduate Research Pro Dean, via MMS, for a Leave of Absence at any
point in their studies where exceptional circumstances have affected, are currently affecting, or will affect the ability of the student to engage with their studies.

If a student fails two attempts to re-engage following an agreed leave of absence, e.g. returns to study on an agreed date but fails to complete the expected period of study, they will be subject to the Termination of Studies process unless there are exceptional circumstances which the University considers merit a different outcome.

**Process for Requesting a Leave of Absence**

Application for leave of absence should be made to the Pro Dean, via MMS, and the following information may be required:

- The duration of the period of leave of absence requested, including initial and final dates
- The grounds for leave of absence, e.g. medical or personal, giving brief details of the circumstances.
- Documentary support for the request if appropriate. This should always be provided if the request is on medical grounds. It is the responsibility of the student to obtain such medical evidence, e.g. in the form of a certificate from his/her doctor.
- A realistic and full plan for completion by the end of the recalculated period, which has been approved by the principal supervisor, and will include specific details and timings.
- A supporting letter from the principal supervisor or programme co-ordinator.
- If notification to a research council is required, then all information required by the research council should be submitted with the request.
- The request should be made as soon as possible. If, for example, there is a possibility that an illness may be long term, then a reasonable initial period of leave should be requested, and further periods requested as appropriate.
- If leave of absence is approved, Registry will send a notice stating the dates for which leave has been granted. If a student is sponsored by a UK research council or similar body, it is important that these dates are adhered to in correspondence with the research councils or sponsoring bodies.

**Duration of Leave of Absence**

- The minimum duration of a Leave of Absence is one month.
- The maximum duration of an initial Leave of Absence request is 1 year.
- A research postgraduate student may request multiple leaves of absence, but may not exceed a total of two years.
- Students may not request a Leave of Absence extending beyond their current expected end date.

**Compulsory Leave of Absence**

If a student fails to meet the University Senate Regulations for attendance, a compulsory Leave of Absence will normally be required.

**Date of Final Attendance**

Leave of Absence is granted on the basis of the student’s last date of attendance, not the date the application is made or approved.

**Other Implications**

Students should note that Leave of Absence may have significant financial and visa consequences, as well as implications on the right to remain in University accommodation.

**Re-engagement**

Students wishing to re-engage must provide evidence to show that the circumstances for which they
were granted a Leave of Absence have now been managed and that any conditions for re-engagement have been met.

If a student has not re-engaged or re-registered at the end of a period of Leave of Absence, this will be handled under the Failure to Register policy.

Exceptions to policy
Any exceptions to the policy must be referred to the relevant Pro Dean.

Appeals and Complaints
Students have the right of appeal through the University’s appeals process: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/students/rules/appeals/policy/
## Leave of Absence: Draft Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit paper to Academic Council for approval – policy to come into immediate effect</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>By 29 Feb 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post new policy to University’s webpages with new cover sheet and remove the current UG/PGT version</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>Following Academic Council approval on 9 Mar 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise PGRC members that policy has been approved by Academic Council</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>Apr 16 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email re updated location of policy to be circulated to: Directors of Postgraduate Studies, School Secretaries, Pro Dean PGR, Professional Services (Registry and Student Services), Iain Cupples</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>By end Apr 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add to the summary of all new/revised policies published at end of academic year</td>
<td>Emily Feamster</td>
<td>By mid Jun 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>