

SASP Annual Review of Research 2010/11

Each SASP research student is reviewed each academic year, in accordance with the St Andrews University Postgraduate Code of Practice. This includes both part-time and full-time students, and both MPhil and PhD.

MLitt students are 'reviewed' at the June Exam Board, when a decision is taken over progression to dissertation or transfer to MPhil.

Students who are visiting the SASP PhD programme for one year or less will not be reviewed.

1. Timing.

The deadline for conducting all reviews and submitting agreed reports to Faculty is 31 July.

Reviews for all PhD students (both full-time and part-time) and for part-time MPhil students should be held in June or July, with all documentation completed by 24 July to allow submission to Faculty by 31 July.

Full-time MPhil students should be reviewed in January or February, with all documentation completed by 1 March.

Reviews should be held late only in exceptional circumstances. If PhD reviews cannot be conducted during June or July, then they should be held *earlier*, not later.

2. Allocation of Reviewers.

The allocation of reviewers will take place early in the second semester, to allow plenty of time for reviews to be arranged. At this time, the SASP director will advise students and reviewers of the requirements for the review.

The first step in the allocation process is the responsibility of students. Students should approach two members of staff whom they would like to review their work. Reviewers should be drawn from the faculty of the two institutions, and cannot include either of the student's two current supervisors. However, any previous first and second supervisors can serve as reviewers. Students should then send the names of two staff members have agreed to review to both the Director and the secretary for Graduate Studies.

The SASP Joint Committee will appoint two reviewers for each student: though these will usually be the two members of staff who have agreed to review, the committee may vary the reviewers, for good reason, such as the distribution of work load for staff. (The SASP director will draw up a draft allocation, to be approved by the Committee.)

3. Prior to the Review.

It is the responsibility of the research student to arrange a date and time for the review.

The first supervisor must submit a report on the student's progress during the year, and plans for the next year. Supervisors are strongly encouraged to identify any concerns that may affect the student's subsequent progress towards their degree: early identification of such issues greatly assists in resolving short-term or long-term concerns.

Students should submit a report on their progress to the Postgraduate Office.

Students should also send the following to their two reviewers at least ONE week in advance of the agreed date of the review.

1. A (provisional) contents list which details both chapter headings and sub-sections.
2. A brief summary of each chapter of the thesis. (No more than 100 words per chapter.) This can be a long summary of the main research goals if the student is in their first year.
3. Sample chapters as set out in the Appendix below.
4. A bibliography.
5. A current CV.
6. A plan of research for the forthcoming year, including any plans for submissions of papers to conferences and journals.
7. A predicted date of submission.
8. The student should also submit their graduate logbook. This is so that the panel can review the frequency of their supervision, and their attendance at Gradskills courses or other seminars.
9. The student may also submit any philosophical work or papers that are not part of their PhD (or MPhil), though this work cannot be deemed to take the place of what they are expected to have produced for their PhD (or MPhil).

4. Conduct of the Review.

Each review should last from 1-2 hrs.

The primary purpose of the review is to assess whether the student is making satisfactory progress towards their PhD (or MPhil), and to assess whether they will submit their thesis on time. The review also provides an opportunity for each student to give feedback on their supervision arrangements, and to provide a forum to air any research-related concerns or grievances in complete confidentiality.

The review process is definitely NOT an additional form of supervision. Student should NOT expect detailed philosophical feedback on their work. However, reviewers may provide such feedback if appropriate. The reviewers are also encouraged, where appropriate, to comment on the CV/research plan of the student and give guidance as to the student's future plans for conference submissions, publications, and job applications.

5. After the Review.

The first reviewer is responsible for reporting the results of the progress review. This report should provide (a) a summary of the progress of the student concerned, and (b) a statement of any requirements that reviewers deem the student must meet by the time of their next review in order for their progress to count as satisfactory.

The first reviewer sends the report to the Head of School, and a copy to the Director of Graduate Studies. A copy will be kept in the student's file, and sent to the student's supervisors.

The Head of School will then report to the Faculty and to the student, using the School Annual Progression Report. Please ensure that the first reviewer's report contains the information the Head of School requires to complete the School Annual Progression Report. The Academic Management and Support Office will action (subject to Faculty Business Committee approval) any changes to the student's registration, as indicated on the School Report.

Should the progress of any student be deemed to be less than satisfactory then a further review will typically take place six months after the original review. In the event that any progress remains less than satisfactory at this further review then a PhD student may be required to take the MPhil degree instead. In extreme cases, the student will be required to terminate their studies.

Appendix. Sample Chapter Requirements.

The requirements for writing sample depends on what stage the student is at. The requirements are as follows. In all cases, if the student is near to submission then they should submit as much as possible.

Full-Time PhD Students.

First Year: At least one sample chapter (or a sample of work relevant to the PhD). (Circa 15,000 words.)

Second Year: At least two sample chapters. (Circa 30,000 words.)

Third Year: At least three sample chapters. (Circa 45,000 words.)

Part-Time PhD Students.

First Year: A sample of work relevant to the PhD (Circa 8,000 to 12,000 words. At least 12,000 if student is aiming to finish in 4 years.)

Second Year: At least one sample chapter. (Circa 15,000 to 24,000 words. At least 24,000 if student is aiming to finish in 4 years.)

Third Year: At least one sample chapter. (Circa 24,000 to 36,000 words. Two chapters, and at least 36,000 if student is aiming to finish in 4 years.)

Fourth Year: At least two sample chapters. (Circa 30,000 to 45,000 words. At least 45,000 if student is aiming to finish in 4 years.)

Fifth Year: At least three sample chapters. (Circa 40,000 to 45,000 words. At least 45,000 if student is aiming to finish in 5 years.)

Sixth Year: At least three sample chapters. (Circa 45,000 words.)

MPhil Students (both full-time and part-time).

First Year: At least one sample chapter (or a sample of work relevant to the MPhil). (Circa 15,000 words.)

Second Year (part-time only): At least two sample chapters. (Circa 30,000 words.)