

PGR Annual Review Guidelines for Reviewers (Assessors)

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 any concerns they may have, for example with their supervisory arrangements.

The structure of the progress review

Shortly before the annual review is due, the student should contact reviewers to arrange the review meeting. According to the new Progress Reviews for Postgraduate Research Students policy available at <https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/media/teaching-and-learning/policies/progress-review-policy.pdf>, **two reviewers are to be present at all review meetings.**

In first year the student will submit a 10 Month Report. A short report (about 3 pages) is required in year 2 review. For year 3 review students should bring a detailed thesis plan, agreed with their Supervisor.

Prior to each meeting, students should complete their self-assessment form (available on MMS) and bring a paper copy of this to the meeting with the reviewers.

The Supervisor's report should also be completed prior to the meeting and should be available to all involved in the review process.

Reviewers will read submitted 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.

To complete the electronic form, go to MMS → CHM-RESEARCH (Y1) → Postgraduate Administration, click Annual Progress Reports tab. Note: there is a delay as a large table is being generated. You should see "Create new" link next to the student being reviewed (see screenshot below), click this to open the new review form.

Postgraduate Administration

This page allows you to manage various forms involved with administration of postgraduate research students.

Examining Committee Nomination Leave of Absence / Extension Annual Progress Reports						
School of Chemistry (182) Change view						
First Name	Surname	Matric Num	Reviewers	Supervisors	Students	
Amane	Abdoun	140024079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create new 04/12/2015 	Create new		
Mohd	Abdul Manan	130000011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create new 24/10/2016 31/07/2015 18/09/2014 	Create new		
Rana	Abdul Razzak	130023752	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create new 25/10/2016 18/12/2015 	Create new		

Complete the report (one for the two reviewers) and press “Save” button to save your data. The report can be edited at this stage, press “Submit review” button when finalised. This will forward the report to PG Convener, who will process it and decide whether any further action is needed (such as arranging for re-review, discussing supervisory concerns with those involved, re-registration to another degree etc.).

Expectations of reviewers

Reviewers are expected to read submitted 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. Reviewers are encouraged to ask about, and give advice on, the normal range of supervisory concerns, but are not expected to deal with especially complex or sensitive matters. The student should be directed to the DoPG/PG Convener, Pastoral Adviser (Prof Slawin, Dr Clarke), PGR Pro Dean or Registry Student Support Officer to discuss these concerns.