

Direct start PhD Progression Procedure

- i. Direct start PhD students are normally expected to undertake 60 CATS of taught modules in the first year of the PhD. Exceptions may be agreed with the approval of the AS CDT Director and MSc Director (or substitute where they are part of the student's direct supervisory team) within the context of framework approval from the WASC & AS CDT Management Committee; this may be the case where:
 - A student has previously taken MSc level analytical science modules at Warwick;
 - A student has transferred onto the AS CDT programme in later years (year 2 onwards).
- ii. Students must achieve an average of 60% or more across the required number of modules and at least 50% in each module to progress to the next year of their PhD project.
- iii. Where (ii) is not satisfied, and there are mitigating circumstances, the Mitigating Circumstances Panel for the MSc courses will make a recommendation as to whether the requirements should be deemed satisfied; or whether resits should be offered.
- iv. Where (ii) is not satisfied, the matter should proceed to a designated Review Panel. The Review Panel should consist of three members of the WASC & AS CDT Management Committee (who are not part of the student's direct supervisory team). The AS CDT Director and MSc Director would not normally be part of the review panel. The review panel should consider:
 - a. The recommendations from the AS CDT Director and/or the MSc Director on the progress of the student and any additional circumstance not covered in the reports below.
 - b. The minutes and recommendations from the Mitigating Circumstances panel.
 - c. The reports of the student's supervisor(s) and advisory panel on their progress with their PhD project, the student's aptitude for the project, and the commitment displayed by the student to the project.
 - d. Whether the student is likely to produce a PhD thesis by the end of their funded period.

The Review Panel should meet with the student to discuss what is required of the student in order for satisfactory progress to be made.

- v. The Review Panel may:
 - a. recommend to the WASC & AS CDT Management Committee approval for progression to the next year of the PhD where it is satisfied that the student's progress on the project is satisfactory, or
 - b. require improvement in levels of attendance, output of results, level of background/literature knowledge, quality of data, or any matter directly pertinent to progress in the PhD.

This must conclude for a determination to be made as to the points at (iv) no later than within 1 year of completion of full-time equivalent PhD work. i.e. where the student commenced in October and undertook 6 months of taught modules, this would normally be 18 months into the studentship (adjusted for any period of temporary withdrawal or part-time study).

- vi. Where the Review Panel is satisfied by the student's progress measured against the goals at (v) at the conclusion of the specified period, the Review Panel should confirm this in writing to the WASC & AS CDT Management Committee, who would normally approve progression of the student. Approval may be granted by email by a majority of the Committee.
- vii. Where the Review Panel is not satisfied by progress or where progress is considered to be borderline, the Review Panel should write to the student. The written communication should offer clear recommendations and/or goals to be achieved within a specified period. Appropriate support for the student should also be signposted. Recommendations should normally be achievable within 3 months.

The Review Panel should also notify the Director of the AS CDT. Where the Director is the student's supervisor, a nominated representative of the WASC & AS CDT Management Committee should be notified.

- viii. A further meeting should be arranged with the student, the Review Panel, and the student's supervisor to determine whether satisfactory progress has been made. A record of this meeting should be made and retained by the CDT Administrator.
- ix. Where the outcome of the meeting at viii. is that satisfactory progress has not been made, then the Review Panel can recommend that either:
 - a. the student must embark on a degree of lower standing; or
 - b. the student will be required to withdraw (Regulation 36).
- x. The student will have the right of appeal to the University's Continuation of Registration Committee.