



SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, PHYSICAL AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES: Department of Computer Science

Annual Review Information:

Timeline:

You will be notified approximately 6 weeks before each of your review deadlines, informing you that you are due to undertake an annual review. It is expected that you will liaise with your supervisory team to arrange the meeting at a time that suits all involved.

Two weeks before your meeting is due to take place, you will need to send a copy of all the relevant documents to your supervisory panel, with the [Doctoral School](#) copied in.

Within a week of the meeting taking place – one of the members of the panel (typically your supervisor) should ensure the [annual review form](#) is signed by all parties, and then submitted with the supporting documents to the [Doctoral School](#) for processing.

Three Month Review:

Students in the Department of Computer Science undertake their first progression review meeting after 3 months of starting their course. This is a streamlined version of a full annual review, involving only a short report describing the training received to date and the plans for the remainder of the academic year.

First Annual Review:

The first full Annual Review ought to take place within the first eight months of study. This time, the student is expected to provide a report describing the work carried out so far and assessing how far the objectives set after the first three months have been met.

Second Annual Review:

For Full-Time students, the second Annual Review will be due within twenty months of starting study. In many cases, this Annual Review will be considered an Upgrade meeting instead of an Annual Review. Please refer to the [Upgrades in the Department of Computer Science](#) for further information about this meeting.

Third Annual Review and Pre-Submission Interview:

Your final full Annual Review is due to take place within 33 months of study. This meeting will also include a viva to discuss your progress.

In your writing-up year, you will be invited to complete a Pre-Submission Interview six months before your final submission deadline. This meeting will take place with the Director of Postgraduate Education or their Nominee.

Part-Time Students:

The timescale for progression for part-time students is pro-rata with respect to the Full-Time Equivalent. The First Annual Review is due within twelve months. It is important to note that part time students should still undertake an annual review each year.

Research Colloquium:

Each year you will be expected to give a talk at the Annual Postgraduate Research Colloquium in the School. This normally takes place in May or June and is considered a part of the requirements for a successful progression meeting.

Composition of the Annual Review Panel:

In order to be considered properly constituted, your annual review panel must consist of **at least one** member of your supervisory team, **as well as** an independent member of staff from the Department/School.

Annual Review Documentation:

As part of the Annual Review Process, you are expected to submit a written report showing your progress to date. The exact structure and format of this report should be discussed with your supervisor. In addition to this, you will be required to submit the following documents **at least two weeks prior** to your meeting taking place:

- [PGR Student Training Log](#)
- [Supervisory Meetings Log](#)
- Ethical Review Form (If Required)
- A copy of the Confirmation of Completion Receipt from the latest PRES Survey.

Annual Review Outcomes:

After your meeting has taken place, there are three possible outcomes that the Annual Review Panel can choose from. These are:

- Good progress
- Satisfactory progress, save for minor concerns in one or more areas
- Unsatisfactory progress

If you receive an outcome of 'Unsatisfactory progress', you will be required to undertake a further review within a few months of the original meeting. The deadline for this referral meeting will be clearly stated on the Annual Review form and confirmed by the Doctoral School when the form is processed. In certain cases, the department/School may consider whether to issue a formal warning.