

## **General Guidelines**

### **1) Submission of Half Yearly progress reports:**

- 1.1 The research scholars of all categories must submit half-yearly progress reports (i.e. one for each semester), to her/his supervisor, starting from the date of confirmation of registration. The report shall include an elaborate description of the reading, writing, data collection or any other work done in relation to the research. The PhD Scholar must submit a 4-5 page progress report to the Supervisor, Doctoral Progress Committee (DPC) members and International Co-supervisor (appointed by the University) before 10 days of the scheduled DPC review. The respective Supervisors/ Convener shall inform the scholar, well in advance, the review date and venue in consultation with the Doctoral Progress Committee's (DPC's) members and make suitable arrangement so that the Co-Supervisor may join the review electronically (if possible).
- 1.2 *An International co-supervisor shall provide academic advice and practical support, as well as take part in review and provide input for progress reports and recommendations. The precise responsibilities of the co-supervisors may be determined in each case in consultation with the Supervisor.*
- 1.3 *The Supervisor in consultation with the Co-Supervisor of the PhD Scholar may jointly determine when the student is ready to proceed for submission of synopsis and thesis, and when the student is ready for the final Public Viva-Voce.*
- 1.4 The DPC, comprising of the two external experts appointed by the University for each student and the Supervisor, shall meet to review the progress of the Research Programme of the student at the end of every term/semester as per the DPC review schedule notified by the University (Kindly refer to the University's website for DPC review schedule). It is advised that the Supervisors should strictly follow the review schedule as notified by the University. However, under very compelling circumstances the University may grant permission for extension, subject to approval by the Vice Chancellor.
- 1.5 Each progress report should contain the achievements during the period under review and plans for the rest of the program. Each report will have provision for both – the student and the supervisor/s – to voice their issues and concerns during the study.
- 1.6 The student shall clearly state sources from which the information is derived, the animal and human ethical approvals, obtained, if any, the extent to which the work of others has been made use of, and the portion of the work the researcher claims as original.
- 1.7 The Supervisor shall certify the reports and the reviews, including Research Week Reviews, Supervisor should specifically mention whether the progress is satisfactory and accepted or not. Only after the Supervisor's and Doctoral Progress Committee's (DPC's) approval regarding the satisfactory progress of the work, the student shall be allowed to continue his/her research in the next term/semester. Incomplete Review Comments shall render that particular DPC null and void and shall not be counted.

- 1.8 If 3 consecutive DPC reviews of particular PhD research scholar are not approved / not accepted / not successful then the PhD admission of that research scholar will be cancelled subject to recommendation of the same from his / her supervisor.
- 1.9 The Research Scholars shall have to present their work at every annual research week, organized by the University. Every Research Scholar shall have to remain present in person as per the schedule announced by the University. However, under very compelling circumstances, special permission for a presentation by SKYPE or any other electronic means and for the review may be given, if a research scholar applies for it, well in advance, with specific reasons.
- 1.10 The Supervisor shall remain present at all the Reviews including the Open Seminar and Research Week of the PhD scholar. University shall reimburse Travelling expenditure, as per GTU norms, to Supervisors and DPC members for attending the review of the PhD Scholar along with a modest honorarium; however, any other facilities related to boarding/lodging, venue etc. shall not be provided by GTU. In addition, a sum of Rs.500/- per day shall be provided to the respective Supervisor towards making necessary arrangements for the review.
- 1.11 Unless justified by Supervisor two consecutive, failures to submit half-yearly progress reports and annual progress reports (as per conditions mentioned above) and failure to present their work at the Research Week of the University is likely to lead to cancellation of PhD registration.

## **2) Number of Reviews by the Doctoral Progress Committee:**

- 2.1 The Doctoral Progress Committee must meet at least twice in a year to review the progress of each scholar until the scholar submits the synopsis of the thesis. A gap of 4 to 6 months have to be maintained between two reviews as per scheduled displayed by GTU.
- 2.2 The research scholars shall have to present their work at annual research week organized by the University. All the scholars shall have to present in person at annual research week in addition to the s Doctoral Progress Committee (DPC) reviews, in a year.
- 2.3 All GTU recognized PhD Supervisors shall conduct the DPC reviews of the respective research scholar/s in presence of all appointed External Experts / doctoral Progress Committee (DPC) Members within the specified time frame as announced by the University.  
Electronic medium such as skype etc. may be utilized, if otherwise necessary; and the comments of review, by the expert who participated / evaluated through electronic medium, has to be submitted by him on the same date through email to the concerned Supervisor (copy of the email to be enclosed along with the submitted review card).
- 2.4 In the event of any member of the DPC either declining to continue or is continually not available during scheduled DPC's, or is stationed outside Gujarat at a later stage, the Supervisor may suggest names for replacing such an expert to the Vice Chancellor.