

## Nazarbayev University Modification Form for Programs and/or Courses

<b>1. Program Details<sup>1</sup></b>		
1.1 Program Title:	PhD in Science, Engineering and Technology	
1.2 School:	School of Engineering / School of Science and Technology	
1.3 Department:	Direction of PhD Studies in Science, Engineering and Technology	
<b>2. Modifications Proposed</b>		
2.1 Type: Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2.2 Effective Date: Fall 2018	2.3 Collaborative <sup>2</sup> (Yes/No): Yes
2.4 Summary of modifications		
#	Modifications recommended	Rationale
1	<b>Establish 3 (three) core graduate electives rather than current optional 3 (three) MSc courses.</b>	<p>Current program only requires 2 core-courses (Personal and Professional Research Development / Statistics), while giving the opportunity to pick (optionally) 3 MSc courses as electives. In the practice, most students have not taken full 3-elective courses and are using this clause to avoid taking courses that, according to PPC, Provost and Dean, should be compulsory to offer a breadth in the preparation of our PhD students. Now we are proposing these three graduate courses (to include MSc and PhD electives) to be chosen among all the available courses in SEng and SST, but in a compulsory condition or as a core-electives.</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> This Minor Amendment is supported on Clause in Section 3 “Definitions”, sub-section 3.2 “Minor Modifications”: “The addition or replacement of a non-core course within a program...” of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
2	<b>Mandatory registration per semester</b>	<p>Current program does not express clearly the regulation about how to deal with every semester registration. What has happened so far is that many students, despite being regular students, are not registered in regular semesters and this translates a problem to the OR which can't deal with transcripts and track of taken courses properly. Now we propose to request a compulsory registration semester by semester using the code courses</p>

<sup>1</sup> An updated version of the program and/or course specification must be provided indicating the proposed modification using tracked changes.

<sup>2</sup> A collaborative program is one that is delivered in cooperation with another School or with a partner university. If a program is collaborative, the proposed modifications should be discussed and agreed upon with the partner.

		<p>already created for each course.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment will ensure that all courses are taken following the established sequence of requisite-courses which is a common practice at NU and is related and supported on Clause in Section 3 “Definitions”, sub-section 3.4 “Minor Modifications”: “Pre-requisite or co-requisite courses” of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
3	<b>Affiliation of Lead Supervisor and Internal Co-Supervisor</b>	<p>Current regulation establishes that at least "Lead Supervisor" or "Internal Co-Supervisor" must be from one of the two Schools (SEng or SST). At the PPC we agreed that it needs to be enforced that "Lead Supervisor" must be from one of the two schools, while the Internal Co-Supervisor can be from another school or research center of NU (currently, we have Internal Co-Supervisors from NLA for example, but could have Internal Co-Supervisors from School of Mines as well, for example). With this measure we want to avoid situations presented in the past like for example, Lead Supervisor of one student was a Professor from the School of Medicine or from NLA (this makes more difficult the interaction between the student and our administration when they need to request funds for example).</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment is supported on Clause in Section 3 “Definitions”, sub-section 3.6 “Minor Modifications”: “Course Assessment Methods and/or weightings” of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
4	<b>Change of Oral Defense of PhD Research Proposal from “around 20min” to: a presentation time within 30 to 35 min, with an additional period of time for Questions and Answers not longer than twice the presentation time.</b>	<p>Oral Defence of Research Proposal (end-of-1st year Viva) is currently regulated to last around 20min. Members of PPC consider that unrealistic and unpractical. Therefore, a more realistic period of time is proposed to give enough time to the student to present his/her proposal to the PRC. Also, by recommendation of T&amp;L Committee, it is added a regulated period of time for Questions and Answers.</p>



		<p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment is supported on Clause in Section 3 “Definitions”, sub-section 3.6 “Minor Modifications”: “Course Assessment Methods and/or weightings” of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
5	<p><b>Change of Oral Defense of PhD Thesis from “around 20min” to: a presentation time within 30 to 45 min, with an additional period of time for Questions and Answers not longer than twice the presentation time.</b></p>	<p>Oral Defence of Thesis (end-of-PhD Viva) is currently regulated to last around 20min. We at PPC consider that unrealistic and unpractical. Therefore, a more realistic period of time is proposed to give enough time to the student to present his/her arguments and defend the thesis in front of the Thesis Committee (we had already our first PhD defence and found it almost impossible to meet; in fact the student took more than 30min to have a satisfactory defence). Also, by recommendation of T&amp;L Committee, it is added a regulated period of time for Questions and Answers.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment is supported on Clause in Section 3 “Definitions”, sub-section 3.6 “Minor Modifications”: “Course Assessment Methods and/or weightings” of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
6	<p><b>Supervisory Registry as a recommendation</b></p>	<p>Currently it is mandatory that all faculty supervising our PhD students must be listed in a "Supervisory Registry" which requires that all faculty, despite their experience, must take a "PhD Supervisor Training workshop to be entered on the PhD Supervisor Register". Therefore, since in practice it has not been possible to implement, the proposal is to set this requirement as a "strongly recommended" and try to establish a semester-by-semester workshop to allow faculty to enter in the workshop. This workshop may be initially taught by those faculty who did the HEA PhD Supervisory Workshop the last year and afterwards, involve all faculty to re-create this workshop for entry faculty and for trained faculty who need to renew their registry every 5 years.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment is supported on Clauses in Section 3 “Definitions”, sub-section 3.5</i></p>

		<p><i>and 3.6: "Minor Modifications": 3.5. "Course teaching methods" and 3.6. "Course Assessment Methods and/or weightings" of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
7	<b>Regularize 2<sup>nd</sup> PRC to be within 1-3 months</b>	<p>Current regulations establish that Second PRC (after failing First PRC) meeting happens either between 1-3 months or within 2 months. PPC agrees that it should be categorically mentioned that it can be within 1-3 months on a case by case basis. This will avoid ambiguity with the 2-month statement.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment is supported on Clause in Section 3 "Definitions", sub-section 3.6: "Minor Modifications": "Course Assessment Methods and/or weightings" of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
8	<b>Extending PRC Committee membership</b>	<p>Current regulations establish that PRC (Progress Review Committee) members are selected among PPC members. This amendment pretends to allow PPC members to select PRC members not only from PPC, but from any of our two affiliated schools (SEng or SST; perhaps in the future, also the School of Mines) given that the faculty is much more related to the field of expertise of the PhD student. It will give the PPC more flexibility in the selection of PRC members with a more clear affinity with the area of the PhD thesis being evaluated. The Chair of the PPC will still be present in all PRC as established, except when conflict of interest arises.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>This Minor Amendment is supported on Clause in Section 3 "Definitions", sub-section 3.6: "Minor Modifications": "Course Assessment Methods and/or weightings" of Guidelines for Modifications to Programs and Courses, approved by AC, Minutes #39, 17-June-2015.</i></p>
<b>3. School Approval</b>		
3.1 Teaching and Learning Committee/or equivalent (Chair's signature):		3.2 Date: <u>25.07.18</u> Minutes # <u>7</u>

3.3 Dean's signature: <i>Charles Syp</i>	3.4 Date:
<b>4. Academic Quality Committee (for major modifications only)</b>	
4.1 Academic Quality Committee Recommendation:	
4.2 Chair's signature:	4.3 Date: