

**School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook of the  
autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University**

**Category:** Policy

**Approval Date:** 14.12.2022

**Effective Date:** 14.12.2022

**Level of Access:** Staff and Students Only

**Classification Number:** 2.6 SEDS

**Approving Authority:** Academic Council

**Registration Number:** 12

**Owner:** School of Engineering and Digital  
Sciences

**Revision Date:** 30.04.2025

**Applicability:** NU

**Retired Documents:**

**Title:**

**Date:**

**Registration Number:**

**Approving Authority:**

## **Section 1. Purpose and Application**

1.1. The School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD's Student Handbook (hereinafter - Handbook) complements the “Academic Policies and Procedures for graduate programs of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University” (hereafter - APPs) and the “Regulatory Framework for Graduate Programs and Courses of autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University” (hereinafter – Graduate Framework).

1.2. This Handbook applies to all PhD students enrolled in all PhD programs in the School of Engineering and Digital Sciences, approved on 2019 or thereafter.

## **Section 2. Definitions**

- 2.1. The following abbreviations are used in this Handbook:
- 2.1.1. CGPA - Cumulative Grade Point Average;
  - 2.1.2. CQE – Comprehensive (Subject) Qualifying Examination;
  - 2.1.3. DGPC – ad-hoc Department Graduate Program Committee SEDS – School of Engineering and Digital Sciences;
  - 2.1.4. ECTS – European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System;
  - 2.1.5. GPA - Grade Point Average;
  - 2.1.6. GPC – standing SEDS Graduate Program Committee;
  - 2.1.7. GTA - Graduate Teaching Assistant;
  - 2.1.8. HoD – Head of Department;
  - 2.1.9. OTD - Oral Thesis Defense;
  - 2.1.10. PhD Programs – Doctor of Philosophy programs provided in the SEDS;
  - 2.1.11. PRC – ad-hoc Progress Review Committee;
  - 2.1.12. RQE – Research Qualifying Exam;
  - 2.1.13. SC – standing Supervisory Committee;
  - 2.1.14. SEDS – School of Engineering and Digital Sciences;
  - 2.1.15. TEC – ad-hoc Thesis Examination Committee;
  - 2.1.16. University – the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University.

## **Section 3. Main Provisions**

### **3.1. The Department Graduate Program Committee**

3.1.1. The DGPC has the mission of overseeing the operation of the discipline-specific PhD program. The DGPC, including its chair and secretary, shall be established by decision of GPC upon consultation with HoD.

3.1.2. Functions of the DGPC:

1) oversees the academic performance of the PhD students in their discipline and recommends actions to facilitate the students' success in the program;

School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook of the autonomous organization  
of education Nazarbayev University

- 2) establishes the PRC and TEC for each student;
- 3) determines whether the current level of progress and future direction will result in a viable PhD;
- 4) ascertains the working dynamics of the Supervisory Committee and the PhD student to ensure it is working constructively;
- 5) approves supervisory arrangements and annual progression, including changes to them;
- 6) makes recommendations relating to student's withdrawal or dismissal from the PhD program;
- 7) reviews at initial stage the students request for Leave of Absence and emits further recommendation to the School;
- 8) endorses recommendation of the TEC and passes it to GPC for endorsement to confer the award of the PhD title, which is passed to the Dean and further to the Provost for consideration;
- 9) recommends to the GPC for further recommendation to Dean extensions of a PhD student in their discipline to enter years 5 or 6 and thus, the Dean may further recommend to Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs for consideration;
- 10) considers cases for dismissal of PhD students and forwards them for endorsement by GPC (other than those based on academic or non-academic misconduct) for further recommendation to the Dean;
- 11) investigates the appeals, problems, disagreements and potential conflict occurring within the program, such as within the SC, between the SC and the student, or between the SC, the student and the review stages;
- 12) designs and elaborates the CQE of the discipline and determines the mechanism of delivery and assessment;
- 13) recommends changes to the program to the GPC for its endorsement prior to endorsement by the School's Teaching and Learning Committee, the Dean and further approval by Academic Council.

#### 3.1.3. Rights and responsibilities of DGPC members:

- 1) the Committee members are required to fulfill their duties, assignments and responsibilities as assigned to them in order to carry forward the work of the Committee;
- 2) the members of the Committee have the right to suggest items for the Committee's consideration and have access to materials of the Committee.

#### 3.1.4. Procedures:

- 1) the Chair convenes meetings, organizes the Committee's work, and ensures the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee;
- 2) in case of the Chair's absence, these functions are carried out by another committee member designated by the HoD for that given occasion;
- 3) meetings are held as often as determined by the Committee;
- 4) the committee is at quorum when more than half of the voting members are present;
- 5) the Committee's recommendations are made by majority vote;

6) the Committee members are to disseminate information about Committee's initiatives to their Department fellows and PhD students for further diffusion when appropriate;

7) the meeting minutes of the Committee are recorded in English and Kazakh according to specified requirements for preparing minutes of the University and signed by the Chair and Secretary of the committee with endorsement of all attending members;

8) the committee reports regularly to the HoD.

### **3.2. The Progress Review Committee**

3.2.1. PRC has the mission of undertaking the review of the Thesis Research Proposal (RQE) of every PhD student and the review of the annual progress of the PhD student. The PRC for each PhD student shall be formed by decision of DGPC upon consultation with HoD. The DGPC chair will normally be appointed as PRC chair, unless he/she is a member of the PhD student's SC, in which case there will be appointed another faculty member of the department. Each PRC shall also have one member from SEDS who will have specialist knowledge in the area of the PhD student's research and cannot be a member of the PhD student's SC.

#### 3.2.1.1. Functions:

1) to examine the PhD student's Thesis Proposal (RQE viva) and determine where improvements can be made;

2) to examine the student annual progress.

#### 3.2.1.2. Rights and responsibilities of PRC members:

1) the Committee members are required to fulfill their duties, assignments and responsibilities as assigned to them in order to carry forward the work of the Committee;

2) the members of the Committee have the right to suggest items for the Committee's consideration and have access to materials of the Committee.

#### 3.2.1.3. Procedures:

1) the Chair convenes meetings, organizes the Committee's work, and ensures the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee;

2) in case of the Chair's absence, these functions are carried out by another committee member designated by the HoD for that given occasion;

3) meetings are held during the Thesis Proposal Oral Defense (RQE viva) and during the annual progress review of the student;

4) the student must be in attendance. In the event of their absence, the meeting will have been considered to have taken place;

5) the Chair will instruct the PhD student on their requirements for the meeting;

6) for Thesis Proposal Oral Defense (RQE viva), the PhD student and SC including the external supervisor must be present (or connected via videoconference);

7) the committee reports the results to the DGPC;

8) in case of Thesis Proposal Oral Defense (RQE viva), after discussion with the student, the PRC will deliberate in private, and make recommendations;

9) the Committee can make a number of recommendations, that include: satisfactory progress and the student is allowed to continue, or minor amendments are needed and a second PRC meeting is not required, or major changes and a second PRC meeting may be required, or the student cannot progress and must be referred to the DGPC and further to GPC for recommendation of dismissal to be passed to Dean for final decision;

10) in the event that a student misses the first PRC meeting or major changes are needed after the first PRC meeting, then the student is automatically scheduled a second PRC meeting, which must take place within 3 months;

11) no student may have more than two opportunities to approve the PRC evaluation;

12) meeting minutes of the PRC are recorded in English and Kazakh according to specified requirements for preparing minutes of the University and signed by the Committee members and are passed to DGPC for further actions or endorsements and keep at the School Office with access to DGPC, GPC, Dean and the Office of the Provost.

### **3.3. The Academic Year**

3.3.1. The academic year as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.4. Registration Policy**

3.4.1. Requirement on Minimum Registration: enrollment for a minimum of 24 ECTS credits that count toward graduation is required during first and second semesters to maintain status as a full-time student. Under exceptional circumstances, a student may be permitted to enroll for fewer than 24 ECTS credits in each of the first two semesters, if written permission has been received from the Dean of the SEDS. After second semester, PhD students must maintain continuous registration as required by the Graduate Framework via the 0 ECTS Research Progress Course (e.g., CSCI/DCHME/D CEE/DELCW/DMAE/ROBT-700: Thesis Research). However, additional taught courses may be taken after the second semester according to specific needs of the student with approval of the DPGC.

3.4.2. Requirement on Maximum Registration: enrollment for a maximum of 36 ECTS credits that count toward graduation is permitted in any given semester. A student may be permitted to enroll for more than 36 ECTS credits if written permission has been received from the Dean of the SEDS.

### **3.5. Attendance**

3.5.1. Attendance policy will be defined by the instructor in the course specifications (i.e., course syllabus).

### 3.6. Credits

3.6.1. The credit definition and award procedures as specified in the APPs shall be followed.

### 3.7. Requirements for Program Completion

3.7.1. The PhD program requires a full-time dedication of the students and is expected to be completed in 4 years of studies, considered as 48 consecutive months, comprised of 8 regular (fall and spring) semesters and 4 summer terms. The minimum possible duration of the program is four academic years (8 regular semesters plus their 4 summer terms). Extensions beyond 4 years, for up to a maximum of total program duration of 6 years, require approval of the DGPC, Head of Department, GPC, Dean and Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs and may involve financial charges to the student.

3.7.2. The University sets continuation fees for an extended period of study for all PhD programs of the University, indicating specific fees per semester (fall, spring) and per term (summer), as also stated in the APPs. The amounts for the current academic year can be found by contacting the Bursar's Office of the University. The continuation fees apply starting from the 6th year of study to doctoral students admitted commencing fall semester 2022 and onward (not including the time on Leave of Absence).

3.7.3. To progress and graduate, students must:

- 1) earn a CGPA no less than B- (2.67 on a 4-point scale);
- 2) earn a PASS or IPS (In-Progress Satisfactory) mark for the Thesis Research course;
- 3) accumulate 240 ECTS or more by the end of the program comprised by the required 60 or more ECTS of taught courses and 178 or more ECTS awarded for their research work;
- 4) successfully pass final Thesis Oral Defense;
- 5) contribute to the teaching mission of the university by appointment as a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) according to Clause 14 of the Graduate Framework.. At least two GTA assignments with satisfactory performance assessment from the assigned mentor are required to PhD students from cohort 2022 onwards. Cohorts 2019-2021 need at least one GTA assignment, whereas no GTA assignment is needed for cohorts prior to 2019.

3.7.4. The DGPC is responsible for organizing and delivering the end-of-first year CQE to the students of the discipline.

3.7.5. The DGPC must determine and inform the student 1 semester in advance of the CQE regarding the procedure for the examination, the subjects to be assessed, the members of the examination panel, and the evaluation and appeal process (provided in APPs). The CQE, delivered in written format, is designed to test the student's knowledge and skills in selected discipline subjects. The written examination will be

comprised of two questions from three subject-areas of the selected discipline previously chosen by the student from the pool of subject-areas listed for this purpose by the DGPC. The examination will be prepared and conducted by an *ad hoc* committee designated by the DPGC in agreement with the HoD with a responsible faculty for each subject. The student must pass all three subject-areas in the exam to progress in the program. For example, if the student fails in one or two of his/her selected subject-areas in the first opportunity, then he/she has a second chance to re-exam in the failed subject-areas. If the student fails any subject in the second attempt, he/she cannot progress in the program and must be referred to the DGPC and further to GPC for recommendation of dismissal to be passed to Dean.

3.7.6. All PhD students in good standing, after satisfactorily completion of first year, will be scheduled to defend their Thesis Proposal (RQE) by the end of their second fall semester. The calendar, conditions and expectations from the Thesis Proposal Defense (RQE viva) will be indicated in the specific discipline PhD program guidelines. After approval of the RQE by the respective PRC, the student progress will be assessed on annual basis by the PRC. The recommendation of PRC is taken to the DGPC for endorsement and passed to the SEDS program administration.

3.7.7. For the successful completion of the PhD thesis defense, the student must satisfy the following minimum criteria:

1) demonstrate an original contribution to knowledge that is deemed to have high quality and international impact. This may be defined through different means, but must include independent, peer-review from an external expert not connected with the University or the PhD student or the SC;

2) publish or demonstrate unconditionally acceptance of at least 1 article in an international peer-reviewed renown journal as the main author. Review articles cannot be claimed as a condition for the graduation. The publication must be based on the core content and disciplinary contributions of the thesis. Herein, the definition of “international” is given as broadly as possible as to not to limit the destination of the paper, but it is assumed that the journal will be intended for an international audience, in English and is renown in the field of research. “Renown” should be taken to mean of high quality, as defined by its SCImago or Web of Science Journal Rank of Q1 or Q2. If a given journal is ranked in both databases, the one that gives the highest quartile will be used. Students submitting multi-authored publications, including authors beyond their thesis supervisors, as evidence of having published, will need to justify their contribution to the work in the article compared with that of others in the author list who are not their supervisors;

3) submit their thesis book according to the procedures defined in the PhD program guidelines of each specific discipline. A soft copy of the thesis is sufficient for the oral examination and must be accompanied by a fully signed PhD Thesis submission form and a similarity report based on the institutionally approved plagiarism-checking tool (e.g., Turnitin, iThenticate or similar software tool approved by the University for this purpose). The similarity report should indicate a score in the green zone, without any exclusions, as defined by Turnitin, and all excerpts from published works should be properly attributed, referenced and permissions from

publishers, when needed, should have been acquired, including candidate's publications. Scores in the yellow zone may be permitted by candidate's TEC, assuming that a significant portion of similarities are found with candidate's own publications and they are limited to small excerpts (2-3 paragraphs) from these publications. Inclusion of complete candidate's articles will not be accepted in the thesis manuscript; and

4) successfully defend their thesis at a viva according to the procedures defined in this Handbook.

3.7.8. The conferment of the PhD degree will follow the next stages:

1) When a recommendation for the award of a PhD Research Degree has been made, following the approval of revisions by examiners if necessary, the student will be asked to submit the final thesis book. These regulations describe several possible outcomes of the examination and students may be asked to make minor amendments to the thesis or be re-examined before the research degree can be conferred;

2) the precise details of format and submission of the final thesis book for SEDS programs is given in the Policy on Ph.D. Thesis Formatting and Styling of the School of Engineering and Digital Sciences within the discipline guidelines. An electronic version of the thesis is required;

3) once the finally approved thesis book has been received by the SEDS Graduate Studies administration, the proposal for PhD conferment is put to the next GPC meeting for endorsement, passed to the Dean of the School, and further to the Provost for final approval, following which the student will receive a letter of conferment. On receipt of the letter of conferment, the student may begin using the title of 'Doctor'. When the degree has been formally conferred, they will then become eligible to attend the next award ceremony of the University, where the award certificate will be presented.

### **3.8. Transfer Of Credits From Outside University**

3.8.1. The credit transfer from outside university as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.9. Re-admission**

3.9.1. The Re-admission process as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.10. Grading System**

3.10.1. Letter grades must be given for all taught-course assessments. The Thesis Research course that runs along all semesters in the program, including summer terms, is subject to IPS/IPU (In-Progress Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory) grading until the completion and successful oral defense of the thesis, when the grading is set to PASS/FAIL. All elective courses will have letter grades. The overall course % mark



will be rounded to one decimal place in the determination of the final course letter grade.

3.10.2. The relevant grade awarded should be corresponded to the achievement of the specified learning outcomes at the appropriate level. For all taught PhD EQF (European Qualification Framework) Level-8 courses, the student must first consult with the course instructor as soon as the grade is available in the Learning Management system. If any error is found, the student should complete a SEDS Grade Appeal Form and submit it to the course coordinator. The course coordinator will complete the appropriate form and submit it to the Dean.

3.10.3. Students may appeal the decisions obtained in either the Thesis Proposal Defense, CQE or Thesis Defense by completing a SEDS Grade Appeal Form and delivering it to the Chair of their DGPC, who will review the case within DGPC and will recommend actions to SEDS Dean for his/her final decision.

3.10.4. If any error, procedural irregularity, prejudice on the examiner is presumed or explicitly found, the student should complete a SEDS Grade Appeal Form and submit it to the DGPC who will evaluate and make recommendation to SEDS Dean. The Dean may recommend a re-examination of the thesis proposal (RQE viva), CQE, oral thesis defense, or may support the decision of the examiners.

3.10.5. The appeal process to marks for taught courses will follow the indications on the APPs, section 16. The appeal process for the PhD thesis defense results must happen within 5 working days after the defense occurs or after the results are presented to the PhD candidate, whatever occurs later.

3.10.6. Students who fail to maintain their CGPA equal or above 2.67/4.0 in a first opportunity, will enter in probation. The DGPC may then recommend to these students to take new courses or retake certain courses to improve their academic standing and get out of probation. For two consecutive semesters in probation the DGPC may recommend the dismissal of the student and pass to Dean for further actions in accordance with internal documents of the University. The total number of times a student may re-take a course is limited to one.

3.10.7. Students who fail the CQE for the first time will enter in probation status and will have a second chance to present and pass the CQE within a period of 1-3 months. A student who fails the CQE on the second attempt will be dismissed.

3.10.8. Students who fail the Thesis Proposal Defense (RQE viva) for the first time will enter in probation status and will have a second chance to present and pass the RQE within a period of 3 months to be established by their PRC. In case the student fails the RQE for a second opportunity, their PRC may recommend the dismissal of the student to the Dean for further actions in accordance with internal documents of the University.

3.10.9. Students who fail the annual progress review by their PRC (held each year after passing the RQE) for the first time, will enter in probation status and will have a second chance to present evidence of progress requested by their PRC within a period of 3 months. In case the student fails the annual progress review for a second opportunity, their PRC may recommend the dismissal of the student to the DGPC for

its endorsement and pass to Dean for further actions in accordance with graduate APP provisions.

3.10.10. Students who fail OTD for the first time will enter in probation status and will have a second chance to present and pass the OTD within a period of not more than 6 months to be established by their TEC. In case the student fails the OTD for a second opportunity, their TEC may recommend the dismissal of the student to the DGPC for its endorsement and pass to Dean for further actions in accordance with internal documents of the University.

### **3.11. Administrative Grades**

3.11.1. Special administrative grades and notations as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.12. Assigning Grades**

3.12.1. Final grades are awarded as specified in APPs.

### **3.13. Grade Submission**

3.13.1. Instructors must submit Final grades according to the deadlines as specified in APPs.

### **3.14. Calculation of GPA And CGPA**

3.14.1. GPA and CGPA are calculated according to procedure specified in APPs.

### **3.15. Academic Standing**

3.15.1. Academic Progress, Academic Standing and Academic Probation are defined in APPs.

### **3.16. Change of Final Course Grade**

3.16.1. The final letter or Pass/Fail grade must be assigned or changed to a student by the responsible person according to procedure specified in APPs.

### **3.17. Grade Appeal**

3.17.1. The grade appeal procedure as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.18. Course re-take**

3.18.1. The procedure for course re-take as specified in APPs shall be followed.

School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University

### **3.19. Extension of Study**

3.19.1. The extension of student's study beyond the period defined within the approved Program Proposal is regulated in the APPs.

### **3.20. Course Assessment and Evaluation**

3.20.1. Course assessment and evaluation will be defined by the instructor in the course specifications.

### **3.21. Final Examination Procedures**

3.21.1. All rules and procedures for Final Examination as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.22. End-of-Semester Period Policy**

3.22.1. All Take-home or other forms of final examinations must follow policies established in APPs.

### **3.23. Student Examination Conduct**

3.23.1. During an examination, students are required to follow procedures, rules and code of conduct as specified in APPs.

### **3.24. Publication of Final Examination Results**

3.24.1. All rules and procedures for Final Examination as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.25. External Examiners**

3.25.1. External Examiners may be assigned according to regulations in APPs.

### **3.26. Graduate Research Milestones: The PhD Thesis**

3.26.1. All PhD students must select and declare their major research thesis topic, lead supervisor, internal co-supervisor and external co-supervisor before the deadline set by the SEDS in each of their programs. The thesis topic, Lead Supervisor and Co-Supervisors must be approved by the DGPC. The research progress must comply with restrictions established in the Graduate Framework, Chapter 3, Section 13.

3.26.2. All changes to the thesis project, Lead Supervisor and Co-Supervisors must be approved by the DGPC.

3.26.3. The PhD thesis format must be in accordance with the Policy on Ph.D. Thesis Formatting and Styling of the School of Engineering and Digital Science.

3.26.4. Each PhD thesis shall be examined by a PhD TEC, which should consist of the Chair of DGPC who will serve as the Chair of the TEC, Lead Supervisor, one internal NU expert faculty and at least one external expert.

3.26.5. The thesis defense may be scheduled in any semester of the year and will be scheduled at least 3 months after thesis and all supporting documents, including the list of proposed internal and external examiners, are submitted by the student and SC to the DGPC for its approval.

3.26.6. The external thesis examiner should be a qualified professional from outside NU with doctoral degree, demonstrated expertise and reputation in the field of the thesis. The DGPC will select the internal NU expert and the external member from a list of candidates provided by the thesis supervisors and student.

3.26.7. The following criteria hold for the selection of the external thesis examiners:

- 1) must not have any conflict of interest with the student and supervisor(s);
- 2) must be able to examine the thesis objectively without bias or influence;
- 3) must be academically qualified, with relevant expertise and active or non-active for no more than 3 years with extensive expertise and relevant publications in the field of the research area;
- 4) reciprocal examining with a supervisor from another university is not permitted.

3.26.8. The PhD thesis will be presented in written form and defended before the PhD TEC under the following circumstances and conditions:

- 1) the examination must occur in a public forum<sup>1</sup>, open to students, staff and faculty;
- 2) the PhD candidate will make a 30-45 minutes presentation of their research, which must highlight the novelty and originality of their findings. The presentation will be followed by an additional period of time for questions and answers, not longer than twice the presentation time;
- 3) the TEC will then make a cross-examination of the PhD student;
- 4) the forum may then ask relevant questions of the PhD student;
- 5) after TEC questioning-answering session moderated by its chair, the Supervisory Committee may also ask questions and/or express their comments and recommendations regarding the quality of the work;

---

<sup>1</sup> In exceptional cases, it may be that the viva may occur in a closed-door proceeding due to, for example, the existence of highly confidential data connected with IPR or Confidential Disclosure Agreement/Non-Disclosure Agreement (CDA/NDA). In this case, the viva will occur without public participation and where necessary, the release of the thesis and data for dissemination will be agreed during the DGPC pre-defense assessment stage. The thesis publication or embargo will follow current restrictions established by the “License Agreement on accession of Open access archives (repository) to the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University” and its provisions to publish in the Nazarbayev University Repository.

6) the TEC will ask the audience, including student and Supervisory Committee, to retire to allow TEC members discussing the Examination and the thesis book and decide, through a majority, the verdict;

7) thereafter the preliminary verdict may be conveyed to the PhD student and Supervisory Committee.

3.26.9. Both internal and external examiners must submit their thesis examination reports to the DGPC;

3.26.10. The final mark of the PhD thesis defense will be either Passed or Failed.

3.26.11. However, Passing mark might be direct or conditioned as:

1) approval without amendments;

2) approved with minor amendments; or

3) approved with major amendments. If approved with minor amendments, the student has up to one month to submit the amended thesis to TEC for their final approval. If approved with major amendments, the student has up to three months to submit the amended thesis to TEC for final approval. Unconditional approval is needed before TEC approval is passed to the DGPC and GPC for endorsement and then to Dean and Provost for final conferment of the diploma, given that the student has completed the minimum coursework required by the program.

3.26.12. After the thesis examination, in case of conditioned approval, the student may need to modify the thesis in accordance with the examiners' comments. The final thesis shall be approved by the Supervisory Committee (Lead Supervisor and Co-Supervisors) and the TEC.

3.26.13. Re-examination of the PhD thesis may be permitted only once, with the approval of the Dean of SEDS and it could happen in a period of not less than 6 months after the failed defense happened. A failed second thesis defense attempt leads to dismissal.

3.26.14. The PhD student must complete the License Agreement on accession of Open access archives (repository) to NU and deposit a softcopy of the final approved thesis in the library. One soft copy of the PhD thesis shall be lodged in the office of the SEDS. Additional copies of theses for supervisors shall be made through agreement between the PhD students and their supervisors. All intellectual property arising from the PhD thesis is owned by the University unless exception has been agreed between the University and the student.

3.26.15. The DGPC, with the endorsement of the GPC, will only recommend to the SEDS the award of the PhD degree after a softcopy of the thesis has been deposited into the NU library.

### **3.27. Withdrawal of Degree**

3.27.1. The rules and procedures for withdrawal of a degree as specified in APPs shall be followed.

### **3.28. Final Provisions: About Student Support and Guidance**

3.28.1. The supervision of the PhD student and his/her research is the responsibility of the SC, defined as Lead Supervisor appointed as a full-time faculty at the department of the PhD discipline, at least one Internal Co-Supervisor from any school in the University, and at least one Co-Supervisor external to the University. External supervisors must be identified on the basis that they meet the University's supervisor criteria and are expected to participate in discussing the PhD proposal research plan, annual project progress meetings and other activities of SC.

3.28.2. Each student must have SC conformed by the end of the first year.

3.28.3. Although it is desirable that the Lead Supervisor has experience of successful supervision of PhD students to completion, it is not compulsory provided that collectively SC members have such experience.

3.28.4. SC has the responsibility to foster the PhD student's development as an independent professional researcher. SC should also provide the necessary academic guidance and support throughout all stages of research and writing. This will involve:

- 1) helping define the research direction, the research question and formulate possible hypotheses;
- 2) providing guidance on the management of the research project;
- 3) providing advice on existing scholarly debate and present state of knowledge;
- 4) an introduction to the major sources of information in the field of inquiry;
- 5) helping with both general and advanced research techniques appropriate to the field of inquiry;
- 6) introducing the candidate into the relevant research community;
- 7) ensuring that the distinction between mastering existing knowledge and developing original work is made explicit and reflects the requirements of the regulations;
- 8) making clear the standard of work required for doctoral thresholds, both in conceptual and methodological terms;
- 9) initiating and overseeing the research plan approval;
- 10) maintaining regular monitoring and evaluation of the candidate's progress and to report on this as required;
- 11) agreeing a schedule of regular meetings with the student, in accordance with the regulations and in the light of discussion of arrangements with the student;
- 12) approving written records of supervisory meetings, as drafted by students and to ensure that they are sent to School Office and kept on the student's file;
- 13) being accessible to the student at appropriate times when he or she may need advice;
- 14) giving guidance about the nature of research and the standard expected, the planning of the research program, literature and sources and the problem of plagiarism;
- 15) requesting written work as appropriate, and return such work with constructive criticism and in reasonable time;
- 16) arranging as appropriate opportunities for the student to talk about his or her work to peers, at national and international conferences, meetings, etc.;

17) ensure that the student is aware of the University regulations on Intellectual Property and that he or she adheres to the requirements and observes the principles contained therein;

18) providing training in the ethical, legal and other conventions used in the conduct of research, and support the student in the consideration of these as appropriate;

19) conducting the initial assessment, and on-going review, of the student's training and skills development needs;

20) ensuring that the student is aware of institutional-level sources of advice and support, including careers guidance, health and safety legislation, equal opportunities policies and disabled student support services;

21) maintaining and developing the necessary skills and expertise in order to perform all facets of the role effectively (including taking up appropriate continuing professional development opportunities);

22) ensuring, as far as possible, that disabled students and students with specific learning difficulties have an equal opportunity to partake in Research Degrees;

23) if working in a potentially hazardous research environment, ensuring and monitoring that the student possesses adequate technical competence in any relevant research techniques, so that he or she presents no undue risk to themselves, others, and/or the facilities of the University or its partner organizations;

24) giving detailed advice on the necessary completion of successive stages of work so that the whole may be submitted within the scheduled time;

25) ensuring that the student is made aware of inadequacy of progress or of standards of work below that generally expected;

26) identifying prospective external and internal examiners to the PPC;

27) wherever possible, encouraging candidates to collaborate with colleagues from other organizations during their program of research by facilitating introductions to contacts with mutual research interests, identifying networking opportunities such as research seminars and conferences, and by providing opportunities for reciprocal visits and collaboration;

28) if SC is unable to provide the expertise on a particular aspect of the project, they must ensure the provision of appropriate advice either from within the University or from outside. All SC changes must be submitted (as per PhD Handbook Annex) for approval.

3.28.5. The Lead Supervisor should have adequate time for dedicated supervision and be reliably and regularly available to their students. The allocation of University supervisor(s) time of 45 hours total per Lead supervisor and per Internal co-supervisor per student per year for a full-time student will be considered in school workload planning. At least one annual meeting of the student and the full Supervisory Committee (i.e., Lead Supervisor and Internal/External Co-Supervisors) is required, whether by videoconference or in person.

3.28.6. In each SC, the Lead Supervisor will have primary administrative responsibility for the student and will also be responsible for annually reporting on the student's progress. A supervisor cannot act as lead supervisor for more than six

students at any one time, and therefore in each year should not take more than two PhD students as their Lead Supervisor.

3.28.7. The lead supervisor will also have responsibility for planning the financial expenditure of the PhD project and its timely submission to the School management for inclusion in the School's budget. According to the financial regulations of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the financial year coincides with the calendar year starting 1 January and ending 31 December of each year and the lead supervisor should ensure through negotiations with School management team that the proposed financial expenditure is included in the School budget.

3.28.8. No student may leave a supervisor without the approval of their DGPC. To change SC, the PhD Supervisory Committee Changes Form (as per PhD Student Handbook Annex) must be completed and submitted to the DGPC, which will convene a meeting with the student and/or the current supervisory committee. A decision can then be made, and a progression plan of changing supervisors can be implemented. No student can remain in the PhD program without a supervisory committee.

3.28.9. All issues not covered in this Handbook should follow similar final provisions as specified in APPs.

#### **Section 4. Waiver**

4.1. The same waivers included in the APPs apply to this document.

#### **Section 5. Temporary Provision**

5.1. Not applicable.

#### **Section 6. Revision**

6.1. The Handbook will be revised by 30 April 2025.

#### **Section 7. Related Documents**

7.1. Academic Policies and Procedures for graduate programs of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University, Regulations on Leave of Absence, Dismissal and Voluntary Withdrawal for students of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University, Regulatory Framework for Graduate Programs and Courses of autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University, Policy on Ph.D. Thesis Formatting and Styling of the School of Engineering and Digital Science.





## PHD STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

Nazarbayev University is committed to the pursuit of excellence in learning, teaching, research, and service. This *PhD Student Code of Conduct* is intended to identify the University's standards for and expectations of our PhD students. It is the student's personal responsibility to be familiar with and to follow all aspects of this *PhD Student Code of Conduct* in addition to Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures of the University.

All students enrolled at Nazarbayev University are expected to:

1. conduct themselves honestly and in compliance with all University policies and procedures;
2. behave in a way that is conducive to the proper functioning of the University;
3. avoid any behavior which threatens the academic freedom of other persons, faculty or students, to pursue their research or to participate in the life of the University;
4. not behave in a way that disrupts or interferes with any teaching or academic activity of the University, including political, cultural, social or sporting gatherings conducted under the auspices of the University, or authorized to be held at the University;
5. behave in an ethical manner at all times, and avoid any behavior or action that might unfairly or unreasonably disadvantage or advantage another student;
6. never use, possess or supply any illegal substance on campus;
7. never participate in any campus activity while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs;
8. treat all members of the University community (including faculty, staff, students, and visitors) with appropriate courtesy, tolerance and respect. This includes behavior that takes place off-site but in the context of University research or training;
9. recognize the rights of all members of the academic community (including faculty, staff, students, and visitors) to be treated fairly and equitably, free from all forms of harassment, including respecting the basic human rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of belief, as these rights are necessary prerequisites for academic freedom;
10. avoid any behavior that is dangerous, discriminatory, harassing, or bullying toward any member of the academic community;

- 11. seek to participate in an active and participatory manner in the learning process;
- 12. attend scheduled classes, meetings and other required events, except where exceptional circumstances have arisen;
- 13. submit all required coursework, projects, etc., in a timely manner;
- 14. make use of copyrighted materials only in legal ways;
- 15. not engage in plagiarism or any other kind of academic misconduct, including following the normal conventions and procedures of academic scholarship;
- 16. ensure that all research activities undertaken have been carefully reviewed by the appropriate bodies with respect to the ethical requirements for research;
- 17. make appropriate use of University resources (including buildings, equipment, the library, technological facilities, etc.) in a lawful and ethical manner; and
- 18. ensure their actions do not harm, or bring into disrepute, the University's reputation or good standing in the nation and world;

*The following signature indicates the full and complete acceptance of the PhD Student Code of Conduct by the student, and indicates her or his understanding and willingness to adhere to the PhD Student Code of Conduct and procedures as defined in the PhD Student Handbook.*

\_\_\_\_\_

Student's Name
Signature of Student
Date

For Official Use Only			
DGC Chair		Date Received	

Annex 2  
to the School of Engineering and  
Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook  
of the autonomous organization of  
education Nazarbayev University



NAZARBAYEV  
UNIVERSITY



SCHOOL OF  
ENGINEERING AND  
DIGITAL SCIENCES

### PHD SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE FORM

<b><i>PhD student name:</i></b>	
<b><i>Department:</i></b>	
<b><i>Address for correspondence:</i></b>	
<b><i>E-mail and telephone contact:</i></b>	Phone: Email:

***Title and description of the research project (between 300-500 words)***

***Identify all supervisors for your project and briefly list why they are appropriate  
(Give contact details for both internal and external supervisors. Each PhD student project  
must have 2 internal supervisors and 1 external supervisor)***

**Lead supervisor:**

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil/MSc  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil /MSc  PhD

Provide the following details of maximum five students if you have successfully supervised PhD students. Attach supporting document of at least one PhD student successfully supervised.

- 1) Name of student:  
Title of thesis:  
Name of university where the thesis was completed:  
Year of graduation:  
Your role (Supervisor, Co-supervisor):  
Website link of thesis (if any):

- 2) Name of student:  
Title of thesis:  
Name of university where the thesis was completed:  
Year of graduation:  
Your role (Supervisor, Co-supervisor):  
Website link of thesis (if any):

**Co-supervisor 1:**

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil/MSc  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil /MSc  PhD

Provide the following details of maximum five students if you have successfully supervised PhD students. Attach supporting document of at least one PhD student successfully supervised.

- 1) Name of student:  
Title of thesis:  
Name of university where the thesis was completed:  
Year of graduation:  
Your role (Supervisor, Co-supervisor):  
Website link of thesis (if any):

- 2) Name of student:  
Title of thesis:  
Name of university where the thesis was completed:

Year of graduation:

Your role (Supervisor, Co-supervisor):

Website link of thesis (if any):

**Co-supervisor 2:**

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil/MSc  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil /MSc  PhD

Provide the following details of maximum five students if you have successfully supervised PhD students. Attach supporting document of at least one PhD student successfully supervised.

1) Name of student:

Title of thesis:

Name of university where the thesis was completed:

Year of graduation:

Your role (Supervisor, Co-supervisor):

Website link of thesis (if any):

2) Name of student:

Title of thesis:

Name of university where the thesis was completed:

Year of graduation:

Your role (Supervisor, Co-supervisor):

Website link of thesis (if any):

**External Co-Supervisor:**

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil/MSc  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil /MSc  PhD

I understand my responsibilities as a PhD student as outlined in the PhD Student Handbook.

**Signed by PhD student:**

**Date:**

**Print name** (block capitals) .....

**Signed by Lead Supervisor:**

**Date:**

**Print name** (block capitals) .....

**Signed by Internal Co-supervisor(s):**

**Date:**

**Print name** (block capitals) .....

**Signed by External Co-Supervisor(s):**

**Date:**

**Print name** (block capitals) .....

For Official Use Only			
DGP		Date	
Chair		Received	

**Note:** supervisor shall not normally act as lead supervisor for no more than six students at any one time, and therefore in each year should not take more than two PhD students as their Lead Supervisor.

Annex 3  
to the School of Engineering and  
Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook  
of the autonomous organization of  
education Nazarbayev University



## PHD RESEARCH PLAN

Submitted by the PhD Research Student for the:

**Doctor of Philosophy in “                      “ Program of the Autonomous Organization  
of Education “Nazarbayev University”**

### 1. The Applicant

**Surname:**

**Forenames:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Local Address:**

**Private Address:**

### 2. Title of the investigation:

Confirmation of the Department to which the PhD student is affiliated:

### 3. Start date:

### 4. Aim(s) of the investigation:

**5. Proposed plan of work, including its relationship to previous work, with references and details of any External Collaborators:** *(Please give sufficient information, including a general introduction, to allow the Progress Review Committee to assess the application (up to 2 extra sheets of A4 may be appended if necessary)).*

**5.1** Where there is a collaborating establishment, please indicate the relationship between work to be undertaken in the collaborating establishment and that to be undertaken at the University, including the approximate proportions of time to be spent in each establishment:

School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook of the autonomous organization  
of education Nazarbayev University

**5.2** Please indicate if the program of work is likely to yield results which may lead to the signing of a confidentiality agreement or restriction of dissemination of results (detail any arrangements that are in place or need to be put in place):

**5.3** Please identify any training needs you may have:

**6. Consideration of ethical issues**

**6.1** Do ethical issues arise from this research project? Yes  No

If the answer is Yes, go to 6.2 below.

**6.2** Have these issues been approved by the University’s Research Ethics Committee? Yes  No

**7. Statement by the Applicant**

I wish to submit this research plan for the degree of *PhD* for approval, on the basis of the proposal given in this application.

I confirm that the information given on the form is correct.

I understand that I must prepare and defend my thesis in English.

Signed..... Date

**8. Approval by Supervisors**

**Lead Supervisor**

Signed..... Date

**Internal Co-Supervisor 1**

Signed..... Date

**Internal Co-Supervisor 2**



Signed.....

Date

**External Co-Supervisor**

Signed.....

Date

<b>For Official Use Only</b>			
DGC Chair		Date Received	

Annex 4  
to the School of Engineering and  
Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook  
of the autonomous organization of  
education Nazarbayev University

*Section 1*



**PHD RESEARCH PLAN ORAL DEFENSE  
SECTION 1 – SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE SECTION\***

\* The Lead Supervisor, in representation of the supervisory committee, must complete this form only; this report is confidential; your PhD student will not receive a copy.

This form should be type written

This form is part of a process designed to enable the supervisory committee to reflect on their PhD student's progress and the support they have been receiving and to confirm that the student has progressed sufficiently to continue to be registered as a research student.

**Student and supervisor details**

Student name:

Location:

Start Date:

Mode of study:

Current expiry date:

Title of project:

Does the student require an extension of registration?

Yes  No

If yes, please provide justification:

Name of supervisor completing the progress form:

Names of the other members of the supervisory committee:

### Progress report

1. Has the frequency of meetings with your supervisee been satisfactory?

Yes  No

If No, please elaborate:

2. Were expectations of supervision discussed and agreed at the beginning of the student's studies?

Yes  No

If Yes, please indicate whether these have been met or whether the type and level of supervision has had to be renegotiated:

3. Has the student followed up specific actions as requested by you, including submission of work, reports, attending training, conducting experiments?

Yes  No

If No, please give details:

4. If the student has submitted any work, what is the standard of that work?

Acceptable  Borderline  Unacceptable

If Unacceptable, please give details and recommendations:

5. Please give a brief report (normally 200 words) on the student's progress and performance in the last 12 months, detail any areas of concern **AND** what actions should be taken (continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

6. Do you believe that the student is broadly on target to complete their studies at the date agreed (or as formally extended)?

Yes  No

If No, please elaborate:

7. Have you introduced your student to the relevant wider research community and helped them become part of that community?

Yes  No

If Yes, please give details:

8. Are there any actions required to improve or enhance the student's progress, for example, more frequent submission of written work for discussion, research methods training, presentations at work-in-progress seminars, further discussions and debate through relevant conferences?

Yes  No

If yes, please elaborate (again, please continue on separate sheet if necessary):

9. Are there, in your view, any resource issues inhibiting the student's progress?

Yes  No

If you have answered Yes, please indicate what these are, and what action if any you have already taken to assist the student in resolving them.

10. **Progression recommendation**

Please tick one of the following:

i) The student has made satisfactory progress and should be allowed to progress.

ii) In my view, the student has not made satisfactory progress and should be asked to complete additional work outlined below before progression is confirmed.

Details of additional work:

Lead Supervisor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

For Official Use Only			
DGC Chair		Date Received	

## Section 2



### PHD RESEARCH PLAN ORAL DEFENSE

#### SECTION 2 – PROGRESS REVIEW COMMITTEE SECTION\*

\* The Progress Review Committee (PRC) must complete this form in as much detail as possible. It must not copy any confidential information relayed from Section 1, but to convey issues in a general sense.

PhD student's Name:

Names of the Supervisors:

Lead Supervisor –

Internal Co-Supervisor –

External Co-Supervisor –

Names of the Progress Review Committee members:

Chair –

Member –

1. The members of the Progress Review Committee (PRC) report that they have examined the PhD Research Plan submitted by the PhD student and have also examined the candidate orally on the subject of the defense of the PhD proposal:

Date of oral defense .....

Was Lead Supervisor present: YES  NO

2. The members of the Progress Review Committee (PRC) report that they have determined one of the following:

*Please tick relevant box*

(1) That the proposal and its defense by the candidate have satisfied them in the examination and the proposal outline should be approved

(2) That to satisfy the examiners in the examination, the candidate is required to make specified amendments to the examiners' satisfaction within ..... months (insert number of months) (see Section 3 of this form).

A further oral examination is not required.

(3) That the candidate be permitted to re-enter for the examination of the PhD proposal outline and re-present the proposal in a revised form within ..... months (insert number of months).

A further oral examination is required.

(4) That the candidate has not satisfied them in the examination and the student should be recommended for dismissal from the program.

3. Amendments

3.1 If the review member(s) has determined that the candidate has to make specified minor or major amendments, these should be clearly set out in this form in the appropriate section. Students must then complete the Minor and Major Amendment Changes Form (Annex 8), within an agreed timeframe from receipt of this form from the DGC (usually 2 months), detailing the changes in response to the amendments.

3.2 This sheet should be submitted to the Department Graduate Committee (DGC) normally within one week after the oral. You may advise the candidate direct of the necessary amendments during the oral defense or you may request the DGC to do so afterwards.

4. Comments and Amendments

4.1 List the comments and amendments in numerical order:

Examiners' names and signatures

.....	Date .....
.....	Date .....
.....	Date .....
.....	Date .....

Please return this sheet within one week of the oral examination to School Doctoral Office.

**For Official Use Only**

DGC Chair		Date Received	
--------------	--	------------------	--



**PHD RESEARCH PLAN ORAL DEFENSE  
SECTION 3 – EXTERNAL CO-SUPERVISOR SECTION**

This form should be type written

This form is part of a process designed to enable the External Co-Supervisor to reflect on their PhD student’s progress and the support they have been receiving and to confirm that the student has progressed sufficiently to continue to be registered as a research student.

**Student details**

Student name:

Location:

Start Date:

Mode of study:

Current expiry date:

Title of project:

Please give a brief report (normally 200 words) on the Research plan (Annex 3) submitted by the student, detail any areas of concern **AND** what actions should be taken (continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

External Co-Supervisor’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

For Official Use Only			
DGC Chair		Date Received	



## Annex 5

to the School of Engineering and  
Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook  
of the autonomous organization of  
education Nazarbayev University



### PHD SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE CHANGES FORM

**Student Name:** .....

**PhD Title:** .....

**Current Supervisors**

**Lead Supervisor:** .....

**Internal Co-Supervisor(s):** .....

**External Co-Supervisor(s):** .....

**Proposed Supervisory Team** (Complete the sections where the changes are proposed. If the supervisors are from different Departments, Schools or Institutions, these must be clearly specified in this form)

**1. Lead Supervisor**

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil  PhD

Please indicate briefly the role this supervisor is expected to contribute to this proposal, including areas of expertise.

## 2. Internal Co-Supervisor 1

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil  PhD

Please indicate briefly the role this supervisor is expected to contribute to this proposal, including areas of expertise.

## 3. Internal Co-Supervisor 2

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil  PhD

Please indicate briefly the role this supervisor is expected to contribute to this proposal, including areas of expertise.

## 4. External Co-Supervisor (please add more if necessary)

**Name, qualifications, post held and place of work:**

Other than *this* Candidate detail experience of supervision of registered research degree candidates:

Currently supervising  MPhil  PhD

Previously supervised to successful completion  MPhil  PhD

Please indicate briefly the role this supervisor is expected to contribute to this proposal, including areas of expertise.

School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook of the autonomous organization of education Nazarbayev University

expertise.

**Statement by the Applicant / Lead Supervisor**

I wish to submit these changes to the Supervisory Committee.

I confirm that the information given on the form is correct.

Student .....	Date
Lead Supervisor .....	Date
Internal Co-Supervisor(s) .....	Date
External Co-Supervisor(s) .....	Date

<b>For Official Use Only</b>			
DGPC Approval		Date Approved	

Annex 6  
to the School of Engineering and  
Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook  
of the autonomous organization of  
education Nazarbayev University

*Section 1*



**PHD PROGRESS REVIEW COMMITTEE FORM  
SECTION 1 – STUDENT SECTION\***

\* The PhD student must complete this form only; this report is confidential; your PhD supervisors will not receive a copy.

This form should be type written

This form is part of a process designed to enable you and your supervisory committee to reflect on your academic progress and the support you have been receiving and to confirm that you have progressed sufficiently to continue your registration as a research student.

The form should be completed by you and returned to the DGPC. Your supervisors (represented by your Lead Supervisor) will also prepare a report on your progress. Once both reports have been received, you will be invited to a meeting with members of your Progress Review Committee, who are not your supervisors, to discuss your progress generally and to identify any further training or support needs.

**Personal details**

Student name:

Location:

Start Date:

Mode of study:

Current expiry date:

Lead Supervisor:

Title of project:

School of Engineering and Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook of the autonomous organization  
of education Nazarbayev University

Project description: (no more than 200 words)

### Supervision

Please continue your answers to questions on a separate sheet if necessary, and attach to this form.

1. Please indicate in which category you would place yourself at present (tick one):
 

i)	Research active	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Research lapsed	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Research completed, not yet writing up	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Research completed, writing up	<input type="checkbox"/>
  
2. How many times during this academic year did you meet formally with your supervisors?
 

Lead Supervisor	Int. Co-Supervisor	Ext. Co-Supervisor
-----------------	--------------------	--------------------

Additional comments:
  
3. Are meetings prompted by you or your supervisory committee? (tick one):
 

You	<input type="checkbox"/>
supervisory committee	<input type="checkbox"/>
Both	<input type="checkbox"/>
  
4. Were expectations and frequency of contact between you and your supervisory committee agreed at the beginning of your studies?
 

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------
  
5. Are you receiving the kind of support you require from your supervisors?
 

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------

Please elaborate here on the kind of support you receive. If you feel your supervision is not adequate to your needs, please describe how you think it could be improved:

**Researcher development**

6. During this academic year have you given any presentations or work-in-progress seminars, or produced any papers or articles?

*(for example peer reviewed abstracts, peer reviewed papers, posters for conference, conference presentations or other publications)*

Yes  No

If yes, please provide details and references below, including links:

7. Have you undertaken any research training and support programs during your period of study so far?

Yes  No

If yes, please give details:

8. If you have followed the Research Methodology course at Nazarbayev University, indicate whether it was relevant and useful.

Relevant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Useful	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you have answered no to either part, please specify why or how improvements could be made:

9. Do you feel that you have any additional training needs at this stage?

Yes  No

If Yes, please specify:

10. Have you attended any conferences, seminars or lectures this year above and beyond what your program has required you to attend?

Yes  No

If Yes, please specify:

11. Are you on target to complete your PhD degree in the time set out on your original form or as modified by any agreed extension?

Yes  No

If no, please give a new estimate of the date your studies will be completed:

12. Have you had your Research Plan approved?

Yes  No

If No, please give the date the University expects your Research Plan to be approved:

If different to the above, please give the date by which you expect to submit your thesis outline/Research Plan:

13. Since your last annual progress review (or your Research Plan Oral Defense if you have not yet completed a progress report), please address each point:

i) Has your progress been consistent with what was approved?

ii) Detail any major changes to the original project:

iii) What advances have you made in your own understanding of your research area?

iv) What work have you provided for your supervisory committee?

14. Do you have any additional comments to make?

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**For Official Use Only**

GDPC Chair		Date Received	
---------------	--	------------------	--

*Section 2*



**PHD PROGRESS REVIEW COMMITTEE FORM  
SECTION 2 – SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE SECTION\***

\* The supervisory committee must complete this form only; this report is confidential; your PhD student will not receive a copy.

This form should be type written

This form is part of a process designed to enable the supervisory committee to reflect on their PhD student's progress and the support they have been receiving and to confirm that the student has progressed sufficiently to continue to be registered as a PhD student.

The form should be completed by Lead Supervisor on behalf of the supervisory committee and returned to the School's Doctoral Office. Your PhD student will also prepare a report on their progress. Once both reports have been received by the Progress Review Committee, your PhD student will be invited to a meeting with the PRC to discuss their progress generally, and to identify any further training or support needs.

**Student and supervisor details**

Student name:

Location:

Start Date:

Mode of study:

Current expiry date:

Title of project:

Does the student require an extension of registration?

Yes

No

If yes, please provide full justification:



Name of supervisor completing the progress form:  
Names of the other members of the supervisory  
committee:

### Progress report

1. Has the frequency of meetings with your supervisee been satisfactory?

Yes  No

If No, please elaborate:

2. Were expectations of supervision discussed and agreed at the beginning of the student's studies?

Yes  No

If Yes, please indicate whether these have been met or whether the type and level of supervision has had to be renegotiated:

3. Has the student followed up specific actions as requested by you, including submission of work, reports, attending training, conducting experiments?

Yes  No

If No, please give details:

4. If the student has submitted any work, what is the standard of that work?

Acceptable  Borderline  Unacceptable

If Unacceptable, please give details and recommendations:

5. Please give a brief report (normally 200 words) on the student's progress and performance in the last 12 months, detail any areas of concern **AND** what actions should be taken (continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

6. If the Thesis Outline/Research Plan has not been approved, please give the date by which you expect the student to submit the application.

7. Do you believe that the student is broadly on target to complete their studies at the date agreed (or as formally extended)?

Yes  No

If No, please elaborate:

8. When do you expect the student to submit their thesis and undertake their viva?

9. Have you introduced your student to the relevant wider research community and helped them become part of that community?

Yes  No

If Yes, please give details:

10. Are there any actions required to improve or enhance the student's progress, for example, more frequent submission of written work for discussion, research methods training, presentations at work-in-progress seminars, further discussions and debate through relevant conferences?

Yes  No

If yes, please elaborate (again, please continue on separate sheet if necessary):

11. Are there, in your view, any resource issues inhibiting the student's progress?

Yes  No

If you have answered Yes, please indicate what these are, and what action if any you have already taken to assist the student in resolving them.

12. **Progression recommendation**

Please tick one of the following:

i) The student has made satisfactory progress and should be allowed to progress.

ii) In my view, the student has not made satisfactory progress and should be asked to complete additional work outlined below before progression is confirmed.

Details of additional work:

Lead Supervisor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**For Official Use Only**

DGPC Chair		Date Received	
---------------	--	------------------	--

*Section 3*



NAZARBAYEV  
UNIVERSITY



SCHOOL OF  
ENGINEERING AND  
DIGITAL SCIENCES

**PHD PROGRESS REVIEW COMMITTEE FORM  
SECTION 3 – PROGRESS REVIEW COMMITTEE SECTION\***

\* The Progress Review Committee (PRC) must complete this form only. This form will be shown to both PhD student and the supervisory committee. It must not copy any confidential information relayed from Section 1 or 2, but to convey issues in a general sense.

This form should be type written

PhD student's Name: .....

Names of the Progress Review Committee members:

.....  
.....

1. The members of the Progress Review Committee report that they have examined Section 1 and 2 of the PhD Progress Review and have determined one of the following:

*Please tick relevant boxes*

(1) That the progress by the PhD student has been satisfactory and the student should be allowed to continue

(2) That to satisfy the Progress Review Committee, the PhD student and / or supervisory committee are required to make the following amendments:

The following criteria must be met by the:

PhD student  supervisory committee  Both

The amendments are as follows (in bullet point format):

It is also determined that a meeting between the PhD student and the supervisory committee should be convened to discuss specific aspects of the amendments:

Yes  No

(3) That there are critical issues with the progress that are unable to satisfy the Progress Review Committee. The PhD student and / supervisory committee is required to make the following amendments:

The following criteria must be met by the:

PhD student  supervisory committee  Both

The amendments are as follows (in bullet point format):

It is also determined that a meeting between the PhD student and the supervisory committee should be convened to discuss specific aspects of the amendments: Yes  No

If the review member(s) has determined that the candidate has to make specified minor or major amendments, these should be clearly set out in this form in the appropriate sections. Students must then complete the Minor and Major Amendment Changes Form (Annex 8), within an agreed timeframe from receipt of this form from the DGPC (usually 2 months), detailing the changes in response to the amendments

(4) Significant concerns are raised regarding the PhD student or the supervisory committee and should be referred to the PhD Program Committee.

2. General comments of the Progress Review Committee (these by the PRC must be provided, including any recommendations for additional training or alterations to the research project):

PRC Members' signatures

..... Date .....

..... Date .....

..... Date .....

Please return this sheet within one week of the Progress Review Committee meeting to the DGPC.

For Official Use Only			
DGPC Chair		Date Received	

Annex 7  
to the School of Engineering and  
Digital Sciences PhD student Handbook  
of the autonomous organization of  
education Nazarbayev University



### **PHD THESIS SUBMISSION FORM**

This form should be type-written.

1. The applicant

Surname: Forename:

Local address: Private address:

Email:

Telephone number:

2. Title of the thesis :

3. Start date of PhD studies:

4. Proposed viva date (this must not be less than 3 months from date of submission of the Thesis Submission form):

5. Proposed internal examiners (at least two suggestions) and full contact details (their CV or internal web-site link must be provided):

Briefly justify the appropriateness of the suggested internal examiners to act as members of this PhD Thesis Examination Committee

6. Proposed external examiners (at least two suggestions) and full contact details (their CVs

must be provided):

Briefly justify the appropriateness of the suggested external examiners to act as members of this PhD Thesis Examination Committee

7. Do any of these proposed examiners have a potential conflict of interest and/or perceived conflict of interest with the PhD student or the supervisor committee?

Yes  No

If yes, please detail how:

8. The applicant must confirm the following:

i) The full manuscript accompanies this form:

Yes  No

ii) The student has one or more research articles as first author in Q1/Q2<sup>2</sup> international journals, either published or accepted for publication.

Yes  No

If yes, please provide publication details. If your article(s) has been accepted but not published yet, include the submitted article along with the relevant correspondence with the journal, as a separate attachment.

9. Provide a short summary/abstract of the PhD project (no longer than half a page):

10. Are there any items leading to confidentiality issues that restrict the dissemination of data, results, technical reports or the thesis?

Yes  No

If Yes, please specify what the items are, any dates or deadlines involved and the requested format for the viva (you must provide any supporting documentation, e.g. NDAs, CDAs, PCT):

Student.....	Date
Lead Supervisor.....	Date
Internal Co-Supervisor(s).....	Date

<sup>2</sup> as defined by SCImago or Web of Science Journal rankings

External Supervisor(s) .....	Date
------------------------------	------

<b>For Official Use Only</b>			
DGC Chair		Date Received	

**Decision of the Thesis Examination Committee (TEC)**

**Approved**

Comments including any action required:

Members of TEC

Signatures

Date:

**Not approved**

Actions required:

Members of TEC

Signatures

Date:

<b>For Official Use Only</b>			
DGC Chair		Date Received	





**MINOR & MAJOR AMENDMENT CHANGES FORM**

This form should be completed when Minor or Major Amendments are stipulated at any review stage. The changes, in response to each amendment listed in the review form, must be detailed in this form by the PhD student and agreed with their supervisor. This form will be submitted to the PRC chair, within the agreed timeframe set at the review meeting, to ensure that each stipulated amendment has been satisfactorily actioned.

This form should be completed in type-written format by the student in response to annual review or Research Proposal Examination.

PhD Student’s Name:

.....

PhD Project Title:

.....

Detail the changes made in numerical order to the amendments listed in the review form:

PhD Student’s Signature

..... Date .....

PhD Supervisors’ Signature

..... Date .....

..... Date .....

..... Date .....

PRC Chair’s signature

..... Date .....

Please return this sheet within the agreed timeframe stipulated in the review meeting to the DGPC.

**For Official Use Only**

DGPC Chair		Date Received	
---------------	--	------------------	--

### Sequence of milestones for SEDS PhD programs

#### **Year 1**

- Take core/elective courses in both semesters
- By the end of the Spring Semester:
  - ✓ [Annex 2] Have SC approved



#### **Year 2**

- Fully dedicated to thesis research
- By the end of the Fall Semester:
  - ✓ [Annex 3] Sit RQE (if failed, can be retaken within 3 months, and, if failed again, up for dismissal)



#### **Years 3, 4 (and possibly 5 and 6)**

- Fully dedicated to thesis research
- By the end of the Spring Semester:
  - ✓ [Annex 6] Sit PRC examination (if failed, retake it within 3 months, and, if failed again, up for dismissal)
- From Year 4 onward:
  - ✓ [Annex 7] Submit PhD Thesis, and