PhD/MPhil Progress Review One Requirements

Overview

Research training at The University of Queensland is research and professional development. It is more than a thesis. It is 'training in research' plus 'training by research'. It is expected that Higher Degree Research candidates will acquire the Graduate Attributes through their time at UQ. The School of Social Science highly values

- knowledge and skills in the field of study;
- effective communication skills;
- critical judgment and research skills;
- independence and creativity; and
- ethical and social understanding.

The HDR program is intended to develop the HDR Graduate attributes. Graduates are required to demonstrate attainment of these attributes through a variety of means, including successful attainment of three academic progress reviews.

Progress Review One

The purpose and criteria for this progress review are available on the Progress Review website.

Completion of the research integrity training module, setting up the project in UQ Research Data Manager, registration of an ORCID with UQ and other key induction activities should have been undertaken when you completed your Early Candidature Checkpoint, prior to the first progress review.

A presentation is **not** required for Progress Review One. Instead, we recommend the candidate presents a paper at an appropriate forum of their own choice such as a conference or seminar during the second or third year of their candidature. We encourage candidates to present at the School of Social Science Postgraduate Conference, in School working paper series or School cluster seminars. National and international conferences are also suitable.

While it is not required, the candidate may alternatively choose to present a paper during the first year of their candidature if they feel that is productive. In such a case, the candidate should organise and submit an independent written evaluation of the presentation. The evaluation should outline areas of strength and any areas of potential improvement. In particular, the evaluation should address the scholarly quality of the presentation (e.g. engagement with relevant literature, methodology and/or data) and the format of the presentation (verbal communication and quality of any visual illustrations such as PowerPoint slides). This written evaluation can then be included in the progress review documentation submitted via the myUQ Portal. If the candidate chooses to present in the first year of their candidature, no further presentations will be required during the remainder of their candidature.

Timing and Components

Depending on any interruptions, Progress Review One will take place approximately 12 months FTE (PhD) or 6 months FTE (MPhil) after commencement of the candidature. The components of the progress review are:

- written work; and
- an interview.

While the UQ Graduate School has indicated that candidates should organise interview times and locations for their progress reviews, the School of Social Science HDR committee has sought to avoid the logistical difficulties this will likely entail. For that reason, the HDR committee will organise the location, days and times for all progress reviews. The DHDR will send out a schedule of the planned progress reviews in the research quarter before the candidate's progress review is due, including the

location, date and time as well as the candidate's designated HDR Chair. Candidates should use the information provided in the schedule when they complete the details of their progress review through the myUQ portal.

1. Written work

1.1. The student's progress review documentation

The candidate must submit the following written Progress Review documents:

- A full draft of the literature review chapter of no more than 10,000 words. This full draft must: demonstrate that the candidate is aware of what is already published about the chosen topic; demonstrate a sound understanding of the theoretical issues relevant to the research through the formulation of a conceptual framework; and identify how the candidate's research will address a gap in the literature and advance knowledge. An iThenticate Report must accompany this chapter.

The candidate is also required to submit a separate overview document of the research project. This document of no more than 2000 words must include:

- A brief introduction that discusses the importance and relevance of the topic;
- a clear statement of the research aims/questions;
- an outline of proposed methodology – this should include all relevant details regarding methodology and, depending on the methods used, should include detail regarding the intended research participants and the field of study, sampling or measurements, and consideration of the strengths and limitations of the methodology;
- an estimated timeline for phases of research relative to each progress review, and consideration of any factors that might slow progress;
- an indication of the feasibility of the research, including details about the financial and other resources and professional development training required;
- a budget documenting the expected costs of undertaking the research. This budget must include a clear description of the cost items and a justification. This budget and justification will be evaluated to endorse transfer of the total sum of School HDR funding support. You will be asked to report on the expenditure of these funds during the second and third progress reviews. Please ensure you are familiar with the School's Higher Degree by Research Funds Policy available here, including what may and may not be funded.
- a demonstrated and clear understanding of the ethical issues involved and a plan to have an ethics application submitted if it has not already been approved.

1.2 External review of written documents

The written work, including the draft chapter and project overview document, must be rigorously reviewed by an independent reviewer, who will submit a report prior to the interview to assist the HDR Chair to determine the progress (quality and quantity) of the candidate's research. The reviewer should address the elements outlined above, namely:

1. whether the draft chapter demonstrates the candidate's awareness of what is already published about the chosen topic;
2. whether the draft chapter demonstrates a sound understanding of the theoretical issues relevant to the research through the formulation of a conceptual framework;
3. whether the candidate has clearly identified how their research will address a gap in the literature and advance knowledge;

4. whether the overview document evidences a sound methodology, feasibility, and awareness of ethical considerations.
5. whether the documentation indicates areas of improvement (e.g. quality of writing, constructing arguments, research topics to address, or any other matter the reviewer has concern about).

The student and the advisors are jointly responsible for identifying a suitable external reviewer and submitting the student's written work to the reviewer approximately 4 weeks prior to the scheduled interview day. This should allow sufficient time for the reviewer to read and return comments in time for discussion during the Progress Review interview. It is the joint responsibility of the student and the advisory team to ensure that the document is provided to and returned by the reviewer prior to the review interview, and included in the documentation submitted via myUQ.

1.3 Other documentation

The candidate must also submit all Candidate documents to the HDR Chair via the myUQ portal. The Principal Advisor will independently complete the Principal Advisor Statement in the myUQ portal.

1.4 Submission of documentation

All documents are submitted via the myUQ request. Instructions on how to submit the documents are detailed in the 'how to organize a progress review' section of the Progress Review website.

The expectation in Social Sciences is that all documentation is received by the Chair no later than **one week** before the scheduled interview. If documents are not submitted in a timely manner the progress review outcome will be 'repeat review'. In such cases, the candidate will need to complete the progress review in the next research quarter.

2. Interview

The interview will include the designated HDR Chair, the candidate and advisory team. The DHDR may also be requested to attend at the Chair's discretion. At the candidate's request a student representative on the HDR Committee may also be present. The expected duration of the interview is 45 minutes.

The interview will include time for the candidate to talk with the HDR Chair without their advisory team present, as well as time for the HDR Chair to meet with the advisory team without the candidate. The interview provides an opportunity for further feedback to be provided to the candidate, and to discuss approaches to dealing with any issues that may interfere with successful progress toward the second progress review.

At the completion of the interview, the HDR Chair may recommend one of four possible outcomes.

3. Progress delay

Progress reviews cannot be postponed. In cases where the Principal Advisor and candidate agree that the candidate is not ready to provide documentation sufficient to pass the progress review, the progress review will still proceed. In such cases, however, it is not necessary to send out the candidate's documentation for external review. Instead, the candidate should submit the documentation (chapter draft and project overview) as it stands. While the candidate will likely have to repeat the progress review the following research quarter, the HDR committee Chair will seek information during the interview about progress planning, including a detailed schedule of proposed activities enabling the candidate to successfully pass the progress review next research quarter. In other words, the HDR committee will actively engage with the candidate and advisory team to identify outstanding issues and promote timely progress.