

PhD/MPhil Progress Review Two 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 Two

The purpose and criteria for this progress review are available on the [Progress Review website](#).

Timing and Components

Depending on any interruptions, Progress Review Two will take place approximately 12 months FTE (PhD) or 6 months FTE (MPhil) after the first progress review was due. 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 written Progress Review documentation. The written work is commonly a full draft thesis chapter of no more than 12,000 words involving empirical data, analysis and/or discussion, or a substantial piece of academic writing such as an article submitted for publication to a refereed journal. This document must be accompanied by an iThenticate Report. A literature review, (historical) background chapter, or methodology chapter is **not appropriate** for this review.

The candidate is also required to submit an overview document of no more than 2000 words outlining thesis progress to date. This document should include a thesis chapter outline, an indication of

writing progress made for each chapter, any remaining data to be collected, and a timeline towards the completion of a full draft of the thesis.

1.2 External review of written documents

The written work, including the draft chapter and thesis progress report, must be 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 will be asked to respond to the following questions:

- Are the data and methods appropriate to address the research aims?
- Has enough of the right type of data been collected or is more work required?
- Is the candidate at a level consistent with being two-thirds of the way through their project?
- Is the draft chapter of adequate PhD/MPhil scholarly quality?

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 the myUQ Portal.

1.3 Other documentation

The candidate must submit all [relevant documents](#) to the HDR Chair via the myUQ portal. The Principal Advisor will independently complete the Principal Advisor Statement in the myUQ portal.

If the candidate has presented a paper since Progress Review One (e.g. at a conference such as the School of Social Science Postgraduate Conference, a national or international conference, in a School working paper series or School cluster seminar), the student and advisory team should organise a written evaluation of the presentation by an independent reviewer outlining 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 evaluation can then be included in the Progress Review Two documentation submitted via the myUQ Portal.

If the candidate has not yet presented, arrangements should be made for a presentation in the third year of the candidature and subsequent submission of the written evaluation at Progress Review Three.

If the candidate received School HDR research support funding upon completion of Progress Review One, the candidate should include a brief report on the expenditure of these funds. This can be done in table format, indicating the original budget items and costs, actual spending to date, and some commentary on the projected costs for the remainder of the project.

1.4 Submission of documentation

All documents are submitted via the myUQ Portal. Instructions on how to manage your progress review and submit 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 HDR 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 final 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.