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Contact details of Postgraduate officers

Postgraduate Coordinator: Dr Naomi Stead
Email: n.stead@uq.edu.au
Phone: +61 7 3346 7852

Postgraduate Administrative Officer: Mrs Erin Lewis
Email: erin.lewis@uq.edu.au
Phone: +61 7 3365 3824

Ethics Officer: Dr Naomi Stead
Email: n.stead@uq.edu.au
Phone: +61 7 3346 7852

OH&S Officer: Dr Tim O’Rourke
Email: t.orourke@uq.edu.au
Phone: +61 7 3365 3848

Types of RHD research conducted in the School of Architecture

The School supports a wide range of research types, modes and methods. From scholarship in the architectural humanities, to work based in anthropological and ethnographic approaches drawn from the social sciences, to quantitative or qualitative scientific approaches, to design- and practice-based research – a range of projects in these and other modes are encouraged. Different types of research projects may have distinct outcomes, for example some dissertations will be primarily textual, while others will include calculation, measurement, modeling and data analysis, and others still will rely on drawings and images, or indeed built works in part or whole. Nevertheless there are a series of commonalities linking all RHD projects in the school, and which the milestone process will address across all types of research project.

All candidates will be required to demonstrate the ability to manage a research project in a timely way, and the quality of their work will need to meet acceptable academic standards particular to their mode or field of work. Candidates will always need to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of their own area of research (whether practice- or theory- based), will always need to define and explore a significant research question or problem (whether practice- or theory- based), will need to demonstrate their rationale, approach, process of and argument in addressing that question, and will need to draw new and original findings from the project as a whole. Within this general framework, the milestone process in the School will be flexible enough to allow for the specific submission requirements of a given project, in its own terms.

General introduction to the School’s RHD milestone process

The University’s milestone process ensures that candidates stay on track and have access to feedback and guidance throughout their higher degree study, in addition to that received from their advisors. When entered into in the right spirit, it is a process equally beneficial for the candidate, the advisors and the school – an opportunity to pause and evaluate how the project and the
candidature is progressing, to affirm those aspects which are going well, and redirect any that need adjustment. It is also a way to inform the rest of the RHD candidates and staff of the School about individual candidates’ research, and to build and maintain a collegial research culture. It provides practice in written and verbal presentation, and is thus a form of research training.

The School of Architecture regards RHD candidates not as students, but as early career researchers. The milestone seminars are thus closer to the meeting of (more and less senior) colleagues than a hierarchical examination process. Thus the School views the three milestones as part of the broader advisory process – not as an assessment or examination of the candidate or the project. The actual metaphor of ‘milestone’ is useful here: in literal terms a milestone is a specific, designated point on a journey. The intention of the milestone process is thus to determine whether candidates have yet reached that point, or whether there is some way to go before they get there. It is generally not a question of whether they will reach that point, but when, and what could best assist them in getting there. Therefore the milestone seminar will always view the research project as a work in progress.

It is expressly not the School’s intention that the milestones be stressful or intimidating, and measures will be taken to make the event supportive, respectful, and productive for all participants.

The UQ Milestone Policy sets out a three-stage process designed to enable candidates to successfully complete your studies within 3 to 4 years (PhD) or 1 to 2 years (MPhil). Each milestone is scheduled at equal points throughout the candidate’s particular program. The three Milestone Stages are Confirmation, Mid-Candidature Review, and Thesis Review. A detailed list of the sequence, steps and responsibilities for management of milestone review seminars is included at the end of this document.

A description of the general expectations for each milestone can be found on the UQ Graduate School website: http://www.uq.edu.au/grad-school/completing-each-milestone. Each candidate should familiarise her or himself with these descriptions. Further information on milestone progression can be found in the UQ Policy and Procedures Library: https://ppl.app.uq.edu.au/content/4.60.05-research-higher-degree-candidature-progression-and-development.

If there is ever any discrepancy between this School of Architecture document and Graduate School guidelines, the latter will take precedence.

**Components of the milestones**

Each milestone comprises three components,

1. a submission (whether written, drawn, measured, modeled, built, etc)
2. an oral presentation
3. a formal interview with the Milestone panel

In addition, the Confirmation and Mid-candidature milestones can include,

4. an optional private interview with the PG Coordinator
The nature of the first three components vary between the Confirmation, Mid-candidature and Thesis Review milestones, as detailed below. Nevertheless the pattern for each milestone seminar is similar, and in all cases the Panel makes an assessment of the submission, oral and interview components, and the candidate either receives an Attainment of Milestone or Extension of Milestone depending on the deliberations of the Panel. The panel’s decision is communicated to the candidate immediately, at the end of the event, and is followed about a week later by a formal written report, prepared by the Chair with input from all panel members.

The optional private interview can be arranged just prior to the Confirmation and Mid-candidature milestones, and constitutes an opportunity for an informal, confidential discussion between the candidate and PG Coordinator about supervisory arrangements, and any other questions or issues the candidate may be experiencing. If agreed between the PG Coordinator and the candidate, issues identified during this conversation can be raised in the formal milestone process that follows, or other solutions may be sought, or they may remain confidential.

In all cases the submission should be first presented to the principal advisor who will send it to the milestone chair (copied to PG admin officer) 7-10 days in advance of the seminar. The file size and document length should be kept within reasonable bounds. The milestone chair or principal advisor will forward this submission to all members of the advisory team, guest critics etc, to read prior to the seminar.

**Composition and role of the milestone review panel**

Milestone Panels consist of the following:

1. Chair – Postgraduate Coordinator or their Delegate
2. Guest Critic selected by the Principal Advisor
3. Principal Advisor and Associate Advisors

**Role of the Chair**

The administrative role of the Chair is to convene the meeting, manage the timing of the presentation and questions, chair the public questions and the private interview, make notes on the deliberations and conclusions of the panel, and prepare these as a report which is then circulated first to the panel and, when its contents and findings have been agreed, to the candidate. Where the PG Coordinator delegates the role of chair (for instance, in a case where the PG Coordinator’s own candidate’s work is under discussion), then the delegate must be a senior member of the School of Architecture staff who has experience in RHD supervision, and has at least one candidate who has passed successfully through the same level of milestone.

The substantive role of the chair is to read or examine the submission and attend closely to the oral presentation and interview, and on the basis of these to make a judgement about whether the RHD project is properly framed and planned, that it is being carried out in a scholarly and timely fashion, and that the candidature is being properly managed. This intellectual role of the chair is significant, and carries equal weight to that of the guest critic.

The panel reaches its decision through debate leading to consensus. In cases where there is a minor disagreement among the panel, the Chair (whether PG Coordinator or her/his delegate) will have the casting vote on whether or not the milestone has been attained. In cases where there is a major
disagreement, the PG Coordinator will reach a decision after discussion with the Head of School and/or the Director of Research. Note that Graduate School guidelines empower the PG Coordinator to over-rule the findings of the panel, although this would only occur in extreme circumstances.

**Role of the guest critic**
The role of the guest critic is to read or examine the submission and attend closely to the oral presentation and interview, and on the basis of these, along with the critic’s experience of accepted RHD standards, to make a judgement about whether the RHD project is properly framed and planned, and that it is being carried out in a scholarly and timely fashion. The guest critic is not obliged to make a formal written report, although external critics sometimes choose to offer their notes to the candidate following the milestone seminar, or to follow up with a more informal individual conversation later.

Guest critics are asked to bear in mind that a different type of feedback is required at each of the three milestones. The confirmation milestone presents the research at a stage that may still be formative, open-ended, and potentially still speculative, and hence the feedback from the external critic and panel has the greatest potential to be transformative at this stage, and should be considered accordingly. At the Mid-candidature the work will be further along in its progress, having already passed through confirmation and had its general terms and framework accepted there. External critics at the Mid-candidature milestone are asked to check how and where the thesis has travelled from the earlier milestone, and whether that path is advisable, but generally not to send the whole project off in a new direction. The Thesis Review milestone calls for summative feedback – it is a final check prior to submission, at a stage when the terms of the project have already been set, and it would be inappropriate (except in extreme circumstances) to revisit the general framing of the project or return to the terms of the earlier two milestones.

It is expected that the guest critic will have expertise in the area and mode of research covered by the RHD study, and knowledge of accepted standards for RHD research. In cases where the external critic has demonstrated and specific expertise in the area of the study but does not hold an MPhil/PhD, they may still act as external critic, however in such cases an additional senior staff member from the School of Architecture must join the panel to ensure that scholarly expectations and standards are upheld. These cases are subject to discussion and approval from the PG Coordinator.

**Role of the advisory team**
The role of the advisory team during the milestone seminar, in addition to having assisted the candidate with the framing and preparation of the milestone documents, is to offer their advice and feedback to the chair and guest critic, and their own judgement as to whether they regard the milestone to have been achieved. The combined opinion of the advisory panel (whether that consists of one, two or more individuals) will carry only the same weight as each of the Chair and external critic.

**Negotiating a variation to the usual pattern or submission requirements**
In some instances there may be suitable grounds to vary the usual pattern of how a milestone seminar is run, or the nature of the submission or oral presentation. In these cases the candidate
If a candidate needs more time
If a candidate feels they need more time to complete a milestone, this should be discussed with the advisory team in the first instance, and perhaps also the PG Coordinator. If it is agreed that an extension is the best path, an Attainment or Extension of Milestone form can be downloaded from the Graduate School website. Within a given candidature, a total of three extensions of three months each are possible within the milestone structure. More rules can be found at http://ppl.app.uq.edu.au/content/4.60.05-research-higher-degree-candidature-progression-and-development.

Where a milestone is not reached
Where a panel decides that the work does not meet the requirements of a given milestone, in the first instance an extension will be granted, and the milestone will be rescheduled for repetition in three months time. If the requirements are not met a second time, the school is obliged by the Graduate School to undertake a formal review of candidature, on the grounds that either:

1. The candidate has not demonstrated satisfactory progress, or,
2. The School can no longer provide appropriate advisory support to the candidate

The School is then asked to make a recommendation from the following options:

1. Termination of candidature with academic penalty
2. Transfer from the PhD to the MPhil program
3. Withdrawal from candidature without academic penalty

In cases where the school recommends that an RHD candidate be withdrawn without academic penalty, there can be an option to re-enrol at a later time. This should be discussed with the advisory team and the PG Coordinator if this eventuality arises. More rules can be found at http://ppl.app.uq.edu.au/content/4.60.05-research-higher-degree-candidature-progression-and-development.

If a candidate has reservations about a milestone process or outcome
Where a candidate is dissatisfied with the way a milestone has been conducted, or with the decision of the panel, then in the first instance they should take the matter up with the PG Coordinator, or if that creates a conflict of interest, with the Director of Research or the Head of School. If that discussion fails to resolve the issue, then the candidate may choose to take the matter up with the Graduate School.
The Confirmation milestone

Confirmation of candidature is expected to take place 12 months (PHD) or 6 months (MPhil) after commencement, or the equivalent for those enrolled part time. The purpose of the confirmation milestone is to ensure that:

- the candidate receives appropriate feedback in relation to the viability and progress of the research project
- the candidate has sufficient training and there are resources available to complete the program within the recommended timeframes
- the composition of the advisory team is appropriate.

In more general terms, the confirmation milestone process provides the opportunity for concentrated, expert feedback from a larger panel beyond the advisory team, at a time when the project is advanced enough to be informed, yet formative enough to still benefit from diverse opinions. This provides affirmation and advice for both the advisory team and the research candidate, and ensures that the project meets the standards of the school and the university. This is particularly important where the project involves experimental methodologies, or other forms of ‘non-standard’ research.

All of the university’s compliance requirements must be met before the Confirmation milestone, for instance all international students must have completed their formal induction, ethics approvals should have been secured if necessary, and all candidates should have completed the online Academic Integrity Tutorial at https://www.uq.edu.au/integrity.

According to the graduate school, the confirmation milestone ‘is your opportunity to explain your research project to your peers. At the end of the confirmation process you should be comfortable with the robustness and viability of your research project. Your academic colleagues will provide you with valuable feedback on how to improve your research questions and proposed methodology. You will also have a clear path to follow towards Mid-Candidature Review.’

Like all of the milestones, the confirmation milestone comprises three parts: a submission, an oral presentation, and an interview. The confirmation also includes the option of a private interview between the candidate and the PG Coordinator, in advance of the milestone, to discuss how the advisory arrangements are functioning, and the candidate’s general wellbeing and satisfaction with their RHD studies.

**Confirmation: the submission**

The submission for the confirmation milestone comprises two parts:

1. a detailed written thesis proposal
2. a submission demonstrating the research work. This may take varied forms depending on the nature of the research. Most commonly it will be a written scholarly paper, but it could also be a suite of design or analytical drawings or models; an illustrated report on fieldwork; a set of measurements, calculations or data analyses; a prototype or building component; a built work of architecture in part or whole; or some other submission suitable to the nature of the research project.

The thesis proposal provides a detailed overview of the project and the means for undertaking it. A library of past successful thesis proposals is available for consultation upon request from the Postgrad Coordinator. Thesis proposals usually include the following items (but are not restricted to these headings):

- Title
• Project description
• Project aims
• Research questions
• Significance
• Originality
• Methods, and justification of methods
• Chapter headings/abstracts
• Anticipated Limitations/Requirements
• Requirement for ethics or OH&S approvals
• Research timeline
• Bibliography

The School offers flexibility in the structure and content of the thesis proposal, in order to accommodate the broad range of projects undertaken within the school. Candidates should discuss the content (including the headings) of their proposal with the advisory team well in advance of the milestone, as the requirements will vary according to the nature and scope of each project.

In addition to the thesis proposal, a submission of the research work should be presented to the panel. If it is a written essay, it should demonstrate the ability to formulate and express an argument, as well as mastery of the scholarly conventions of correct academic prose and referencing etc. A written submission might be a conference paper or journal article, or a draft thesis chapter. The paper would ideally not exceed 5000 words in length.

Other, non-textual types of submission should be tailored according to the nature of the project. But in all cases the submission should represent a substantial piece of work, which clearly demonstrates the quality of the research to date, demonstrates a clear grasp of academic standards and conventions in its particular mode, demonstrates progress towards addressing a particular research question or problem, etc. If in doubt about what kind of submission may be appropriate, please consult the PG Coordinator.

The documents for the submission should be sent in advance via email. Please do not include appendices or attachments.

**Confirmation: the optional private interview**

Candidates are offered the option, prior to the confirmation seminar, to have a private interview and conversation with the PG Coordinator, to discuss the candidate’s general wellbeing and satisfaction with their RHD studies, including how the advisory arrangements are functioning. This is an informal opportunity to raise any questions, problems, issues or concerns that the candidate might have about any aspect of their candidature including advisory arrangements, and wish to raise in a private and confidential conversation rather than in the formal milestone interview. This interview is entirely optional, and any candidate who has concerns about advisory arrangements or any other aspect of their candidature is also welcome to make an appointment with the Postgraduate Coordinator at any time.

**Confirmation: the compulsory oral presentation**

The oral presentation should take approximately 30 minutes and comprise a brief overview of the project (approx. 10 mins) and a research presentation (15-20 minutes). Candidates should practice and carefully time their presentation so as not to speak for too long. This presentation should be seen as akin to a research seminar in the school – it will usually have a broader audience beyond the immediate panel members, and an effort should be made to make it engaging and well communicated.
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The project overview is usually based on the submitted thesis proposal document, but candidates should bear in mind that only the panel members will have read this in advance, and other members of the audience may have no knowledge of the project or the field. It is therefore best to assume you are introducing the project to an entirely new audience. One of the research skills under examination here is how effectively you are able to explain and communicate your research topic, including its relevance and significance. The overview of the research project should thus include an introduction to the field of research, an outline of the project’s scope, questions, aims and methods and so on.

The oral research presentation is most often based on the formal submission. The presentation should convey some argument, and showcase the candidate’s initial research findings, and research skills as appropriate to the project. Most commonly these will be analytical and writing skills, but they can also be modelling or analysis, design or documentation, etc. The presentation is usually an examination of questions that will form part of a chapter, or will be presented as a conference or seminar paper or other publication. Candidates are encouraged to use images and visual aids to assist in their presentation. Following the presentation there is an opportunity for the audience to ask questions and discuss the project, after which the audience leave the room before the formal interview begins.

Unlike the two later milestones, in the confirmation milestone the oral presentation is compulsory. Students who are enrolled remotely are strongly encouraged to travel to Brisbane to give this presentation in person, although if this is impractical or impossible or would cause undue hardship it can be conducted via Skype.

**Confirmation: the formal interview**

The Interview occurs immediately after the oral presentation. This is a discussion between the candidate and the milestone review panel and offers an opportunity to discuss in a more private setting the project, its scope, strengths and weaknesses, resources required, and any foreseen issues. Following the interview, the candidate will then be asked to leave the room to enable the milestone review panel to decide whether the candidate has achieved the milestone requirements and make notes on the milestone report. This usually takes about 20 minutes. The candidate is then invited to re-join the milestone review panel to learn the outcome of their milestone and discuss the panel’s recommendations.

The milestone report is usually forwarded to the candidate within a week after the milestone takes place. Following the receipt of this the candidate should discuss the outcome of the milestone with her or his advisory team.

**The Mid-Candidature Review milestone**

Mid-candidature review is expected to take place 12 months FTE (PhD) or 6 months FTE (MPhil) after confirmation is attained. The purpose of this milestone is to ensure that:

- the project is on track for completion within candidature duration
- the candidate’s research and other professional skills are developing appropriately
- the composition of the advisory team is appropriate.

In more general terms, the mid-candidature milestone checks that the project is on the right track intellectually and practically, that it can be completed in the remaining time, and that any questions or problems that the panel identifies can be rectified while there is still time in the candidacy.
According to the graduate school, ‘At this milestone you should receive comment on your progress to date, the rigour of your research methodology and suggestions for any final experiments or data collection activities. You will discuss with your academic colleagues what you need to do to make the journey to Thesis Review.’

Like all of the milestones, the mid-candidature milestone comprises three parts: a submission, an oral presentation, and an interview. Also, like the confirmation milestone, the Mid-Candidature review includes the option of a private interview between the candidate and the PG Coordinator, in advance of the milestone, to discuss how the advisory arrangements are functioning, and the candidate’s general wellbeing and satisfaction with their RHD studies.

**Mid-candidature: the submission**

The submission for the confirmation milestone comprises two parts:

1. an updated thesis proposal / chapter plan
2. a draft thesis chapter

The thesis proposal submitted for the Mid-candidature milestone should build upon the earlier version prepared for Confirmation, but can be expected to have shifted and developed as the research has progressed. For instance, the research questions may be more specific or refined, and the project description and thesis title may have changed as the project has advanced.

The mid-candidature thesis proposal should have greater emphasis on the sequence and content of the chapters, and thus while it is important to give the context of the project by laying out the aims, significance, and field (etc) of the project as a whole, emphasis should be laid upon a detailed chapter plan.

The updated thesis proposal should be accompanied by a draft thesis chapter, the content of which can vary according to the nature of the project. It will most often be a written argument, in which case it should be a well-developed draft, fully referenced and in scholarly prose, and accompanied by a bibliography. In other cases it may be appropriate for the chapter to consist primarily of drawings or analysis or calculations, which is acceptable so long as the chapter meets the academic standards and conventions of its particular mode of research. The chapter can be based upon or incorporate work that was originally prepared as a conference paper or journal article or other form of presentation, but these must be adapted to the format and form of a thesis chapter. A chapter requires a different tone, style, and scope than other kinds of publication, and by the stage of the Mid-candidature milestone it is important to assess whether this is within the candidate’s capability. Also, by the Mid-candidature milestone the candidate should have begun work on the actual thesis document in something close to its final order, sequence and scope.

The draft thesis chapter would ideally not exceed 8000 words in length. The documents for the submission should be sent in advance via email. Please do not include appendices or attachments.

**Mid-candidature: the optional private interview**

Candidates are offered the option, prior to the Mid-candidature seminar, to have a private interview and conversation with the PG Coordinator, to discuss the candidate’s general wellbeing and satisfaction with their RHD studies, including how their advisory arrangements are functioning. This is an informal opportunity to raise any questions, problems, issues or concerns that the candidate might have about any aspect of their candidature, including advisory arrangements, and wish to raise in a private and confidential conversation rather than in the formal milestone interview. This interview is entirely optional, and any candidate who has concerns about advisory arrangements or
any other aspect of their candidature is also welcome to make an appointment with the PG Coordinator at any time.

**Mid-candidature: the oral presentation**

The oral presentation for mid-candidature review follows the same pattern as the confirmation seminar – first an overview of the project as a whole (approx. 10 mins) followed by the presentation of the draft chapter (20 mins) most likely in abbreviated form.

For mid-candidature and thesis review milestones, the candidate may be given a ‘credit’ for the oral component if they have completed a conference paper, 3 minute thesis presentation or school research seminar on the topic of their thesis, in a suitable academic context, within 6 months of the scheduled milestone. Candidates who believe they meet the criteria for this ‘credit’ should make their case to the PG Coordinator, who will make a decision as to whether the oral presentation is needed or not.

Where a credit is granted, and there is no formal presentation, candidates are encouraged to still give a brief (up to 10 mins) introduction to the project as a whole, presenting only to the milestone review panel and not to a public audience.

**Mid-candidature: the formal interview**

The interview in the mid-candidature review follows exactly the pattern for the confirmation interview – namely that the Interview occurs immediately after the oral presentation. It is a discussion between the candidate and the milestone review panel and offers an opportunity to discuss the project, its scope, its direction, its strengths and weaknesses, and so on. Following the interview, the candidate will then be asked to leave the room to enable the milestone review panel to reach a decision and make notes on the milestone report. This usually takes about 20 minutes. The candidate is then invited to re-join the milestone review panel to learn the outcome of their milestone and discuss the panel’s recommendations.

The milestone report is usually forwarded to the candidate within a week after the milestone takes place. Following the receipt of this the candidate should discuss the outcome of the milestone with her or his advisory team.

**The Thesis Review (final) milestone**

Thesis review is expected to take place 12 months FTE (PhD) or 6 months FTE (MPhil) after mid-candidature review and should be held no later than 3 months prior to the expected thesis submission date. The purpose of this milestone is to ensure that:

- the work is of a standard to be examined by the expected submission date
- appropriate feedback about the readiness of the thesis for examination can be given
- any issues or concerns with the thesis requiring attention can be addressed prior to submission
- the scope, originality and quality of the thesis are of an appropriate standard
- there is a forum for discussing the mix of disciplinary knowledge required among the thesis examiners to review the breadth of work contained within the thesis
- the candidate and the advisors have an opportunity to express any reservations or concerns about having any particular individual act as an examiner and the nomination of a chair of examiners can be discussed
- the candidate has an opportunity to request an oral thesis examination in addition to a written examination
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In more general terms, the thesis review milestone is a final check to be sure that the dissertation is likely to meet the standards of the school and the university, and that it is likely to be completed on time.

The Graduate School notes that ‘by this stage you should have the majority of your thesis written. Your peers will be available to provide you with direction and guidance in the final stages of your project. Comment will be made on the content and structure of your thesis. You will receive suggestions on how to make it ready for submission.’

Like all of the milestones, the thesis review milestone comprises three parts: a submission, an oral presentation, and an interview.

**Thesis review: the submission**

The submission component for the thesis review comprises a full draft of the dissertation, or as close as possible to that. The dissertation is expected to be substantially complete by this stage, and while some parts may be still in draft form, and some small parts yet to be prepared or written, the majority of the chapters should be ready. The content of any unwritten parts should be indicated in summary form. The submission should include a contents page. The documents for the submission should be sent in advance via email. Please do not include appendices or attachments unless they are part of the actual thesis draft.

**Thesis review: the oral presentation**

The oral presentation for thesis review follows the same pattern as the confirmation and mid-candidature seminars – first an overview of the project as a whole (approx. 10 mins) followed by the presentation of one draft chapter (20 mins) most likely in abbreviated form.

For mid-candidature and thesis review milestones, the candidate may be given a ‘credit’ for the oral component if they have completed a conference paper, 3 minute thesis presentation or school research seminar on the topic of their thesis, in a suitable academic context, within 6 months of the scheduled milestone. Candidates who believe they meet the criteria for this ‘credit’ should make their case to the PG Coordinator, who will make a decision as to whether the oral presentation is needed or not.

Where a credit is granted, and there is no formal presentation, candidates are encouraged to still give a brief (up to 10 mins) introduction to the project as a whole, presenting only to the milestone review panel and not to a public audience.

**Thesis review: the formal interview**

The interview in the Thesis review follows exactly the pattern for the confirmation and Mid-Candidature milestones – namely that the interview occurs immediately after the oral presentation. It is a discussion between the candidate and the milestone review panel and offers an opportunity to discuss the project, its scope, its direction, its strengths and weaknesses, and so on. Following the interview, the candidate will then be asked to leave the room to enable the milestone review panel to reach a decision and make notes on the milestone report. This usually takes about 20 minutes. The candidate is then invited to re-join the milestone review panel to learn the outcome of their milestone and discuss the panel’s recommendations.

The milestone report is usually forwarded to the candidate within a week after the milestone takes place. Following the receipt of this the candidate should discuss the outcome of the milestone with her or his advisory team.
Timeline, steps and responsibilities for managing Milestone Review Seminars

In advance:

1. The PG admin officer schedules a date for the seminar and communicates this to student, advisors, and PG coordinator, 6-8 weeks before seminar.
2. If there is an unavoidable need to change the scheduled date (for instance if a particular external critic is not available on that date) then the reschedule is the responsibility of the Principal advisor, working in association with the PG admin officer.
3. The Principal advisor ensures that the milestone requirements and expectations have been communicated to the student. If there are any questions these are discussed with the PG Coordinator, 6-8 weeks out.
4. The Principal advisor chooses and approaches a suitable external critic, 4-8 weeks out. Principal advisor informs the PG coordinator of the name and email address of the external critic.
5. The PG coordinator agrees to chair, or nominates a suitable alternative chair, 4-8 weeks out.
6. If the candidate is applying for a ‘credit’ for the presentation part of the milestone (for Mid-Candidature and Final Thesis Review only) they make an appointment to discuss with the PG Coordinator, giving evidence of a recent public presentation, 2-4 weeks out.
7. The candidate is invited to make an (optional) appointment with the PG Coordinator to discuss supervisory arrangements, including any proposed changes, 7-10 days out.
8. The candidate prepares the written submission in consultation with the advisors, and emails the completed document to the principal advisor 7-10 days prior to the seminar. Principal advisor distributes the submission to PG coordinator and other advisors.
9. PG coordinator sends the written submission to the external critic, along with the milestone guidelines and briefing on the external critic’s role, 1-2 weeks out.
10. If the candidate is giving a public seminar they prepare a short (150 word) abstract and email to PG Coordinator for advertising to the school research community, 1-2 weeks out.
11. The advisors, chair, and external critic read the written submission and note any questions they may have for the candidate, also observations and/or ideas about the strengths and weaknesses of the project. Note that external critics are not obliged to provide a written report but may (if they choose) make their notes available to the student.

On the day:

1. PG admin officer sets up staff room with data projector and laptop immediately before the seminar. The candidate should discuss any special presentation requirements with the PG admin officer in advance. Candidates are welcome to use their own computers if desired.
2. PG coordinator (or delegate) chairs the seminar. This usually follows the pattern of: an oral presentation by the student, followed by a short period of general questions and discussion with the audience, after which the audience leaves the room and a private interview is conducted between the student, advisors, chair, and external critic, after which the student leaves the room and the panel confers about whether the milestone has been attained, and makes notes for the milestone review.
form. The panel reaches consensus, the student is invited to re-enter the room, and the decision is announced to the student immediately.

After the event:

1. The chair prepares the milestone review form, and circulates to the advisors and external critic for feedback and any changes or additions to reflect the discussion that took place in the interview and panel deliberations, 1-7 days after the seminar.

2. When consensus has been reached about the milestone review form, the chair circulates it in final form to advisors and candidate, 7-10 days after seminar.

3. The PG admin officer completes the Graduate School Milestone form, attaches the milestone review form, and submits it to the graduate school.