

## **ABE Graduate School: Mid-Term Progress Review Form**

The purpose of the Mid-Term Review is to provide PhD researchers and the supervision team with a formal feedback moment involving an external committee (up to two independent evaluators) at the 2,5-year point. It is important to emphasise that this is not a Go/No-Go moment, but that the aim is to identify where the PhD researcher is in terms of their research progress, which includes progress on writing up the research, on collecting and analysing data, and on formulating their contribution(s) to knowledge. This is also a feedback moment in the middle of the PhD journey to identify if any additional support is needed.

Prior to the Mid-Term Progress Review meeting with the independent evaluators, the PhD candidate should produce a written document. Given the disciplinary diversity in the faculty, there is flexibility as to what this written document can be. For instance, this can be a progress report that explains what has been achieved following the Go/No-Go meeting, including e.g. research findings to date vis-à-vis the research questions and objectives. Alternatively, the PhD researcher, in consultation with the supervision team, can produce a research article that have already been (or is in the process of becoming) published. Whatever the format, it is important that this is **not additional work** for the PhD researcher, and that it is clear the written document is or can be an integral part of the thesis. It is also important that the written document presents a clear basis for discussing progress on addressing the research questions; data collection and analysis; thesis writing, and; doctoral education.

It is useful to prepare a 10-15 minute presentation at the start of the Mid-Term Progress Review meeting. Based on the written document and presentation at the Mid-Term Progress Review meeting, the committee should provide comments on the following, highlighting the positive points of achievement and the specific points of attention.

### **1. Clarity and accomplishment of the research aim, objectives, questions and contributions**

*To what extent is the research aim, objectives and questions still clearly defined in the written mid-term review document? To what extent is addressing the research aim, objectives and questions still feasible (i.e. the ability to complete within the remaining 1,5 to 2,5 years)? To what extent is/are the contribution(s) to knowledge clear and achievable, as articulated in the written mid-term review document?*

### **2. Logic and coherence of the written Mid-Term Review document and presentation**

*To what extent is the written mid-term review document logical and coherent? To what extent is the narrative of the thesis clear? And to what extent is the written mid-term review document a significant part of the intended PhD thesis?*

**3. Clarity of future plans for the remaining period**

*To what extent is there a clear and achievable plan to complete and write up the research in the remaining period? Where are the gaps and where are the opportunities for flexibility in adapting the plan? The review is also an opportunity to discuss the feasibility of the scope of study.*

**4. Doctoral education**

*To what extent is the candidate on track to achieving the necessary credits for doctoral education (i.e. 45 Graduate School credits)? To what extent is there a good balance between acquiring new or strengthening skills in discipline-related, research-related and transferable knowledge domains?*

Signatures of members of the committee

\*\*\* We are trialling an online method of signing progress review forms, which will streamline and accelerate the process of documentation. \*\*\*

---

PhD candidate

---

Promotor

---

Supervisor

---

External member