****

**School of Languages and Cultures**

**HDR Progress Reviews**

**First Review**

*All requirements should be completed by the end of the research quarter in which the review is due. Documents for review must be submitted by the census date for that research quarter, and at least two weeks before the review meeting. For full-time students, that is the same research quarter in which they commenced, one year later (eg. If you started in RQ3, your review is due in RQ3 of the following year.*

NB: the first thing a candidate should do in organising their review is to contact the members of their review committee (advisors, external reader, and HDR director as chair) in order to determine a suitable date and time for the progress review meeting. Once this is established, the HLO should be informed of this so that they can book a room for the meeting and start a paper trail ([hdr.languagesandcultures@enquire.uq.edu.au](mailto:hdr.languagesandcultures@enquire.uq.edu.au)).

It is hoped that the Reader, who is not on the advisory team but should be someone in or familiar with the field of research, will remain on the panel for all reviews in an HDR student’s candidature, and then go on to be the Chair of Examiners for the thesis and oral defence. While the candidate themself is responsible for the selection of the Reader, it is assumed that the Principal Advisor will play some role in this. Discussions about Reader selection should begin at least six months before the first review (typically six months into candidature).

**Oral presentation** (should be scheduled on one of the quarterly SLC HDR presentation days)

The oral presentation is a formal seminar presentation to the School:

* 20 minutes of presentation, followed by 10 minutes question time;
* Should be clear, concise and free of jargon, appropriate for the audience (HDR students and academic staff across the disciplines in the school); and
* Should overview the project:
  + Explain topic, rationale, position of work in field;
  + Outline key concepts and theoretical issues;
  + Detail the methodology.

There is no need to include your budget or timeline or other such administrative matters in your presentation. You may wish to include a chapter outline, but that is not absolutely necessary.

**Written documentation** (should be submitted at least two weeks before the progress review meeting, and must be submitted by the census date of the research quarter in which the review is due)

Other than the portfolio, which is a sort of professional resumé, all of the documentation required for the review is material which the candidate will or ought to be producing as part of their research project, leading to their thesis. The intention is not to create work in addition to the writing of the thesis, but rather to demonstrate the current state of progress of the project and thesis to allow for vital input from your panel.

**(1) Portfolio**

Download a blank copy of portfolio [here](https://graduate-school.uq.edu.au/files/10765/SLC%20HDR%20Portfolio%202022.docx). You should keep this portfolio and update it during candidature to resubmit for each progress review.

**(2) Candidate Statement**

Template available [here](https://my.uq.edu.au/files/22665/Candidate%20Statement.docx). Please email this document to your chair. This is a confidential statement. Do not include your advisory team or other members of your panel.

**(3) Progress Report**

Length: The document should be no more than 3,000 words.

* The document should include:
  + The thesis statement;
  + Rationale and position of the work in its field;
  + Outline of key concepts and theoretical issues;
  + Overview of methodological framework (unless included in the draft chapter)
  + Provisional Chapter outline (one short paragraph each);
  + Proposed timetable for completion;
  + Statement of resources and skills required to complete project;
  + Budget statement;
  + Statement on progress re ethical clearance requirements (completed/ in train/ not started/ irrelevant).

**(4) Draft Literature Review/Methodology**

This document should be the existing draft of the literature review. In some cases, this might include a methodology, or at least discussion of competing methodologies. The literature review should demonstrate critical engagement with the literature and consideration of its application to the current project, and not merely be a summary of the literature itself.

**Quality Expectations**

All written documentation should be free from any editorial errors and should demonstrate:

* + - A refined research plan;
    - A narrowed research topic;
    - A specific methodological framework;
    - Appropriate academic writing skills, and;
    - Appropriate levels of academic integrity (the document will be put through ithenticate by the Princiipal Advisor and the report discussed)

**Progress Meeting**

By two working days before the scheduled meeting, the Advisors (Principal and any/all Associates) and the Reader will submit reports. These reports should follow the template provided to panel members, which is also available [here](https://graduate-school.uq.edu.au/files/10780/SLC%20First%20Progress%20Review%20Report%20template%202022.docx).

The meeting will be 45-60 minutes in length. The Chair (usually the HDR Director), committee members (Principal/Associate Advisors and the Reader) and student discuss the committee members' reports to ensure the project is on track and viable. Typically the progress meeting follows this format:

* Candidate responds to the reports. This is an opportunity to seek clarification, ask questions, identify which recommendations the candidate plans to pursue, and which not (and why).
* Panel members can seek further clarification, explore possibilities, and broadly discuss the project and the materials with the candidate.
* The student and the advisors are also interviewed separately to give feedback on the functioning of the advisory team and any issues that may need to be addressed. The Chair and Reader are present throughout.
* The committee determines whether the candidate’s progress is satisfactory for this stage in candidature. If unsatisfactory, the panel may require the candidate to undertake another review within the following three months (this will not affect the timing of subsequent reviews). At the least, the panel will outline what needs to be done in order to bring the project up to a satisfactory standard for the expectations of the next progress review, two years into candidature (if full-time). The panel may set specific tasks with timelines, and may ask to see evidence of progress prior to the next review. It is hoped that even where progress is satisfactory, the panel will still have useful input.
* The Chair will submit a report summarising the meeting and outlining any steps to be taken.

**FEEDBACK**

It is expected that the candidate will receive feedback from the advisory team during the preparation of the document. The presentation and progress meeting also provide opportunities for the provision of structured feedback.

*Oral presentation:*

Audience members are invited to ask questions, which can provide inspiration for the project itself. Just as importantly, the audience’s comments and questions show the candidate what is clear and what is less than clear in the way they present their research questions.

*Written documentation:*

The advisory team and independent reader will provide written feedback on the candidate’s written materials. Panel members may also, if they wish, provide comments on the submitted draft material.

**GENERAL EXPECTATIONS AT THE FIRST PROGRESS REVIEW**

Note that these are not requirements, and that individual projects will require a different mix and timing of activities. However, regardless of the project, the review progress is aimed at ensuring that any HDR project remains on track to complete within the permitted time (ideally a total of 3.25 to 3.5 years for a PhD (Full-time) and 18 to 21 months for an MPhil).

Generally speaking, by the end of the first year of candidature, a full-time PhD candidate should be able to produce the materials under “Written documentation” above. In addition, if the project requires Ethics Approval, this should have been obtained by end of the first year so that data collection can be undertaken (and hopefully completed by the second progress review).