****

**School of Languages and Cultures**

**HDR Progress Reviews**

**Second 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 first review took place in RQ3 of the following year, and your second review is due in RQ3 of the year after that (assuming you remain enrolled full-time and do not interrupt your studies).*

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)).

**Oral Presentation** (should be scheduled on one of the quarterly SLC HDR presentation days[[1]](#footnote-1)\*)

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

* 20 minutes, 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 the aims and objectives in brief;
* Present the current version of the research questions
* Outline the key concepts
* What is done and what remains to be done
* Present (a sample of) the findings so far

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 circulated to the panel 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)

**(1) Portfolio**

The candidate submits an updated version of the portfolio completed for the previous 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 2,000 words.

The document should include:

* A (revised) thesis statement
* Summary of:
  + Main achievements since last progress review
  + Any changes to the project
  + A thesis plan (chapter outline)
  + Timeline for the remainder of candidature (including future milestones, writing targets, conferences etc)
  + Training or resourcing requirements
  + Projected budget for the remainder of candidature

**(4) Sample Substantive Chapter(s)**

By this stage, a candidate will have a number of chapters in draft form, with possibly one or more of them in advanced draft form, while others consist of little more than dot points, notes, or ideas. The candidate should submit either one substantive chapter in advanced draft form, or several chapters in draft if no chapter exists as an advanced draft.

By ‘substantive chapter’ it is intended that the draft will show some analysis and working with data. The chapter(s) in question should not be an introduction, conclusion, or literature review.

**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 with the notification of the meeting, also available [here](https://graduate-school.uq.edu.au/files/10790/SLC%20Second%20Progress%20Review%20report%20template%202022.docx).

The meeting will be 45-60 minutes in length. The Chair (normally 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.
* Resource implications are checked (ensuring that the required materials/funds have been sourced etc).
* 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 final progress review, three 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, findings, and analysis.

*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 SECOND 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 second year of candidature, a full-time PhD candidate should be able to produce the materials outlined above. They should also have completed their data collection or be very close to doing so. They should have a very clear plan and timeline for the remaining period of their candidature.

1. \* **Note:** As an alternative to presenting at the school presentation day, candidates may give a conference presentation based on their project (as opposed to a project overview to an academic conference, with their Principal Advisor’s approval. In these cases, the advisory team and candidate must arrange that a suitably experienced academic in the audience – who may is NOT a member of the advisory team - provides feedback on the presentation, for example using the Oral Presentation Feedback form. In these cases the candidate should contact the school Director of HDR Studies ([slc.drt@uq.edu.au](mailto:slc.drt@uq.edu.au)) well in advance of the conference to organise this. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)