Chairing a progress review meeting

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

RECOMMENDED STEPS

1	**Prior to the meeting**

- On commencement the Advisory Committee Chair must be appointed. Advisory Committee Chairs must be approved by the Head of Department/School or delegate. The Advisory Committee should then be appropriately formed and added to the candidate's record (via the submission of a <u>Request Change in Project Details form</u> available in the Student Portal).
- For all progress review meetings check the candidate has booked a date, time and location for the meeting (if applicable in your Department/School).
- Candidate completes their section of the online progress review form in CiAnywhere (Candidature Management System) 10 days prior to the scheduled meeting.
- Ensure the advisory committee receives appropriate information, including the written progress report prior to the meeting.

2	**Welcome and introduction**

Commence the meeting when all in attendance, introduce any new members and outline the meeting format
  i.   Candidate
  ii. All supervisors
  iii. <u>Advisory Committee Chair</u>
  iv. (Recommended) Other committee members: academic staff, honorary appointee, external member
  v.   (Optional, in attendance) Post doc, advisor or mentor

3	**Presentation by candidate on their progress to date followed by questions**

4	**Review of progress to include discussion of:**

- *(Confirmation only)* Review candidate's written report (5,000-8,000 words)– with iThenticate similarity report
- *(Confirmation only)* Check RIOT: Research integrity training has been completed and certificate provided
- Feedback on presentation
- Review candidate's previously-submitted progress report(s)
- Ensure six monthly interim progress review meetings with all supervisors documented
- Progress to date: preliminary data, methods and resources developed etc.
- Timeline and schedule of research project
- Problems encountered
- Thesis format; flag need for consideration of thesis *with* publication
- Scientific writing skills and their development; courses attended
- Presentation skills: participation in other seminars and symposiums
- Professional development: courses for required skills
- Availability of appropriate resources for project, including statistical support
- Travel, conferences and fieldwork
- Discussion as to whether a 'plan B' is necessary or has been considered
- *(2nd and 3rd year progress reviews)* Discussion about career goals and life post PhD.

5	At the meeting the advisory committee should assess the candidate's progress against each of the criteria in the online progress review form.

6 | Provide candidate and supervisors the opportunity to raise any issues or concerns

Provide the candidate and supervisors the opportunity to raise any issues or concerns **separately and in confidence** to members of the Advisory Committee – ask each party to leave room, in either order. Some example open-ended questions follow:

Candidate absent

- Is the candidate on research trajectory?
- Candidate's independent intellectual input
- Candidate's ownership of PhD
- Concerns about the candidate (well-being) or project
- Potential threats to timely completion?

Supervisors absent

- Any concerns or worries in relation to the PhD?
- Do you need more/less frequent meetings with supervisors?
- Need more supervisor time?
- Quality and breadth of input from supervisors?
- Potential threats to timely completion?

7 | Committee regroups to discuss outcome

Any issues and concerns around the candidate's progress, research project and supervision identified should be discussed and appropriate interventions instigated as soon as possible.

Red flags

- *(Confirmation only)* Literature review not at a reasonable standard
- Candidate not meeting supervisors' expectations
- Supervisor(s) not sufficiently prioritising candidate commitments (e.g. progress review meetings)
- Issues with research project (e.g. project not delineated within larger project, insufficient data)
- Funding issues
- Any issues raised previously by candidate or supervisor

8 | Potential outcomes

Confirmation meeting

- A.   Satisfactory progress - confirm candidature
- B.   Extension to probationary candidature (once only, up to 3 months full time equivalent)

Progress Review meeting

- A.   Satisfactory progress
- B.   'At risk' of making unsatisfactory progress (early intervention strategy with review)

9 | Advisory Committee Chair completes the online form during the meeting and submits for HOD/S or delegate approval

10	The Faculty Graduate Research team will process the form once the HOD/S or delegate submits their approval. If there are any issues with the form or it is incomplete, the team will contact the Advisory Committee Chair directly for further information or clarification.