

Actions required for the Major Review of Postgraduate Progress

PhD and Master by Research candidates are provisionally enrolled for the first 12 months of candidature. In order to progress to full candidature, the Major Review of Postgraduate Progress must be completed. Details of the University's requirements for this are available at: <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/graduatecentre/forms/milestones/major-review/>.

The Major Review must be sufficiently rigorous to identify (and resolve) any stumbling blocks so that completion within time-frame is achievable or candidature is changed. The Major Review is, therefore, a **critical step** in the management and progression of candidature, at which a student's **potential and commitment** to complete the research degree are assessed. It is important this process be completed in a timely fashion, and therefore the major review should be conducted in the tenth or eleventh month of candidature.

Within the School of Agriculture, Food and Wine we have developed a procedure for the Major Review that aims to provide all parties (student, supervisors, School and University) with a clear outcome concerning the state of candidature at the end of the first year. The main part of the Major Review in AFW consists of a Review Meeting, at which you will make a short (15-20 minute) presentation of your research to date and intentions for the remainder of candidature, as well as providing information about plans should there be difficulties etc. After this a review panel, comprising the PGC (as convenor), your supervisors, Independent Advisor (specified as External Discipline Expert on the form), and the Head of the Research Group (or other Senior School Academic from your Department), will meet with you to discuss progress and make determinations against the University's guidelines.

An outline of the process is provided below:

Prior to the meeting

1. About 3 weeks before the intended Major Review meeting the student should arrange a mutually suitable date and time with the panel members listed above. Time for a presentation should also be factored in at this stage (see point 2). Please liaise with the Independent Advisor to ensure they are able to attend, or where practicable, organise for their virtual attendance (e.g. skype).
2. A venue must be booked for the seminar and the review meeting that will follow (generally a meeting room with provision for overhead digital projection, and seating for 15-25 people). Groups often have a specific seminar coordinator who should be consulted to assist with booking a room and circulating the details (including on www.thewaite.org/). Please ensure that all members of your Department and the research group(s) with whom you are affiliated (as appropriate) are informed of the seminar details.
3. Once the review meeting is planned, both student and supervisors are required to prepare a brief (1-page) report using the Major Review of Progress form downloaded from the Graduate Centre web page (see link above). The reports should outline the progress of experimental work and, most importantly, the student's research plans for the remainder of candidature. An updated Gantt chart, and CaRST Development Plan and Training Summary should also be prepared by the student. These are emailed by the Principal Supervisor, together with the Major Review form, to the review panelists in several days in advance of the meeting. The student should bring a hardcopy of the partly completed Major Review form, updated Gantt chart and CaRST documents to the review meeting. Prior to the meeting the student should have updated their CaRST ePortfolio and provided a link to it in the Development Plan.

At the meeting

4. The independent advisor chosen at the outset of the candidature is asked to assist with the review. He/she has some knowledge of the project area, and can assist members of the review panel with advice regarding the experimental approach chosen for the research and the possibility of any major hurdles arising from these considerations during the candidature. Additionally, a senior academic staff member from the research group, or another staff member suitably experienced in the research area, is asked to attend to provide expert advice to the panel.
5. The meeting is convened by the PGC. The student is welcome to bring along a support person. After an introduction about the purpose of the meeting by the PGC, the student gives their presentation for 15-20 minutes, which is followed by some questions from the review panel and the general audience (including members of the Research Group in which the student is a member). At the end of the question period, the review panel and student continue the review meeting in private. Any further questions from the panel are put to the student and then supervisors are asked to leave the room for a brief time to allow the remaining panelists to question the student alone.
6. The supervisors are then asked to return and the student (and any support person) is asked to leave while the review panel discusses the student's progress before making its recommendation. The PGC then invites the student (and support person) to return, the panel's decision is provided and the necessary paperwork completed.
7. The Independent Advisor prepares a brief (half-page) meeting report that summarises the review meeting and the panel's recommendation. This is forwarded to the PGC, who will send all paperwork to the Head of School for approval.

From January 2017, an assessment of the student's progress with CaRST activities is included in the Major Review. Students and their supervisors will therefore need to ensure that adequate planning, monitoring and recording of all CaRST activities is kept up-to-date throughout provisional candidature, and that clear plans are described for future activities.

Often, the review panel makes a recommendation that full candidature be confirmed – this indicates that the first 12 months of candidature have been successful, and that the student, their project and the supervisory arrangements are working well.

The review may alternatively result in a modification of the research plan, or if progress or commitment is judged to be unsatisfactory, the following may occur:

- (a) The student may be given a probationary period of 3-5 months in which an extended Major Review will occur. During this period, the student must complete a series of project-specific tasks to the satisfaction of a Review Panel;
- (b) The student may be required to change enrolment from PhD to a Master by Research or Master of Philosophy or other qualification; or
- (c) Candidature may be terminated.