Higher Degree Research Confirmation of Candidature and Progression Review Policy and Procedure

Policy Category	**Policy**/guideline/**procedure**/rules		
Review	3 years from date of Approval		
Policy Code	ARP001		
Contacts	policy@imc.edu.au		
Version	Approval Authority	Approval Date	Commencement Date
2020.09	Academic Board	21 September 2020	21 September 2020

1. Purpose

This policy outlines the probationary phase of a Higher Degree Research candidate's candidature and the processes in place to help ensure that candidates remain 'on track' during their candidature. In this sense, the policy comprises an integral part of the quality assurance processes.

The specific aims of the policy are to:

1. Identify early in the candidature any support and guidance necessary for their proceeding successfully to the next major stage of their research;
2. Assess progress made and the academic preparedness of the candidate to complete their degree;
3. Provide an opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate written and other necessary research skills appropriate to the postgraduate research level of study; and
4. Achieve more timely and successful completions.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all Higher Degree Research students, and IMC staff, affiliates and who are involved in the supervision and or administration Higher Degree Research at IMC.

3. Definitions

Affiliate is an individual who is not a staff member of IMC but who is engaged by IMC to perform duties or functions and or is recognised for their contribution to IMC. Affiliates include honorary title holders (including honorary, adjunct, visiting positions); consultants to IMC; members of IMC

committees and boards; or any other person engaged by IMC to perform duties or functions on their behalf.

Associate Supervisor is a staff member who has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors, and who in conjunction with the Principal Supervisor is responsible for the guidance and supervision of a HDR student.

Candidate is a student enrolled in Higher Degree Research

Confirmation and Progress Review Panel (The Panel) is an advisory body to the HDRSC, established for each HDR candidate, to formally consider and make recommendations on the candidate's confirmation, progression and submission of thesis.

Higher Degree Research (HDR) include Masters' Degree (Research) and Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).

Higher Degree, Research and Scholarships Committee (HDRSC) is a managerial body responsible for IMC's higher degree research programs oversight and other research and scholarly activities.

Principal Supervisor - A staff member of IMC who meets the requirements of and has been approved for inclusion on the Register of Supervisors as a Principal Supervisor and has primary oversight of a HDR candidate's research.

Timely Completion - Submission of a thesis by the approved submission date with the maximum period of candidature (three years for PhD candidates or part time equivalent, two years for a masters by research candidate or part time equivalent).

4. Procedures

4.1 Pre-Confirmation

Once candidates have accepted an offer and enrolled they must contact the Principal Supervisor and agree on a date for formal induction. The induction process will involve the signing of a contractual agreement between parties and documentation of a regular communication schedule during candidature. The contractual agreement will document the requirement for the candidate and the Principal Supervisor to report every six months to the HDRSC on the progress being made on the thesis. Both parties must sign off when the induction has occurred and forward detail to the Chair of the HDRSC.

4.2 The Confirmation Process

The confirmation process is a requirement of enrolment in HDR that is intended to support candidates in the early stages of their candidature. It will normally occur at the end of the first year of enrolment, or equivalent for part-time candidates. The process will allow candidates to receive objective confirmation that their research direction is sound, the methodologies appropriate and the standard of writing satisfactory. Any difficulties that might impede successful completion can be identified and investigated.

4.2.1 Confirmation and Progress Review Panel

The HDRSC will create a Confirmation and Progress Review Panel (The Panel) to consider confirmation of candidature and progression reviews. The Panel is an advisory body to the HDRSC, and will be established for each candidate comprising at least the following:

- Member, HDRSC
- Provost or nominee
- A representative who is there at the invitation of the candidate
- An external academic or practitioner in the discipline area.

Panels may co-opt additional expertise as required for each candidate. The Chair of the Panel will be appointed by the HDRSC.

4.2.2 Confirmation Requirements

In order for candidature to be confirmed the following tasks or milestones must normally be met by candidates.

1. Presented a detailed research proposal for formal approval within the first 12 months of candidature for a full-time candidate, or equivalent for a part-time candidate;
2. Completed an annotated bibliography or literature review if not included in the proposal;
3. Drafted a preliminary application for ethics approval where relevant;
4. Passed safety course where required;
5. Completed successfully any required coursework units;
6. Completed other approved development activities needed, e.g. units in statistics, academic writing, intellectual property and electronic literacy including use of electronic databases; and
7. Presented their progress to date at an interview with the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel (The Principal Supervisor and associate superviors may attend the interview, but must not answer questions on behalf of the candidate).

During the Confirmation Process candidates will meet with the Panel and satisfy the following requirements:

i. Present to the Panel a written document containing at least:
   - a critical review of recent research in the field,
   - a current research proposal,
   - a current plan of research,
   - a current timetable for completion of the thesis,
   - a comprehensive statement of the resources required to complete the project within the funded period.

ii. Deliver an oral presentation to the Panel,

iii. Provide a verbal defence of the research proposal before the Panel. In addition, the issue of ethics and safety approvals, intellectual property, thesis format and components, and data retention and management must also be considered and addressed.

4.2.3 Confirmation Presentation Process

The Principal Supervisor will nominate possible dates for the Confirmation presentation that will be considered pending the availability of panel members. The HDRSC will notify the candidate and supervisors of the presentation details and request the submission of a written proposal which will then be passed to the Chair of the Panel for distribution to the panel members with sufficient lead-time to allow the Panel to read the documents prior to the oral presentation. Other than in exception circumstances, this shall bel be one week. The Chair of the Panel will also be provided with the **Confirmation Evaluation Form (Appendix 1)** for completion.

The candidate will deliver their oral presentation to the Panel. As a guide, it is expected that the oral presentation for approximately 20-25 minutes.
The Panel members will be given the opportunity to ask questions of the candidate about the proposal and the candidate will have the opportunity to address the Panel and provide a verbal defence of their research proposal. The Principal Supervisor or any associate supervisor may only contribute to answering questions if invited to do so by the Chair of the Panel.

The Panel will determine an outcome. They will record their evaluations, outcome and feedback on the **Confirmation Evaluation Form** provided by the HDRSC and forward all of the documentation to the Chair of the HDRSC for ratification. The Panel is to provide the result and feedback to the candidate as soon as possible after the outcome has been determined. Other than in exceptional circumstances, this shall be within 30 days of the presentation to the Panel.

4.2.4 Unsatisfactory Progress and Termination of Study

Non-compliance with Confirmation of Candidature

Candidates failing to comply by refusal to participate in, or refusal to sign off on, their confirmation of candidature will be deemed to have made unsatisfactory progress. The procedure followed will be the same as that under the Unsatisfactory Progress procedure below.

Unsatisfactory Progress

Unsuccessful confirmation attempt

If the Panel determines that the candidature is not confirmed, the Panel shall document the aspects of the confirmation process which were inadequate, and the candidate will normally be required to undergo the confirmation process again within three months (or six months if the candidate is enrolled part time). The candidate shall be provided with appropriate support during this phase by IMC and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the HDRSC in consultation with the candidate and all supervisors to assist the candidate in deficient areas.

If, after the second presentation, the Panel determines that the candidate cannot be confirmed, the Panel must make a recommendation to the Chair of the HDRSC requiring the candidate to show cause to the HDRSC as to why their candidature should be permitted to continue.

In the event that the Panel does not recommend confirmation of candidature, it is essential that the Panel's Report is sufficiently detailed. In these cases, the Panel's recommendations should include:

- A statement of the Panel's recommendation;
- A statement on the quality of the candidate's work with regard to the standard required for candidature, including the candidate's application to the project, initiative shown in

devising and developing the project and the overall progress to date;

- A statement of all the reasons for the recommendation not to confirm the candidature, indicating all the deficiencies of the proposal;
- A statement outlining the intervention strategies that were implemented;
- A statement of what other options, if any, have been discussed with the candidate.

Where progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory, the candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to a 'show cause' letter from the Chair of the HDRSC. Candidates must respond to the Chair of the HDRSC within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

The HDRSC will review the 'show cause' correspondence, will notify the candidate of the HDRSC's recommendation, and in the case of an unfavourable decision, inform the candidate of the appeal process.

The decision on unsatisfactory progress is final, barring the exercise of the right of appeal. The HDRSC will provide a recommendation to the Academic Board to implement that decision.

Appeal against an unsatisfactory progress outcome

a. Candidates will have the right of appeal against any unfavourable recommendation of the HDRSC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Principal within 21 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavourable recommendation.

b. Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
    i. Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the Confirmation Process; and
    ii. Documentable evidence of prejudice or bias on the part or one or more of the members of the Panel.

4.3 Mid-Candidature Review

For all candidates who have had their candidature confirmed, there will be a Mid-Candidature Review, consisting of a written report and presentation, normally taking place at the end of the second year of enrolment, or equivalent for part-time candidates. The purpose of the Mid-Candidature Review is for candidates to provide evidence to the Panel that their research is progressing satisfactorily and that research targets are being met on a timely basis. The presentation and update on their HDR project will be to an audience that includes the Panel, fellow HDR candidates and academics in their relevant discipline. The is also an opportunity to strengthen collegiality and help to enable timely identification and resolution of any issues that may be impacting a candidate's progress. It is not intended to replace the regular reporting of progress by candidates and supervisors during the candidate's candidacy.

4.3.1 Mid-Candidature Review Requirements

The Review should consist of:

1. Statement of research aims/objectives/questions;
2. Statement of the main research findings to date;
3. Statement of what has been written to date, and what remains to be written;
4. Statement of other tasks to be completed, a timeline for completing these tasks, and an

expected submission date; and
5. Statement of any obstacles to progress.

In addition to the written report candidates are required to make a formal presentation.This material should be presented in a 15 to 30 minute oral presentation, followed by questions from the Panel and audience. The candidate may also be required to meet separately with the Panel to discuss their work-to-date and future tasks.

The Principal Supervisor will nominate possible dates for the Mid-Candidature Review that will be considered pending the availability of panel members. The HDRSC will notify the candidate and supervisor/s of the presentation details and will provide the Chair with a **Progress Review Evaluation Form (Appendix 2)** for completion.

The Panel will determine an outcome. They will record their evaluation, outcome and feedback on the **Progress Review Evaluation Form** provided by the HDRSC and forward all of the documentation to the Chair of the HDRSC for ratification. The Panel is to provide the result and feedback to the candidate as soon as possible after the outcome has been determined.

4.3.2 Concerns about timely completion

If the Panel determines that it has concerns about the candidate achieving a timely completion, the Panel shall document the reasons for its concern. The candidate will be provided with appropriate support during this phase and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the HDRSC in consultation with the candidate and supervisors to assist the candidate in dealing with the concerns raised.

Unsatisfactory Progress

If the Panel determines that the candidate's progress is unsatisfactory, the Panel shall document the aspects of the progress which were inadequate, and the candidate will normally be required to repeat the review process within three months (or six months if the candidate is enrolled part time). The candidate should be provided with appropriate support during this phase by IMC and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the HDRSC in consultation with the candidate and all supervisors to assist the candidate in deficient areas.

If, after the second presentation, the Panel determines that progress is still unsatisfactory, the Panel must make a recommendation to the Chair of the HDRSC requiring the candidate to show cause to the HDRSC as to why their candidature should be permitted to continue.

In the event that the Panel does not recommend continued enrolment, it is essential that the Panel's Report is sufficiently detailed and should include:

- A statement of the Panel's recommendation;
- A statement on the quality of the candidate's work with regard to the standard required for candidature, including the candidate's application to the project, initiative shown in devising and developing the project and the overall progress to date;
- A statement of all the reasons for the recommendation not to continue the candidature, indicating all the deficiencies of the work to date;
- A statement outlining the intervention strategies that were implemented;
- A statement of what other options, if any, have been discussed with the candidate.

Where progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory, the candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to a 'show cause' letter from the Chair of the HDRSC. Candidates must respond to the Chair of the HDRSC within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

The HDRSC will review the 'show cause' correspondence, will notify the candidate of the HDRSC's recommendation, and in the case of an unfavourable decision, inform the candidate of the appeal process. The decision on unsatisfactory progress is final, barring the exercise of the right of appeal. The HDRSC will provide a recommendation to the Academic Board to implement that decision.

Appeal against an unsatisfactory progress outcome

a. Candidates will have the right of appeal against any unfavourable recommendation of the HDRSC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Principal within 21 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavourable recommendation.

b. Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
    i. Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the Mid-Candidature Review process; and
    ii. Documentable evidence of prejudice or bias on the part or one or more of the members of the Panel.

4.4 Pre-submission Review

For all candidates who have substantially completed their research and are in the final stages of thesis preparation, there will be a Pre-submission Review, consisting of a written report and presentation, normally occurring toward the latter part of year three of enrolment (or equivalent for part-time candidates). The Pre-submission Report and Presentation can only be scheduled once the Principal Supervisor has formally advised the HDRSC that he or she is of the view that the research of the candidates has been completed, and the standard of the work is of sufficient standard to be submitted for examination.

The purpose of the Pre-submission Review is for candidates to provide evidence to the Panel that the research has been completed, and the standard of the work is of sufficient standard to be submitted for examination. The presentation will be to an audience that includes the Panel, fellow HDR candidates and academics in their relevant discipline. The presentation is also an opportunity to strengthen collegiality and help identify small areas that need to be addressed prior to submission of the thesis.

4.4.1 Pre-submission Review Requirements

The Review should consist of a Report (maximum of 10 pages) summarising the:

1. Research aims/objectives/questions;
2. Methodology employed
3. Main research findings;
4. Limitations of the research;

5. Implications of the findings.

In addition to the written report candidates are encouraged to use presentation aids such as PowerPoint to assist with the presentation. This material should be presented in a 15 to 30 minute oral presentation, followed by questions from the Panel and audience.

The Principal Supervisor will nominate possible dates for the Pre-submission Review that will be considered pending the availability of panel members. The HDRSC will notify the candidate and supervisors of the presentation details and will provide the Chair with a **Pre-Submission Evaluation Form (Appendix 3)** for completion.

The Panel will review their findings and determine whether the candidate can submit their thesis for examination. They will record their evaluation, outcome and feedback on the **Pre-Submission Evaluation Form** provided by the HDRSC and forward all of the documentation to the Chair of the HDRSC for ratification. The Panel is to provide the result and feedback to the candidate as soon as possible after the outcome has been determined.

4.4.2 Concerns about submission

If the Panel determines that it has concerns that the candidate's work is not of a sufficient standard or is not sufficiently completed to warrant submission, the Panel shall document the reasons for its concern. The candidate will need to be provided with appropriate support during this phase and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the HDRSC in consultation with the candidate and all supervisors to assist the candidate in dealing with the concerns raised by the Panel.

If the Panel determines that the candidate is not ready to submit, the Panel shall document the reasons for the decision, and the candidate will normally be required to undergo the review process again within three months (or six months if the candidate is enrolled part time).

Prior to making a second Pre-submission Review the candidate must document how he or she has addressed the concerns of the Panel. If, after the second presentation, the Panel determines that progress is unsatisfactory, the Panel must make a recommendation to the Chair of the HDRSC requiring the candidate to show cause to the HDRSC as to why their candidature should be permitted to continue. Alternatively, the Panel may recommend that the candidate consider changing enrolment from a PhD to a Research Masters Degree. In rare circumstances a candidate may be permitted to make a 3rd presentation.

In the event that the Panel does not recommend continued enrolment, it is essential that the Panel's Report is sufficiently detailed and should include:

- An unequivocal statement of the panel's recommendation;
- A detailed statement on the quality of the candidate's work with regard to the standard required for candidature, including the candidate's application to the project, initiative shown in devising and developing the project and the overall progress to date;
- A detailed statement of all the reasons for the recommendation not to continue the candidature, indicating all the deficiencies of the work to date;
- A statement outlining the intervention strategies that were implemented;
- A statement of what other options, if any, have been discussed with the candidate.

Where progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory, the candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to a 'show cause' letter from the Chair of the HDRSC. Candidates must respond to the Chair of the HDRSC within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

The HDRSC will review the 'show cause' correspondence, will notify the candidate of the HDRSC's recommendation, and in the case of an unfavourable decision, inform the candidate of the appeal process. The decision on unsatisfactory progress is final, barring the exercise of the right of appeal. The HDRSC will provide a recommendation to the Academic Board to implement that decision.

Appeal against an unsatisfactory outcome

a. Candidates will have the right of appeal against any unfavourable recommendation of the HDRSC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the Principal within 21 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavourable recommendation.

b. Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
    i. Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the Pre-submission Review Process; and
    ii. Documentable evidence of prejudice or bias on the part or one or more of the members of the Panel.

5. Related Documents

1. *Academic Intellectual Property Policy*
2. *Research Higher Degrees Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy*
3. *Research Materials and Data Management Policy*
4. *Higher Degree Research Supervision Policy*
5. *Guidelines on Minimum Resources for Research Higher Degree Students*

6. Version Control

Historical Version	Approved by	Approval Date
2015. 10	Academic Board	22 October 2015

Appendix:

Appendix 1 **Confirmation Evaluation Form**

This form is to be completed by the Chair of the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel in response to a candidate undertaking confirmation. The Panel will have received and read the candidates written proposal in support of the confirmation.

Date of Confirmation: _____/_____/_____

Candidate Details	
Name:	**Student No:**
Current program level: □□□MBR □□□PhD	
Confirmation is being assessed at the following level: □□□MBR □□□PhD	
Confirmation and Progress Review Panel Members	
(1st) Chair of the Panel: **Name: Role:** **(2nd) Panel Member: Name** **(3rd) Panel Member: Name** **(4th) Panel Member: Name**	

Categories for Evaluation

1. Critical review of recent work in the field	**YES**	**NO**
Preliminary literature review completed.		
Literature review demonstrates adequate understanding of research area.		
Comments:		

2. Updated Research Proposal		
The overall research proposal should be assessed in terms of the feasibility, aims, significance, and originality. The scope of the research should be appropriate for the degree.		
	YES	**NO**
Overall research proposal is accepted:		
Comments:		

3. Research Plan	**YES**	**NO**
Research design and methods appropriate to the project:		
Candidate displays sound knowledge of field of research:		
Draft thesis outline appropriate, given the stage of research:		
IP issues:		
Comments:		

4. Updated timetable for completion of the thesis	**YES**	**NO**
Draft timelines are appropriate and achievable**:**		

Comments:

5. Resource Implications	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**
Adequate infrastructure and funding:			
Adequate technical support available:			
Other resources:			
Further training or assistance required: (If "Yes" please provide details below)			

Comments:

6. Oral presentation delivered to the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel in an open forum:		
Duration of presentation (mins):		
Venue of presentation:		
Approx. number of attendees:		
Oral presentation demonstrates a sound understanding of the research topic:	**YES**	**NO**

Comments:

7a. Did the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel question the candidate to obtain a verbal defence of the research?	YES	NO
7b. Was the verbal defence of the research appropriate given the stage of the research?		

Comments:

8. Data Retention and Management:	YES	NO
1. Data storage provisions for this research meet the guidelines under section 2 of the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* and IMC's *Research Materials and Data Management Policy*		

Comments:

9. Ethics	YES	NO	N/A
Is human ethics approval required?			
Has approval been granted by the *Human Research Ethics Committee*?			
If no, is the candidate aware of the required processes to gain such approval and the timeframe for gaining approval?			

Comments**:**

10. Outcome	Tick relevant outcome
The candidate is CONFIRMED (NOTE: Conditional confirmations are NOT permitted)	
2nd Attempt Required **The candidate is NOT confirmed and is required to undertake confirmation again within 3 months (FTE).** The Research Services Directorate will coordinate the second attempt in the same manner as the first. **NOTE: A documented intervention strategy to assist the candidature will be developed by the Chair of the HDRSC.**	
The candidate is NOT confirmed **A recommendation is hereby made to the Chair of the HDRSC to advise the candidate they are required to show cause to the HDRSC as to why their candidature should be permitted to continue.**	

Comments:
Where the recommendation is 2nd Attempt Required, the Panel must detail here or in an attachment the reasons for their decision and ensure that sufficient written feedback is given to support the development of an intervention strategy.

a) Where the recommendation is Not Confirmed the Panel must provide here or in an attachment: An unequivocal statement of the panel's recommendation;
A detailed statement on the quality of the candidate's work with regard to the standard required for candidature, including the candidate's application to the project, initiative shown in devising and developing the project and the overall progress to date;
A detailed statement of all the reasons for the recommendation not to confirm the candidature, indicating all the deficiencies of the proposal;
A statement outlining the intervention strategies that were implemented;
A statement of what other options, if any, have been discussed with the candidate.

Feedback to Candidate

If detailed feedback comments have not been made on the previous evaluation pages you may summarise your feedback for the candidate here.
Please note the candidate will receive a copy of the completed evaluation form.

11. The Confirmation and Progress Review Panel offer the following feedback to the candidate:
Critical review of recent work in the field:
Research proposal:
Plan of research:
Oral presentation:
Defence of research:

Signatures and Ratification

12. Signatures of Panel members:

By signing this form Panel members agree with the outcome documented at item 10 and have formulated feedback to be provided to the candidate.

1) Panel Chair: Name:

Signature: _____ Date:_____/_____/ _____

£Feedback has been provided to the candidate, OR,

£Feedback will be provided to the candidate by_____/_____/ _____

2) Panel Member:

Name: _____ Signature:__

Date:_____/___/ _____

3) Panel Member:

Name: _____ Signature:__

Date:_____/___/ _____

4) Panel Member:

Name: _____ Signature:__

Date:_____/___/ _____

5) Panel Member:

Name: _____ Signature:__

Date:_____/___/ _____

13. Chair of the HDRSC:

a. The following confirmation documents are attached: Research Proposal (from item 2) Research Plan (from item 3) Updated timetable (from item 4)

b. I am satisfied that this outcome was determined in accordance with the Confirmation Year Guidelines, that any mandatory training has been undertaken and that due process was followed.

c. I have confirmed that the Chair of Panel has provided feedback to the candidate

Name: _____

Signature:_____ Date:_____/_____/ _____

PLEASE ENSURE ALL DOCUMENTS ARE SENT TO THE HDRSC, ASAP.

RSO USE ONLY:

Copy of Confirmation Panel Review document sent to candidate & supervisors:_____/_____/ _____

Student acknowledgement received:_____/_____/ _____

Student system updated:_____/_____/ _____

Appendix 2 **Progress Review Evaluation Form**

This form is to be completed by the Chair of the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel in response to a candidate making a progress update seminar presentation. The Panel will have received and read the candidates written proposal in support of continued enrolment.

Candidate Details	
Name:	**Student No:**
Date of Progress Seminar: **Date of Meeting (if relevant):**	**Current program level:** □□□MBR □□□PhD
Expected Submission Date:	**Enrolment End Date:**

Outcome	**Tick relevant outcome**
The candidate is making satisfactory progress towards a timely completion	
The Progress Panel has concerns about the candidate achieving a timely completion	

Please provide information that justifies the basis for your decision.

If the panel has concerns about the candidate achieving a timely completion please elaborate these concerns.

If possible, recommend strategies for addressing any shortcomings or obstacles.

Progress Panel Members

Chair of the Panel:

Name: School:
Signature: _____ **Date:**_____
2nd Panel Member:
Name: School:
Signature: _____ **Date:**_____
3rd Panel Member:
Name: School:
Signature: _____ **Date:**_____
4th Panel Member:
Name: School:
Signature: _**Date:**_____

Please forward this evaluation form to Chair of the HDRSC

Chair of the HDRSC:

Please provide any relevant comments including details of any follow up action:

_____

_____

Name: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

PLEASE ENSURE ALL DOCUMENTS ARE SENT TO THEHDRSC, ASAP.

RSO USE ONLY:
Copy of Confirmation and Progress Review Panel document sent to student & supervisors:__/_____/_____ Student acknowledgement received:_____/_____/_____
Student system updated: /_____/_____

Appendix 3 **Pre-Submission Evaluation Form**

This form is to be completed by the Chair of the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel in response to a candidate's Pre-submission Review. The Panel will have received and read the candidate's report in support of submission.

Candidate Details	
Name:	**Student No:**
Date of Pre-submission Presentation: **Date of Meeting (if relevant):**	**Current program level:** □□□MBR □□□PhD
Expected Submission Date:	**Enrolment End Date:**

Outcome	**Tick relevant outcome**
The Confirmation and Progress Review Panel supports the recommendation of the Principal Supervisor that the candidate submits his or her thesis for examination	
The Confirmation and Progress Review Panel <u>does not</u> support the recommendation of the Principal Supervisor that the candidate submits his or her thesis for examination	
Please provide information that justifies the basis for your decision. **If possible, recommend strategies for addressing any shortcomings or obstacles.**	

Progress Panel Members

Chair of the Panel:

Name: School:
Signature: _____**Date:**_____
2nd Panel Member:
Name: School:
Signature: _____**Date:**_____
3rd Panel Member:
Name: School:
Signature: _____**Date:**_____
4th Panel Member:
Name: School:
Signature: _**Date:**_____

Please forward this evaluation form to Chair of the HDRSC

Chair of the HDRSC:

Please provide any relevant comments including details of any follow up action:

_____

_____

Name: _____

Signature: _____**Date:** _____

PLEASE ENSURE ALL DOCUMENTS ARE SENT TO THEHDRSC, ASAP.

RSO USE ONLY:
Copy of Confirmation and Progress Review Panel document sent to student & supervisors:__/_____/_____ Student acknowledgement received:_____/_____/_____
Student system updated: /_____/_____