

# HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH CONFIRMATION OF CANDIDATURE AND PROGRESSION REVIEW PROCEDURE

<b>Category</b>	Procedure		
<b>Review</b>	3 years from date of Approval		
<b>Code</b>	ARP-001-P		
<b>Contact</b>	policy@imc.edu.au		
<b>Version</b>	<b>Approval Authority</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>Review Date</b>
2026.05	Research and Scholarship Committee	12 May 2026	12 May 2029

## Contents

1	PURPOSE.....	1
2	PROCEDURE.....	1
3	RELATED DOCUMENTS .....	11
4	VERSION CONTROL .....	11
5	STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP/MAINTENANCE.....	11
	Appendix.....	12

## 1 PURPOSE

This procedure outlines the processes for implementing the Higher Degree Research Confirmation of Candidature and Progression Review Policy. It provides detailed steps for the Confirmation process, Mid-Candidature Review, and Pre-Submission Review.

## 2 PROCEDURE

### 2.1 Pre-Confirmation

- Once candidates have accepted an offer and enrolled, they must contact the Research Office and agree on a date for a 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 Check to report to the Director of Research and Scholarship on the progress being made on the thesis every six months, or equivalent for part-time

candidates.

- Both parties must sign off when the induction has occurred and forward details to the Director of Research and Scholarship.

## 2.2 Confirmation of Candidature

The confirmation process will normally occur at the end of the first year of enrolment for PhD and Master candidates, 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.

### 2.2.1 Confirmation and Progress Review Panel

The Director of Research and Scholarship will nominate for approval to RSC a Confirmation and Progress Review Panel (the Panel) comprising at least the following:

- Member, RSC
- Deputy President or delegate
- An independent 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 RSC. Any academic member of the panel must be independent and not directly involved in the supervision of the candidate.

### 2.2.2 Confirmation Requirements

Within the first 12 months of candidature for a full-time candidate, or equivalent for a part-time candidate, candidates must successfully complete any required research training and development activities, including (where applicable): this includes

- Orientation and safety courses
- Completion of required Coursework units
- Training in statistics and research methods
- Academic writing and communication
- Intellectual property and responsible research practice and research integrity
- Use of electronic databases and ethical use of AI in research

Where these conditions have been met, the candidate will be invited to take part in the Confirmation Presentation Process.

### 2.2.3 Confirmation Presentation Process

The confirmation process involves three stages:

### **Request and scheduling of confirmation**

The Director of Research and Scholarship or delegate will schedule the dates for the Confirmation presentation and confirm the availability of Panel members. The Director of Research and Scholarship will notify the candidate and supervisory team of the presentation details. The written proposal is submitted to the Director of Research and Scholarship at least two weeks prior to the Confirmation of Candidature presentation.

### **Submission of written documentation**

#### **MBR**

The thesis proposal documentation must be submitted by the candidate at least two weeks prior to their scheduled Confirmation of Candidature through the Research Office to the Director of Research and Scholarship. This must be scheduled to allow the Panel sufficient time to read the documents in detail prior to the oral presentation. Normally, this shall be at least two weeks before the oral presentation. The thesis proposal documentation will be sent to the Director of Research and Scholarship through the Research Office for distribution to the panel member

#### **PhD**

The thesis proposal documentation must be submitted by the candidate on or before the date requested by the RSC and the Director of Research and Scholarship. This must be scheduled to allow the Panel sufficient time to read the documents in detail prior to the oral presentation. Normally, this shall be at least two weeks before the oral presentation. The thesis proposal documentation will be sent to the Director of Research and Scholarship through the Research Office for distribution to the panel members.

The thesis proposal must include:

- Research aims, objectives and questions
- The proposed research methodology and methods
- A literature review
- Application for ethics approval
- Details of any intellectual property issues that might arise during the process of data collection
- Fieldwork proposal
- A timeline for the completion of the intended data collection activities
- A comprehensive overview of the resources required to complete the project within the funded period

### **Confirmation of Candidature Presentation and verbal defence**

The candidate will deliver an oral presentation to the Panel. It is expected that the oral presentation will last for approximately 15 minutes for the MBR and up to 20-25 minutes for the PhD.

Following the presentation, the Panel will be given the opportunity to ask the

candidate questions for approximately 20 minutes about the proposal and the candidate will have the opportunity to address the Panel and provide a verbal defence of their research proposal.

The Supervisory team may be invited to be present at the presentation but may only join the discussion with the candidate if invited to do so by the Chair of the Panel.

The Panel will determine an outcome as outlined below. The Panel will record their evaluations, outcome and feedback on the **Confirmation Evaluation Form** (Appendix 1) provided by the RSC and forward the documentation to the Research office to send to the Chair of the RSC for ratification. The Panel must endeavour to provide the result and feedback to the candidate as soon as possible after the outcome has been determined. Normally, this shall be within 21 days of the presentation to the Panel.

#### 2.2.4 Unsatisfactory Progress and Termination of Study Non-compliance with Confirmation of Candidature

Candidates who fail to comply with the confirmation procedure by refusal to participate or refusal to submit required documentation 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**

If the Panel determines that the candidature is not confirmed, the Panel shall document the aspects of the confirmation process were inadequate. A 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 by the Institute during this phase and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the RSC in consultation with the candidate and the supervisory team to assist the candidate to remedy any identified inadequacies.

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 RSC requiring the candidate to show cause to the RSC why their candidature should be permitted to continue.

If the Panel does not recommend confirmation of candidature, it is essential that the Panel's Report is appropriately detailed. The Panel's recommendations should include:

- A statement of the Panel's recommendation
- A statement on the quality of the candidate's work relative 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 RSC. Candidates must respond to the Chair of the RSC within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

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

The decision on unsatisfactory progress is final, other than the exercise of the right of appeal.

The RSC will provide a recommendation to the Academic Board to implement that decision.

#### 2.2.5 Appeal against unsatisfactory progress outcome

- Candidates will have the right of appeal against any unfavourable recommendation of the RSC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the President within 21 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavourable recommendation.
- Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
  - Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the Confirmation of Candidature Review process
  - Documentable evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of one or more of the members of the Panel.

### 2.3 Mid-Candidature Review (Only Required for PhD Candidates)

For PhD candidates who have had their candidature confirmed, there will be a Mid-Candidature Review, consisting of a written report and a presentation. This will take 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 the Panel with evidence of satisfactory progress in their research and that research targets are being met in a timely way.

Prior to the Mid-Candidature Review, candidates are expected to have discussed with their Principal Supervisor the nature of their final submission. The final submission is typically in a traditional thesis format. One aspect of the Mid-Candidature Review is the presentation of details, and broad word counts, for each of the two sections. This

allows the panel to confirm the details of the expected final submission.

The presentation aspect of the Mid-Candidature Review will be made to an audience that includes:

- The Review Panel
- Fellow HDR candidates
- Academics in their relevant discipline.

The review 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 does not replace the regular reporting of progress by candidates and supervisors during the candidate's enrolment.

The Principal Supervisor will nominate possible dates for the Mid-Candidature Review presentation and confirm the availability of Panel members. The RSC will notify the candidate and supervisory team of the presentation details and request the submission of the Mid-Candidature Review Report.

### 2.3.1 Mid-Candidature Review Requirements

Prior to the Mid-Candidature Review presentation, the candidate will submit a Mid-Candidature Review Report (maximum of 10 pages) that details:

- Research aims/objectives/questions
- The main research findings to date
- The suggested form of the final submission
- What has been written to date, and what remains to be written
- Tasks to be completed, a timeline for completing these tasks, and an expected submission date
- Statement of any obstacles to completion.

In addition to the written report candidates are required to make a formal presentation. This should consist of a 20-to-25-minute oral presentation. The presentation will follow by questions from the Panel and the audience. The candidate may also be required to attend a supplementary meeting with the Panel to discuss the candidate's work-to-date and future tasks.

The Panel will determine an outcome and record its evaluation and feedback on the **Progress Review Evaluation Form** (Appendix 2). The documentation will be forwarded to the Chair of the RSC for ratification. The RSC will review and ratify the outcome and, where required, make recommendations to the Academic Board. The Panel will provide the result and feedback to the candidate as soon as possible, normally within 21 days of the presentation.

### 2.3.2 Concerns about Timely Completion

If the Panel decides that it has concerns about a candidate achieving a timely

completion, the Panel shall document the reasons for its concern. A candidate will be provided with appropriate support during this phase, and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the RSC in consultation with the candidate and supervisors to assist the candidate in addressing the concerns raised.

### **Unsatisfactory Progress**

If the Panel determines that a candidate's progress is unsatisfactory, it shall document the aspects of the progress which were inadequate. 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 by the Institute during this phase and a documented intervention strategy should be developed by the Chair of the RSC in consultation with the candidate and all supervisors to assist the candidate in deficient areas.

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

In the case of PhD candidates, the Panel may recommend that the candidate considers changing enrolment from a PhD to a Research Master's Degree.

If the Panel does not recommend continuation of a candidate's enrolment, it is essential that the Panel's Report is appropriately detailed.

It should include:

- A statement of the Panel's recommendation
- A statement on the quality of the candidate's work relative 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, identifying 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 RSC. Candidates must respond to the Chair of the RSC within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

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

progress is final, with the exception of the exercise of the right of appeal. The RSC will provide a recommendation to the Academic Board to implement its decision.

### 2.3.3 Appeal against an unsatisfactory progress outcome

- Candidates will have the right of appeal against any unfavourable recommendation of the RSC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the President within 21 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavourable recommendation.
- Appeals will be permitted on procedural grounds only. Procedural grounds for appeal may include:
  - Procedural irregularities in the conduct of the Unsatisfactory Progress process and
  - Documentable evidence of prejudice or bias on the part or one or more of the members of the Panel.

## 2.4 Pre-submission Review

Candidates who have substantially completed their research and are in the final stages of thesis preparation, will undertake a Pre-Submission Review, consisting of a written report and presentation. This will normally occur:

- For PhD candidates: toward the latter part of year three of enrolment (or equivalent for part-time candidates)
- For MBR candidates: toward the latter part of year two of enrolment (or equivalent for part-time candidates)

The Pre-submission Report and Presentation may only be scheduled once the Principal Supervisor has formally advised the RSC 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 quality 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 that the standard of the work is of sufficient quality to be submitted for examination. The presentation will be to an audience that includes:

- The Panel outlined below
- Fellow HDR candidates
- 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.

The Review panel (the Panel) shall comprise of:

- Member, RSC
- Deputy President or delegate
- An independent 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 RSC. Any academic member of the panel must be independent and not directly involved in the supervision of the candidate.

The Director of Research and Scholarship with input from the principal supervisor will nominate possible dates for the Pre-submission Review and investigate the availability of the Panel. The Research office will notify the candidate and supervisory team of the presentation details and written submission date.

#### 2.4.1 Pre-submission Review Requirements

The Pre-submission Review will consist of a Report (maximum of 10 pages) summarising:

- Research aims/objectives/questions
- Methodology employed
- Human Research Ethics requirements
- Main research findings
- Limitations of the research
- Implications of the findings.

In addition to the written report, candidates are required to make an oral presentation on their research and findings. This presentation should last 25-to-30-minutes, candidates are encouraged to use presentation aids.

The presentation will be followed by questions from the Panel and audience. The Panel may ask for a supplementary meeting with the candidate after the presentation.

The Panel will review their findings and determine whether the candidate is permitted to submit their thesis for examination. It will record their evaluation, outcome and feedback on the **Pre-Submission Evaluation Form** provided by the RSC and forward the documentation to the Chair of the RSC for ratification. The Panel is to provide the result and feedback to the candidate as soon as possible after the outcome has been determined, and not more than 21 days after the presentation.

#### 2.4.2 Concerns about Submission

If The Panel determines that it has concerns that the candidate's work is not of a sufficient quality or is not complete, 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 RSC 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 its 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 Panel's concerns. If, after the second presentation, the Panel determines that progress is unsatisfactory, The Panel must make a recommendation to the Chair of the RSC requiring the candidate to show cause to the RSC why their candidature should be permitted to continue.

In the case of PhD candidates, the Panel may recommend that the candidate considers changing enrolment from a PhD to a Research Master's Degree. In rare circumstances, a candidate may be permitted to make a 3<sup>rd</sup> presentation.

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

- An unequivocal statement of the panel's recommendation
- A detailed statement on the quality of the candidate's work regarding the quality 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 RSC. Candidates must respond to the Chair of the RSC within 21 days of receipt of the letter.

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

## **2.5 Appeal against an unsatisfactory outcome**

- Candidates have the right of appeal against any unfavourable recommendation of the

RSC. The formal appeal must be made in writing to the President within 21 days of the receipt of the advice of the unfavourable recommendation.

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

### 3 RELATED DOCUMENTS

#### 3.1 Internal Documents

- i. *HDR Admissions Policy*
- ii. *Code of Conduct for Research*
- iii. *Student Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure*
- iv. *HDR Confirmation of Candidates and Progression Policy*
- v. *Academic Intellectual Property Policy*
- vi. *Higher Degrees Research Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy*
- vii. *Research Materials and Data Management Policy*
- viii. *Higher Degree Research Supervision Policy*
- ix. *Guidelines on Minimum Resources for Higher Degree Research Students*

#### 3.2 External Documents

- i. *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021*
- ii. *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018*

### 4 VERSION CONTROL

Historical Version	Approved by	Approval Date
2026.05	Research and Scholarship Committee	12 May 2026
2024.11	Deputy President (Education)	20 November 2024
2017.05	Academic Board	03 May 2017
2015. 10	Academic Board	22 October 2015

### 5 STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP/MAINTENANCE

*The Research and Scholarship Committee oversees the implementation of, and compliance with, this Policy. For any enquiries or clarification, please contact [policy@imc.edu.au](mailto:policy@imc.edu.au).*

# 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: <input type="checkbox"/> MBR <input type="checkbox"/> PhD	
Confirmation is being assessed at the following level: <input type="checkbox"/> MBR <input type="checkbox"/> PhD	
Confirmation and Progress Review Panel Members	
<p><b><u>(1st) Chair of The Panel:</u></b></p> <p>Name: Role:</p> <p><b><u>(2nd) Panel Member: Name</u></b></p> <p><b><u>(3rd) Panel Member: Name</u></b></p> <p><b><u>(4th) Panel Member: Name</u></b></p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	

## 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:		

<b>4. Updated timetable for completion of the thesis</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
Draft timelines are appropriate and achievable:				
Comments:				
<b>5. Resource Implications</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Adequate infrastructure and funding:				
Adequate technical support available:				
Other resources:				
Further training or assistance required: (If "Yes" please provide details below)				
Comments:				
<b>6. Oral presentation delivered to the Confirmation and Progress Review Panel in an open forum:</b>				
Duration of presentation (mins):				
Venue of presentation:				
Approx. number of attendees:				
Oral presentation demonstrates a sound understanding of the research topic:		<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>

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:			
<b>8. Data Retention and Management:</b>	YES	NO	
1. Data storage provisions for this research meet the guidelines under section 2 of the <i>Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research</i> and IMC's <i>Research Materials and Data Management Policy</i>			
Comments:			
<b>9. Ethics</b>	YES	NO	N/A
Is human ethics approval required?			
Has approval been granted by the <i>Human Research Ethics Committee</i> ?			
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
<p><b>The candidate is CONFIRMED</b> (NOTE: Conditional confirmations are NOT permitted)</p>	
<p><b>2nd Attempt Required</b></p> <p><b>The candidate is NOT confirmed and is required to undertake confirmation again within 3 months (FTE).</b> The Research Services Directorate will coordinate the second attempt in the same manner as the first. <b>NOTE: A documented intervention strategy to assist the candidature will be developed by the Chair of the RSC.</b></p>	
<p><b>The candidate is NOT confirmed</b></p> <p><b>A recommendation is hereby made to the Chair of the RSC to advise the candidate they are required to show cause to the RSC as to why their candidature should be permitted to continue.</b></p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>Where the recommendation is 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.</p> <p>a) Where the recommendation is <u>Not Confirmed</u> 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.</p>	

## **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.

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

## 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 RSC:

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 RSC, 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 PhD 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	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Student No:</b>
<b>Date of Progress Seminar:</b> <b>Date of Meeting (if relevant):</b>	
<b>Expected Submission Date:</b>	<b>Enrolment End Date:</b>

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 RSC

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Chair of the RSC:**

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

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE ENSURE ALL DOCUMENTS ARE SENT TO THE RSC, 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	
<b>Name:</b>	<b>Student No:</b>
<b>Date of Pre-submission Presentation:</b> <b>Date of Meeting (if relevant):</b>	<b>Current program level:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> MBR <input type="checkbox"/> PhD
<b>Expected Submission Date:</b>	<b>Enrolment End Date:</b>

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	
<p><b>Please provide information that justifies the basis for your decision.</b></p> <p><b>If possible, recommend strategies for addressing any shortcomings or obstacles.</b></p>	

