|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Details of the candidate**  |
| Name of candidate |  |
| Principal Supervisor |  |
| Faculty |  |
| Thesis title |  |
| Course | [ ]  PhD [ ]  Masters  | Student Number |  |
| Oral Presentation Date |  |

|  |
| --- |
| To pass the confirmation of candidature, the panel need to be confident that* the supervision panel can offer the requisite feedback on the discipline, the methodology, and the methods
* the candidate has developed capabilities that are essential to the project but hard to acquire, such as English grammar
* the candidate has been able to devote enough time to this project
* the project is potentially feasible within the timeline, budget, and ethical constraints
* the scope of this project is appropriate—roughly equivalent to 3 or 4 ordinary papers if a PhD and 1 to 2 ordinary papers if a Masters by Research

For more information on the confirmation of candidature, such as the expectations of candidates, supervisors, panels, and Faculties, please read these [guidelines](https://www.cdu.edu.au/files/2021-02/Helpful%20guidelines%20to%20conduct%20CoCs.docx) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of assessor | Is this assessor a supervisor? |
| **Chair** | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
|  | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
|  | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: As a panel, decide whether the candidate and project demonstrates the following attributes .**  |
| **The project** |  |
| The candidate demonstrates an extensive understanding of the topic | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The candidate demonstrates an awareness of some complexities, controversies, or limitations in the literature | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| This research seems to address a clear problem or limitation in the literature  | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The methods the candidate will use to collect and to analyse data or information are appropriate | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The candidate has identified the benefits and limitations of the methods they propose | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| **Feasibility** |  |
| The candidate has addressed potential ethical, legal, or safety concerns | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The candidates should be able to collect the data they seek in the designated time | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The candidate should be able to access all the resources they need, such as the necessary software or equipment | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| At least one supervisor has developed expertise in the field, setting, methodology, and methods | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The candidate has outlined a convincing plan on how the research will be published in reputable outlets and translated to practice  | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| **For qualitative or mixed methods research only** |  |
| The candidate has clarified the theoretical underpinning, such as symbolic interactionism or a critical theory | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |
| The candidate has clarified the likely methodologies, such as grounded theory | [ ]  Definitely [ ]  Moderately [ ]  Negligibly |

|  |
| --- |
| For attributes that were demonstrated only moderately or negligibly, please outline your concerns and suggest improvements here  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| The panel has agreed to pursue one of these three alternatives  |
| [ ]  **Approval**We would like to pass the candidate after the presentation.  | * Suggest the candidate address any concerns that were raised in the future
* If one or two of the attributes were rated *negligibly,* a written document should be requested to address these concerns.
* The candidate has 2 weeks to submit this document to the chair
* Submit this form to the Faculty or School after the chair signs
 |
| [ ]  **Reassessment** We invite the candidate to revise the research proposal, to present the research again to the panel only, or both | * The candidate is required to address the concerns within 6 weeks full time or 12 weeks part time
* Submit this form to the Faculty or School after the chair signs
* A new form will need to be completed following the resubmit
* Students can only resubmit once, if the result is the same a second time, you must select ‘Raise Concerns’ below
 |
| [ ]  **Reject / Raise concerns** We do not believe the candidate will be able to pass this degree successfully  | * Usually applicable if you feel the candidate is unlikely to be able to address the concerns within 6 weeks full time or 12 weeks part time
* Submit this form to the Faculty or School after the chair signs
* The candidate will be asked to formulate a plan on how to address these concerns or show cause as to why they should not be discontinued
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of chair | Signature of chair | Date:  |
| Record further comments here. For example, indicate whether you want the candidate to resubmit the research proposal, present their research again, or both. Or confirm the candidate has addressed the attributes rated negligibly in a written document, submitted after the presentation |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Approval of Faculty PVC or Delegate**  |
| [ ]  I agree with the decision of this panel [ ]  I do not agree with the decision of this panel |
| Record further comments here |
| Is Ethics approval required for the Research | [ ]  Yes - Human [ ]  Yes – Animal [ ]  No - Neither |
| Name | Signature | Date:  |

**Please return this form to the Office of Research and Innovation,** **research.degrees@cdu.edu.au**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 4: Endorsement from Dean of Graduate Studies**  |
| [ ]  I approve confirmation of candidature [ ]  I approve the decision to resubmit the research proposal or present the research again[ ]  I have contacted the candidate and supervisors to arrange an alternative approach Include comments here  |
| Name | Signature | Date:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 6: Office of Research and Innovation to complete** |
| [ ]  HDR14 – Supervision Agreement[ ]  HDR13 – Research Proposal & Supervisor Evaluation [ ]  Research Proposal[ ]  Epigeum – Research Integrity Modules (8 Certificates)[ ]  Record Ethics requirements |