

**DIVINE WORD UNIVERSITY**

**EVALUATION OF THE PRE-COMPLETION SEMINAR**

***Note:*** **One** report should be completed by the candidate and all members of the Candidate's Panel of Assessors, at a meeting held with the candidate immediately after the seminar. Separate report(s) should be submitted only if consensus cannot be reached.

Candidate: ……………………………………………… Student ID No. …………………………

Faculty/Department: ………………………………………………………….

Short Title of Thesis / Portfolio ……………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Principal Supervisor: ……………………………………..

Co Supervisor: ……………………………………………

Degree sought: ……………………………………………

Masters/Doctoral Commencement Date: ……………………………..

Date of Pre-Completion Seminar: ……………………………………...

Present at Seminar: Principal Supervisor Dean of Faculty Co Supervisor

Head of Department Senior Academic from another Faculty

Vice President Academic Vice President Research and Higher Degrees

Other: ……………………………….

**Evaluation of Seminar**

**Theoretical Background (Circle one)**

Clear statement and justification of aims of research Appropriate Inadequate

Understanding of theoretical/historical context Appropriate Inadequate

Hypotheses/research questions Appropriate Inadequate

Overall comprehensiveness Appropriate Inadequate

Clear links among portfolio items (Prof Docs only) Appropriate Inadequate

**Methodology**

Appropriateness of method to study Appropriate Inadequate

Understanding of methods Appropriate Inadequate

**Data Analysis (may be marked as “not applicable”)**

Appropriateness of analysis Appropriate Inadequate N/A

Comprehension of analytical techniques used Appropriate Inadequate N/A

Relation of outcome to hypotheses/research Appropriate Inadequate N/A

questions

**Scope**

Scope of work presented appropriate for the degree Appropriate Inadequate

**Quality of Presentation**

Overall organisation, clarity, conciseness Appropriate Inadequate

Verbal skills in presentation Appropriate Inadequate

Quality of visual presentation Appropriate Inadequate N/A

Clarity of take-home message Appropriate Inadequate

**Interpretation and Analysis of Results**

Appropriate interpretation Appropriate Inadequate

Appreciation of strengths and limitations of study Appropriate Inadequate

**Conclusions**

Summary Appropriate Inadequate

Appreciation of significance Appropriate Inadequate

Contribution to professional knowledge (Prof Docs only) Appropriate Inadequate

**Academic Writing Skills**

Assessment of written piece of work (e.g. a publication, Appropriate Inadequate

chapter of the thesis or other evidence of academic

writing skills)

Participation in the writing skills program recommended yes no

Has the option of an oral examination been discussed with the

candidate. yes no

Has a publication plan been presented yes no

If ethics approval was granted, has a final report been

submitted. yes no N/A

Candidates are normally required to have submitted a paper to a professional journal or refereed conference proceedings and/or presented a paper at a significant conference, or creative work at a public exhibition before the evaluation form is signed off by the Supervisory Committee.

Has the candidate satisfied this requirement. yes no

If papers “In Review” evidence must be provided yes no

If “no” please elaborate…………………………………………………………………………………………

NOTE: Students with IP agreements with a sponsoring body that requires the thesis to be embargoed for a period of time must ensure the Library copy of their thesis is placed under restricted access. Applicable Noted N/A

**Supervisor validation of data collected by student:**

What steps has the supervisory team taken to ensure that the data associated with this degree project are authentic. Please indicate:

Regular supervision sessions

Occasional use of plagiarism software on thesis drafts and warn students that others may use plagiarism software on their e-thesis

Spot checks of lab books, field notes, research journals

Spot checks on coding of qualitative data

Spot checks on print outs of statistical analysis

Accompanying student on occasional field trips especially pilot studies

Regular contact with students during remote fieldwork

Ensuring data storage arrangements comply with University ethics requirements

**Risk to student of trauma from the research project:**

Is the student at risk of trauma from the process or findings of the research?

yes no

If yes, what steps has the supervisory team taken to encourage the student to access appropriate counseling support.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………..

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Generic Summative Evaluation of HDR Candidature –**

***including strategic exit points***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Formative*  *recommendation* | *Evaluation of standard of performance (please tick a box)* |
| **Recommendation 1**  Progress satisfactory:  unconditional approval to continue | Group A – Outstanding.  Outstanding in all components of candidature  Group B – Excellent.  Excellent and original approach to the research project but falling outside the very best  Group C - Very Good.  Solid performance in all components of candidature but demonstrating less flair and originality than Groups A or B  Group D – Good.  Variable progress which on balance is appropriate |
| **Recommendation 2**  Progress satisfactory:  conditional approval to continue subject to problems being addressed to satisfaction of Dean of Faculty or delegate | Group A – Outstanding.  Outstanding in all components of candidature; additional requirements purely administrative e.g. ethics approval  Group B – Excellent.  Excellent and original approach to the research project; additional requirements either:  (1) purely administrative e.g. ethics approval or  (2) indicative of inexperience e.g. rescaling of project because it is too ambitious  Group C - Very Good.  Solid progress but demonstrating less flair and originality than Groups A or B; additional requirements either:  (1) purely administrative e.g. ethics approval or  (2) indicative of inexperience e.g. rescaling of project because it is too ambitious  Group D – Good.  Variable performance which on balance is of an appropriate standard; additional skills required e.g. ESL, statistics |
| **Recommendation 3**  Progress unsatisfactory:  approval to continue subject to case management by Director, Higher Degrees | Group E - Proposed research not of sufficient scope for proposed degree or unrealistic in terms of resources and timeframe; candidate apparently has required skills; situation potentially redeemable within 6 months  Group F- Proposed research suitable but candidate deficient in essential skills including time management skills; situation potentially redeemable within 6 months  Group G - Proposed research suitable but candidate being delayed by personal problems; situation potentially redeemable within 6 months |
| **Recommendation 4**  Progress unsatisfactory: the candidate be: either (1) asked to show cause why his or her candidature as a research higher degree student should not be terminated or (2) asked to suspend candidature until personal situation improves | Group H - Candidate appears not to have skills necessary for research higher degree student and is unlikely to gain such skills within 6 months; this assessment must be checked with viva conducted by person with appropriate expertise independent of supervisory team; subject to result of viva, RHDB will ask candidate to show cause why his or her candidature should not be terminated; RHDB may recommend candidate change enrolment to research masters, coursework masters, graduate diploma, graduate certificate.  Group I - Proposed research suitable but candidate being  delayed by personal problems; situation appears irredeemable  within 6 months; this assessment must be checked with viva  conducted by person with appropriate expertise independent of supervisory team; recommend candidate be placed on leave of absence or medical leave, with reconsideration in six months. |

**Recommendation to RHDB (tick one)**

that the research is of a standard and extent appropriate for submission as a thesis; or

that further research work is required, in which case it shall recommend, subject to preparation of a

suitable project plan, an extension of candidature, but shall not recommend any extension beyond the

end of the fifth year from the date of enrolment for a full-time candidate or beyond the end of the

tenth year from the date of enrolment for a part-time candidate (PhD) or 3 years full time or 6 years

part time (Masters)

**Additional work prior to submission**

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Additional work prior to reconsideration**

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Additional comments**

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**CANDIDATE**

I have met with my Panel of Assessors and have discussed and understand

the outcomes of my precompletion seminar.

I have submitted a Notice of Intention to Submit Thesis form:

Name…………………………………Signature…………………………………Date………………..

**Members of the Panel of Assessors**

**(Please print name. Signature. Date)**

PRINT NAME Signature Date

Principal Supervisor ……………………………………………………………………………………...

Co-supervisor ……………………………………………………………………………………………..

Faculty Dean …………………………………………………………………………,…………………..

Senior Academic from ……………………………………………………………………………………

another Faculty

Vice President Academic …………………………………………………………………………………

Executive Action by Director, Higher Degrees yes no

Date Approved by RHDB………….........................................................................

Signature of Vice President Research and Higher Degrees …………………………….