

STUDENT NAME: SU NUMBER:

PROJECT DETAILS:

PROPOSED TOPIC:

PHD START DATE: PART-TIME FULL-TIME

UPGRADE DETAILS (if applicable): UPGRADE

M START DATE:

LATEST ALLOWED
COMPLETION DATE:

Process (please mark the appropriate box):

For continuing to the 2nd year of the PhD, or first-time registration with a Research Proposal.
Sections A, B and D must be completed by the Postgraduate Coordinator.

For upgrading from an MEng/MEngSc(Research)
Sections A, B, C and D must be completed by the Postgraduate Coordinator.

A: EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

The Candidature Panel unanimously agrees that the attached Research Proposal shows that (please select all the relevant tick boxes):

The student has satisfactorily demonstrated background knowledge appropriate for the study.

The student has satisfactorily demonstrated research capabilities appropriate for the study.

Satisfactory expected original contributions are explained in the research proposal.

A satisfactory exposition of the literature relevant to the PhD studies, as well as a synthesis and evaluation of the most important themes found in the literature, are given in the research proposal.

The research methodology, aligned with the study's objectives in the research proposal, is satisfactory.

The research proposal gives a broad time schedule for the study (typically in terms of 4 to 10 activities, with a short description of the focus of each) that is reasonable.

The research proposal gives a clear explanation of the infrastructure (software, equipment, laboratories, operating costs, etc.) necessary to complete the study, as well as reasonable arrangements to provide it.

The critical self-evaluation by the student of progress made to date and of his/her research capabilities given in the research proposal is satisfactory.

The supervisor and co-supervisor(s) (if applicable) have expertise appropriate for the study.

B: EVALUATION OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Candidature Panel unanimously agree that the attached Executive Summary gives a clear summary of the proposed PhD programme, proposed original contributions, possible research publications, and a realistic time schedule.

C: EVALUATION: UPGRADE TO PhD

The Candidature Panel unanimously agree that *(please select all the relevant tick boxes)*:

The research work contains substantial original material, which is publishable. A peer-reviewed conference or journal paper has already been accepted for publication, or such a paper has been submitted to a journal, or a conference, and was evaluated as being publishable in its current form.

The work is of such a high quality that a substantial part of it can form part of a PhD dissertation.

The scope of the work is extendable to the expected levels for a PhD.

The additional work can be completed within the allowed time (as stipulated above).

D: RECOMMENDATION

(a) If an application for an upgrade, *(please select **only one** tick box)*:

After an oral evaluation, all panel members recommend that the Master's programme be upgraded to a PhD, the Research Proposal and Executive Summary be accepted, and that the student be allowed to register for a PhD with the proposed research topic and supervision. Small changes may have been indicated to the documents, which should be made to the satisfaction of the supervisor(s). (Only if all boxes in A, B, and C are ticked).

After an oral evaluation, all panel members recommend that the Master's programme NOT be upgraded to a PhD.

After an oral evaluation, no consensus could be reached by the panel.

(b) If not an application for an upgrade, *(please select **only one** tick box)*:

All panel members agree that the Research Proposal and Executive Summary be accepted, and that the student be allowed to register for a PhD with the proposed research topic and supervision. (Only if all boxes in A and B are ticked).

After an oral evaluation, all of the panel members recommend that the student not be allowed to continue with the PhD.

After an oral evaluation, no consensus could be reached by the panel.

SIGNATURES

The chairperson or Postgraduate Coordinator may sign on behalf of any panel member, if written approval of the outcome by such a panel member is attached.

For Affiliation fields, please insert the name of the department in the case of SU staff.

SUPERVISOR:	<input type="text"/>	CO-SUPERVISOR 1:	<input type="text"/>
DATE:	<input type="text"/>	DATE:	<input type="text"/>
AFFILIATION:	<input type="text"/>	AFFILIATION:	<input type="text"/>
SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>	SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>
Approval Attached:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approval Attached:	<input type="checkbox"/>

CO-SUPERVISOR 2:	<input type="text"/>	CO-SUPERVISOR 3:	<input type="text"/>
DATE:	<input type="text"/>	DATE:	<input type="text"/>
AFFILIATION:	<input type="text"/>	AFFILIATION:	<input type="text"/>
SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>	SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>
Approval Attached:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approval Attached:	<input type="checkbox"/>

PANEL MEMBER 1:	<input type="text"/>	PANEL MEMBER 2:	<input type="text"/>
DATE:	<input type="text"/>	DATE:	<input type="text"/>
AFFILIATION:	<input type="text"/>	AFFILIATION:	<input type="text"/>
SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>	SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>
Approval Attached:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Approval Attached:	<input type="checkbox"/>

AC COORDINATOR:	<input type="text"/>
DATE:	<input type="text"/>
SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>

RECOMMENDATION BY THE DEPARTMENT

The Departmental Management Committee approves the recommendations of the Outcome Report.

In the case of panel members not unanimously recommending an outcome, and after due process, the Departmental Management Committee recommends the following (please fill in below):

DEPT. CHAIR:	<input type="text"/>		
DATE:	<input type="text"/>	SIGNATURE:	<input type="text"/>
