



STUDENT -NAME		MEETING DATE:
OUTCOME	PRIMARY SUPERVISOR - NAME	SIGNATURE
<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY <input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY		
OUTCOME	AUXILIARY SUPERVISOR - NAME	SIGNATURE
<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY <input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY		
MSC or PHD: OUTCOME	THIRD READER - NAME	SIGNATURE
<input type="checkbox"/> SATISFACTORY <input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY		
MCP/PHD: MARK		
<input type="checkbox"/> PM <input type="checkbox"/> MEET <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> RE		

RESEARCH SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS
 Make any comments on the student's report or presentation that you think would be beneficial to have recorded

STEP 1: SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL
MSc or PhD: Students email PG Coordinator <psychology.pgcoordinator@sydney.edu.au> within 3 months of starting.
MCP/PhD: Students email to CPU Admin <psychology.cpu@sydney.edu.au> by last Wednesday in May.

STEP2: READING OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL
 Students organise for the proposal to be read by their primary research supervisor, auxiliary supervisor and an independent third reader, providing them with this feedback form. Readers may provide students with written feedback in addition to the feedback provided at the meeting (see below). Students ask readers to focus on the following whilst reading the student's report:

- a. A short, scholarly justification of your proposed area of study
- b. Aims and hypotheses of your project
- c. Research plan: whether proposed design and methodology (including statistical analyses) enable you to test proposed hypotheses
- d. Feasibility of your study
- e. Outcomes and significance

STEP3: MEETING
 Within one month of the proposal being submitted the student should organise for a meeting with all three readers. The meeting is to be chaired by the student's primary supervisor. The purpose of the meeting is to provide feedback to the candidate and a chance to discuss future research plans. After the meeting, the three readers should finalise the feedback form. The Chair (primary supervisor) can make additional comments. For MCP/PhD students, the third reader provides the mark on this form. Unsatisfactory submissions should be discussed with the PG Coordinators.

STEP4: SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL FEEDBACK FORM
MSc or PhD: Student to email to PG Coordinator <psychology.pgcoordinator@sydney.edu.au> within 1 month of submitting proposal. Student to keep hard copy.
MCP/PhD: Student to email to CPU Admin <psychology.cpu@sydney.edu.au> and Director of Clinical Research <suncica.lah@sydney.edu.au> by last Wednesday in June. Student to keep hard copy.



MASTER OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY & DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (MCP/PhD) MARKING CRITERIA		
PM	PASS WITH MERIT	The PhD research proposal substantially exceeds the expected level of competence for the stage of training. All areas (rational, aims and hypotheses, design and methodology, feasibility, outcome and significance) should be of a high standard. Reserved for work of an exceptionally high standard that demonstrates independent thought, clear evidence of originality, advanced knowledge of the subject area and is of theoretical and (potential) clinical significance. The writing is clear and concise. In order to be awarded a 'Pass with Merit', a student needs to perform in the top 10% of students.
P	PASS	The PhD proposal meets the expected level of competence for the stage of training. A pass is considered to signify work that is of a good to very good standard. The proposal should provide a clear rational and identify an important and novel research question. Aims and hypotheses are clearly articulated. The proposed design is appropriate for testing the hypotheses. The study is feasible. The outcomes are of (potential) clinical significance.
CP -	CONDITIONAL PASS	The PhD proposal demonstrates some misunderstanding or has some deficiencies that are likely to significantly impact quality/feasibility of the proposed project. The problems with the proposal are likely to be resolved in the meeting with the examiner and supervisors. The research may be poorly described or described in insufficient detail to warrant a PASS, but the proposal does not need to be re-written. If the proposal should be re-written, the examiner should award a resubmit
RE	RESUBMIT or REPEAT	The PhD proposal contains a number of misconceptions, omissions or methodological deficiencies. The proposal is poorly organised and clarity of expression of ideas is reduced. These shortcomings raise concerns about proposed research project not being of the quality expected for a PhD. The student must resubmit the proposal within a period of time determined by the CPU A resubmission would usually require changes of various aspects of the original proposal. However, the overall aims and questions proposed in the original research proposal should still be of sufficient interest or clinical relevance to be maintained. The resubmitted proposal will be re-marked by an independent marker. A second marker will be asked to mark the resubmission if the first re-marking is given a fail. If these two markers disagree a third marker will be appointed. If this resubmitted proposal is deemed to have failed to meet the pass mark by two markers, the proposal will be assigned a FAIL. The FAIL mark will result in the Unit of Study being failed. The student is required to repeat and re-enrol in that Unit of Study.
LATE	LATE	Any piece of written work that is submitted after the due date, in the absence of an official extension, will be deemed to have failed to meet course requirements and will be viewed as incomplete. Official extensions must be approved in advance by the CPU. The student will be required to meet with the marker and submit a new piece of work for marking as determined by the marker. If the submission is not received by the Examiner's meeting, a fail will be awarded.
F	FAIL	The proposal is of a sufficiently low standard to be considered not consistent with a PhD. The proposal lacks originality and clarity. It has serious conceptual and methodological flaws. Any piece of written work that is marked with Fail will be marked independently by a second marker, and by a third marker if the two initial markers disagree. Where required, the three markers meet to decide upon a final mark to be awarded. A proposal that is deemed to have failed to meet PhD standard by two markers will be assigned a FAIL. The FAIL mark will result in the Unit of Study being failed. The student is required to repeat and re-enrol in that Unit of Study. For PhD proposals awarded a FAIL mark by two independent markers, the student is required to submit a new PhD proposal within six month. If the student fails the second PhD proposal, the student fails the Unit of Study for the second time. Students are only eligible to repeat Units of Study once.