



2	Research aim is well defined and achievable	
3	Research questions /objectives appropriate to Ph. D and understanding of what is required in Ph. D thesis.	
4	Scholar is familiar with relevant literature (Quality of literature review and/or appropriate use of relevant sources)	
5	Understanding of appropriate research methods to be used and/or conceptual framework or will they need to be developed (further)?	
6	Applied intellectual rigor and critical analysis of data	
7	Implications/suggestions based on findings of the study	
8	Presentation skills	
9	Collaborations (if relevant)	
11	Conference/Seminar presentations/Publication of research	
12.	Any other issue related to progress of research ethical (e.g., institutional animal ethic committee (IAEC), environmental, Human and Intellectual property or Commercial in confidence issues)	

### Section 3: Assessing Performance

3.1 Please mention the number that best indicates agreement or disagreement with each statement concerning the research scholar's performance assessed on the following statements

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

- a) The scholar met agreed research objectives set at the commencement of his/her research?
- b) The scholar diligently and effectively applied himself/herself to research?
- c) The scholar has shown initiative and intellectual engagement consistent with the requirements of the research program and level of study?
- d) The scholar conducted his/her research responsibly and ethically?
- e) The scholar complied with all policies on the conduct of research?

3.2 Does the subject of the research appeal to the interests of the society and/or industry?  Yes  No

3.3 Does the research compare and weigh the material against the work of others?  Yes  No

3.4 Does the research bridge the gap between theory and practice?  Yes  No

3.5 Does the research present credible and accurate information?  Yes  No

3.6. Does the research use sound and appropriate method(s)?  Yes  No

3.7 Does the research add new findings, insights, or knowledge to the body of literature?  Yes  No

3.8 Are the managerial relevance and implications of the decision problem demonstrated?  Yes  No

3.9 Is the timeline for completion provided by the scholar in his written report reasonable?  Yes  No

3.10 If no to any of the above, or if a rating of between 1 and 3 has been circled for any of the items at 3.1, please indicate further steps to be taken. (Please attach a separate page if more space required.)

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

**Section 4: Departmental Research Committee Recommendation**

**Please indicate the Committee’s recommendation:**

1. Scholar is making satisfactory progress.

*OR*

2. Progress is not completely satisfactory and another formal review is required.

Revised formal review due date: .....

Please note: *The maximum extension that may be requested is one month only.*

*OR*

3. Progress is completely unsatisfactory.

(This option should be chosen if the outcome of the formal review meeting is to recommend termination of candidature)

**Please provide reasons for recommending the termination of the candidature:**

---



---



---



---



---



---

**Departmental Research Committee Members to sign:**

<b>DESIGNATION</b>	<b>NAME OF THE MEMBER</b>	<b>SIGN &amp; DATE</b>
Chair person, DRC		
HoD, Member		
All Recognized Research Supervisors in the Dept. Members	1. 2. 3. 4.	
Supervisor of research scholar concerned Member		
Co-supervisor of research scholar concerned - Member		