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**Guidelines and Nomination of Reviewers Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **GUIDELINES** |
| **Role of Review Panel**  The role of a review panel for a research proposal is to determine:   * If the project is conceptually and methodologically sound; * If the project is of appropriate scope for the level of the award; * If the research is significant/able to make an original contribution to knowledge; and * If the research is matched to the candidate’s abilities and school’s resources.   **Criteria for Selecting Panel Members**  Proposal reviewers should have academic qualifications equivalent to the level of degree they are assessing. If a reviewer does not have the appropriate qualifications, a case needs to be made to include them on the panel, based on significant experience judged to be equivalent.  The use of at least one external reviewer is encouraged. However, it may be possible, in some cases of critical mass of research expertise within the University, for a School to nominate a review panel internal to the University. Please review the Conflict-of-Interest Guidelines when selecting a reviewer.  The review panel should have a combination of expertise and experience required to provide appropriate feedback and a detailed report for the research candidate. Reviewers are required to report on:   * The clarity of statement of the research problem; * The significance of the study; * The rationale for conducting the study; * The literature review and theoretical framework; * The statement of the research question/s; and * The proposed methodology and data analysis   Each nominated proposal reviewer requires a statement addressing the suitability of the reviewer to fulfil the role. The statement should include sufficient relevant information for Associate Dean (Research) to determine suitability. Examples may include the reviewer’s experience in publishing, supervision, examining theses, and research grants. Other examples may include professional membership and relevant industry experience. A brief CV should be included (2-3 pages) for each nominated reviewer as evidence against claims in the suitability statement. |

The following matrix should be used to determine whether a review panel has an appropriate mix of skills, experience and expertise:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **Reviewer 1** | **Reviewer 2** |
| **Required for each panel member** |  |  |
| Discipline knowledge |  |  |
| Understanding of key aspects for Literature Review & Conceptual Framework |  |  |
| Understanding of research methodology |  |  |
| Understanding depth and breadth required for the study (assessing scope and timeframe) |  |  |
| Understanding of ethical and risk considerations |  |  |
| **Desired for at least one panel member** |  |  |
| Publication record |  |  |
| Significant industry experience (judged to be equivalent of research track record) |  |  |
| Specific knowledge relevant to the thesis |  |  |
| Supervisory experience |  |  |

**NOMINATION OF PROPOSAL REVIEWERS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CANDIDATE DETAILS (ECU Internal Use Only)** | |
| Student Number: | Enter text here. |
| Candidate Given Name(s): | Enter text here. |
| Family Name: | Enter text here. |
| Principal Supervisor: | Enter text here. |
| School: | Choose an item. |
| Course: | Choose an item. |
| Thesis Title: | Enter text here. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REVIEWER INFORMATION** | |
| **Reviewer 1** | |
| Reviewer’s Title | Enter text here. |
| Name: | Enter text here. |
| Email Address: | Enter text here. |
| Institution: | Enter text here. |
| Citizenship: (list all countries) | Enter text here. |
| Academic Qualifications: | Enter text here. |
| Present Position | Enter text here. |
| ORCID ID (if available): | Enter text here. |
| Staff Web Profile: | Enter text here. |
| Please provide a brief fact paragraph outlining the suitability of the reviewer:  Enter text here. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewer 2** | | | |
| Reviewer’s Title: | Enter text here. | | |
| Name: | Enter text here. | | |
| Email Address: | Enter text here. | | |
| Institution: | Enter text here. | | |
| Citizenship: (list all countries) | Enter text here. | | |
| Academic Qualifications: | Enter text here. | | |
| Present Position: | Enter text here. | | |
| ORCID ID (if available): | Enter text here. | | |
| Staff Web Profile: | Enter text here. | | |
| Please provide a brief fact paragraph outlining the suitability of the reviewer:  Enter text here. | | | |
| **Reviewers Nominated By:** | | | |
| Enter text here. | | **A white square with a blue border  AI-generated content may be incorrect.** | Click to select a date. |
| PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR NAME | | SIGNATURE | DATE |
| **School Approval**  (Forward this completed form to the Associate Dean (Research) for review and signature) | | | |
| Enter text here. | | **A white square with a blue border  AI-generated content may be incorrect.** | Click to select a date. |
| ASSOCIATE DEAN (RESEARCH) NAME | | SIGNATURE | DATE |

|  |
| --- |
| **DISPUTES** |
| Nominated reviewers are approved by the relevant Associate Dean (Research). Supervisors who are dissatisfied with the decision of the Associate Dean (Research) are encouraged to make an appointment with their Executive Dean of School. Disagreements that cannot be resolved at school level may be referred to Dean, Graduate Research. |