

FORM. The intent of this form is to confirm the student's advancement in the program after the defence of their written research proposal, and to record the outcome of the student's candidacy examination with the Office of Graduate Studies.

POLICY. PhD./Doctoral Comprehensive/Candidacy Examination Policy.

DEGREE TIMELINE. Doctoral candidacy must be achieved within the first thirty (30) months in the program. Extensions may be granted under exceptional circumstances, with the permission of the Associate Provost of Graduate Studies.

PROCEDURE. The exam chair is responsible for ensuring completion of this form at the examination and will submit a completed copy of this recommendation to the Office of Graduate Studies.

DELIBERATIONS. Recommendations for advancement must be made in accordance with the PhD/Doctoral Comprehensive/Candidacy Examination Policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The student named below acknowledges that this was their ☐ first or ☐ second candidacy examination and that they were advised of the candidacy exam results during the conclusion of the examination.

STUDENT'S NAME	STUDENT ID	STUDENT'S SIGNATURE
----------------	------------	---------------------

The exam chair named below acknowledges that the exam proceeded pursuant to university policy and that the student has been advised of the candidacy exam results.

EXAM CHAIR'S NAME	EXAM CHAIR'S PROGRAM	EXAM CHAIR'S SIGNATURE
-------------------	----------------------	------------------------

RECOMMENDATION

The degree committee assigns the following recommendation based on the merit of the student's written research proposal and their performance during examination by evaluation with the Candidacy Exam Assessment (page 2).

- ☐ Unconditional Pass – Effective date (date of examination): _____
- ☐ Conditional Pass – Effective date (date the student must satisfy conditions of the pass): _____
- ☐ Fail – Unsatisfactory and does not merit advancement. Further research is required, and re-examination is necessary before a degree can be awarded.
- ☐ Fail – Unacceptable and does not merit advancement. It is not of sufficient merit to warrant re-submission after further work.

The following degree committee members for the above student agree with this recommendation for advancement.

ROLE	NAME	SIGNATURE
THESIS SUPERVISOR		
CO-SUPERVISOR		
DEGREE COMMITTEE MEMBER		
DEGREE COMMITTEE MEMBER		
DEGREE COMMITTEE MEMBER		

OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES USE ONLY

Recommendation for Advancement to Candidacy received by OGS on (date):



CANDIDACY EXAM ASSESSMENT

PhD Candidacy Examination (Proposal Defence) Policy

Student demonstrates oral and written competence in the following areas:

- Strong analytical, problem-solving, and critical thinking abilities
- Relationships among the subject matter of the proposed research and development of knowledge relevant to the practice discipline in the relevant field, and other disciplines;
- Knowledge and skills specific to the proposed research methodology;
- A range of potential research approaches relevant to the proposed research focus;
- Potential to pursue and complete original research at an advanced level;
- Ability to respond to questions about the feasibility of the proposed dissertation project;
- Ability to openly engage in scholarly discussion and debate.

