

## EXAMINATION OF PhD BY PUBLISHED WORKS



**EXAMINERS’ REPORT and NOTIFICATION OF RESULT FORM**

**This report form is effective for examinations from March 2019 onwards**

# Surname of Candidate

Forenames of Candidate (in full)

Department/School/Faculty

Title

The following sections of this document must be completed:

1. The External Examiner's Reports (including three sub-sections);
2. The Internal Examiner's Report;
3. The Joint Report by the internal and external examiners (to be completed after the oral examination);
4. The signed and dated notification to the University of the Examiners’ Formal Examining Recommendation on the Outcome of the Examination.

Guidance for Examining Boards for Research Degrees is attached and should be read by the Convenor and Chair and the Examining Board before proceeding.

**Examiners are reminded that, under current data protection legislation, candidates have the right to access any comments made about them and their work in these reports.**
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## 1

**1.1**

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER’S REPORTS** *(Attach additional pages as necessary)*

## External Examiner’s Report on Critical Analysis and Published Works

External Examiner’s Name

External Examiner’s Signature

Date

* 1. **External Examiner’s Report on the Oral Examination** *(Attach additional pages as necessary)*

External Examiner’s Name

External Examiner’s Signature

Date

## External Examiner’s Report on Matters of General Concern or Interest: to include issues relating to quality and standards which should be drawn to the attention of the Department or to the University. *(Attach additional pages as necessary)*

External Examiner’s Name

External Examiner’s Signature

Date

1. **INTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CRITICAL ANALYSIS / PUBLISHED WORKS** *(Attach additional pages as necessary)*

Internal/ 2nd External Examiner’s Name

Internal/2nd External Examiner’s Signature

Date

## JOINT REPORT BY EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EXAMINERS

The examiners are invited to provide a brief joint report after the oral examination has concluded.

The report should draw together any disparate views on the thesis which may have been expressed by the examiners in their individual reports. A brief agreed view on the candidate's principal strengths and weaknesses, the approach to the topic, and on the performance at the oral examination might also be expressed.

The joint report might also comment on any difficulties experienced during the examination process and, *especially in the case of unsuccessful candidatures*, on the manner in which the examination was conducted and on whether the candidate was given the opportunity to draw the examining board's attention to any particular circumstances which might have affected his/her performance. *(Attach additional pages as necessary)*

External Examiner’s signature

Internal/2nd External Examiner’s Signature

Date

**EXAMINERS’ FORMAL RECOMMENDATION ON THE OUTCOME OF THE EXAMINATION**

**The Board of Examiners, after consideration of the work presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by the above-named candidate recommend:** [*please indicate one only of the following options below; clarification and guidance on each is provided in the "Guidance for Examining Boards”.]*

(tick box)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (a) | **that the candidate be approved for the degree of PhD subject to completion of such minor corrections as may be required by the Examining Board**. Corrections should be completed within a period of four working weeks from the date of the notification to the candidate of the outcome of the examination. The Board may stipulate that the corrections shall be scrutinised by either/both examiner(s) prior to the award process being initiated. (Also use this category where no corrections required.) |
|    | 1. **that the candidate be not approved for the degree of PhD but be allowed to modify the critical analysis and re-submit it for the degree of PhD on payment of a re-submission fee**. A candidate may be allowed a single opportunity to re-submit the work. The re-submission should take place within a period not exceeding twelve months from the date of the official notification to the candidate of the outcome of the examination. This outcome should be used where the critical analysis is satisfactory in substance but defective in detail or presentation.   **NB** This option is not applicable when a re-submitted work is being examined.   1. **that the candidate be not approved for the award of a degree**. This outcome should be selected where the published works do not meet the standard for the award and / or where the critical analysis does not make the case for the award of the PhD. | |

External Examiner’s Signature

2nd External/Internal Examiner’s Signature

Chair’s Signature

Date