

**EXAMINERS’ RECOMMENDATION** (UP7B *– RE-EXAMINATION*)

# *(PhD, MD, MPhil and Prof Doc)*

***Following the oral examination the Examiners are required to complete this report.***

***If, exceptionally, an agreed report cannot be submitted, each Examiner is required to submit a separate report.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Registered Programme |  |
| External Examiner(s)  |  |
| Internal Examiner |  |
| Independent Chair (if applicable) |  |
| First Supervisor (FS) |  |
| Candidate’s Name (in full) |  |
| Title of Thesis |  |
| Date of Report |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section A: Standards information**  *Information from this section will be available* ***on request only*** *to the public through the quality information pages of the University of Portsmouth’s website. If requested, this section will be provided anonymised and* ***without*** *any reference to the candidate and the thesis.* |

 *Delete as applicable*

1.1 Are you satisfied that the procedures for oral examination are sound and **YES/NO**

fairly conducted? If not, please state the respects in which they fall short.

1.2 In your view is the standard of the work appropriate to the level of the award as defined

in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications level descriptor[[1]](#footnote-1) **YES/NO[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Section B: Report of the Examiners on the Presentation** (Compulsory for Prof Doc candidates, optional for all others) |

 *Delete as applicable*

* 1. Are you satisfied with the quality of the presentation:

1. in terms of its overall content **YES/NO**
2. the delivery of the presentation **YES/NO**
	1. Other comments on the presentation:

|  |
| --- |
| **Section C: Report of the Examiners on the oral examination** |

 *Delete as applicable*

* 1. Are you satisfied that the thesis presented is the candidate’s own work? **YES/NO**
	2. Did the candidate show a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of:
1. Matters relating to the thesis **YES/NO**
2. Background studies to the subject of the thesis **YES/NO**
3. Relevance of the research to their professional practice (Prof Doc only) **YES/NO**
	1. If the research programme was part of a collaborative group project, did the oral

 examination demonstrate that the candidate’s own contribution met the

 requirements for the award submitted for? **YES/NO**

* 1. Where an alternative form of examination has been approved by the University, a report on the candidate’s performance should be given below (include an outline of the alternative examination arrangements).

Note: If the provisional recommendations of the Examiners in their independent preliminary reports were not in agreement, an explanatory statement of the final joint recommendation must be included. If the Examiners are not in agreement and are therefore completing separate copies of this report, details of the disagreement should be stated below and, where appropriate, related to the preliminary report.

* 1. Other comments on the oral examination:

Note: Examiners will be given the opportunity to comment further on the candidate’s overall performance

at viva and within the thesis via a feedback form that will be available once the recommendation to award has been confirmed. The form will then be forwarded to the candidate and First Supervisor.

***Section D: Recommendation***

*(for Prof Doc candidates this is subject to approval by a Board of Examiners)*

*\*tick as applicable*

* 1. \*the title of the thesis is accepted
	2. \*the title of the thesis is to be amended as follows:

 …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

* 1. \*that the candidate is to be granted the award for which they submitted.
	2. \*that the candidate is to be granted the award for which they submitted, subject to minor amendments and corrections being made to the thesis to the satisfaction of the

 \*internal and/or external Examiner(s).

* 1. \*that the candidate is to be granted the award for which they submitted, subject to major amendments and corrections being made to the thesis to the satisfaction of all Examiners.
	2. \*that the candidate is not to be granted the award for which they submitted and not

 permitted to be re-examined (please explain below why this recommendation is appropriate).

**Option for those who have submitted for the award of PhD only:**

* 1. \*that the candidate is to be granted the degree of MPhil subject to the appropriate minor amendments to the satisfaction of the \*internal/external examiner(s) (please explain below

why this recommendation is appropriate)

Examiner Signature(s)

Name Printed

Date

**Prof Doc Candidates only if recommendation is 4.3:**

By delegated authority, I declare that the Board of Examiners has confirmed that the candidate may be awarded the above award following the completion of 240 Doctoral level credits and I have also signed a Chair’s Action Memo to this effect.

 Chair of Board of Examiners

Name Printed

Date

I certify that the recommendations of the examiners in respect of the above candidate is accepted by Academic Council and the award recommended is conferred.

Academic Registrar

Date

(Required when examiner’s recommendation is 4.3)

#### FINALISING AND SENDING YOUR REPORT

Please send your completed report, by email, to researchdegrees@port.ac.uk

Following the examination, your report will be copied to the Chair, Faculty Research Degrees Committee (FRDC) and may also be considered more widely through the University’s research degree committees and quality assurance committees.

If your report relates to a candidate who studied the research programme through collaborative partnerships, your report will also be made available to the partner institution Academic Contact.

1. Appendix 1 Guidance Note for the Examination of Higher Degree by Research (including Stage 2 Part 2 Professional Doctorate Students) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If the decision is that the standards have not been met then the recommendations of 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 at Section D may not be selected. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)