HDR Oral Examination Handbook

For information about the Oral Examination process at ECU

November 2018
ECU is committed to reconciliation and recognises and respects the significance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ communities, cultures and histories.

ECU acknowledges and respects the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, as the traditional custodians of the land.

ECU acknowledges and respects its continuing association with Nyoongar people, the traditional custodians of the land upon which its campuses stand.
Oral Examinations for Doctoral Candidates

This handbook contains information about rules, policies and guidelines, as well as the relevant documents for the oral examination process at ECU. The handbook has been developed to complement supervisor training workshops hosted by the Graduate Research School.

The information and resources in this handbook focuses on:
1. General information about oral examinations for all supervisors
2. The roles and responsibilities of the Panel Chair

Please note that material in this resource book is up-to-date as of November 2018. To ensure that you are looking at the most current version of any documents contained in this handbook, please visit the relevant websites:

- Research student intranet: http://intranet.ecu.edu.au/research/for-research-students

Contact
For any inquiries or comments, please contact:

Professor Joe Luca
Dean
Graduate Research School
E: j.luca@ecu.edu.au

Marziya Mohammedali
Project Officer
Graduate Research School
E: m.mohammedali@ecu.edu.au
# Table of Contents

- **Role of the Oral Examination** ................................................................. 5
- **Governance** ......................................................................................... 6
  - University Rules (extract) ........................................................................ 7
  - HDR Procedure 8: Oral Examination ...................................................... 10
- Guidelines for the Examination of PhD theses with Oral Examination .......... 17
- **Oral Examination Timeline** .................................................................. 23
- **The Panel Chair** .................................................................................... 24
- **Oral Examination Proceedings** ............................................................. 25
  - Template: Oral Examination Agenda ...................................................... 27
  - Interim Examiner Report Template ......................................................... 28
- **Panel Chair Report** ................................................................................ 32
  - Panel Chair Report Template ................................................................ 33
- **Additional Resources** ............................................................................ 35
- **Oral Examination Training (for students)** ............................................... 39
Role of the Oral Examination

The oral examination is part of the examination process for all doctoral candidates at ECU who commenced their studies from 2018 onwards. The oral examination is also available to PhD candidates who commenced before 2018 by request.

The oral examination provides candidates an opportunity to demonstrate their critical understanding of the research, its applications, and further directions in a constructive and supportive forum. It is a conversation about their research and will allow them to address any points of inquiry from the examiners. It is not intended to test the candidate’s command of spoken English or their presentation skills, but there will be opportunities that the candidate can access to help prepare for the examination.

For examiners, this is an opportunity to further assess the quality and independence of the research, and discuss aspects of interest in the thesis directly with the candidate before confirming a final grade for the thesis. The oral examination will inform the joint recommendation of the examiners.

Attendees at the Oral Examination:

- Panel Chair
- Candidate
- At least one examiner
- At least one of the candidate’s supervisors (preferably the principal supervisor)
- Panel Chair’s administrative support person
- Dean (GRS) or nominee (optional attendee as observer)
- Associate Dean (Research) or nominee from the school (optional attendee as observer)
- Other member of the candidate’s School
- Other parties deemed appropriate (e.g. support person, industry rep etc.)
Governance

This section of the handbook covers the specific governance documents that relate to the oral examination. These documents are meant to complement existing rules, policies and guidelines that are associated with supervision, support and examination of doctoral students at ECU.

Please note that some of the current documents are in draft form and awaiting final approval.
6.7.3 The total of the periods covered by the studies or work referred to in Rule 6.7.2 shall not be used to satisfy more than one-half of the requirements of the course (except in the case of approved joint Doctoral Degrees).

6.8 Examination Requirements

6.8.1 Subject to Rule 6.8.2, doctoral degree candidates commencing on or after 1 January 2018 are required to undertake an oral examination of their thesis as part of their thesis examination.

6.8.2 Upon submission of a written application from a doctoral degree candidate, the Dean, Graduate Research School may exempt a doctoral degree candidate from the requirement under Rule 6.8.1 to undertake an oral examination.

6.8.3 Doctoral degree candidates commencing prior to 1 January 2018 may elect to undertake an oral examination of the thesis as part of their thesis examination prior to the appointment of examiners, and with the written approval of their supervisors.

6.8.4 A student may only submit a thesis for examination if the student is enrolled in the appropriate thesis unit.

6.8.5 A student who wishes to submit a thesis for examination without supervisor approval must submit a written request to the relevant Associate Dean (Research).

6.8.6 Where a thesis is submitted for examination in accordance with Rule 6.8.5 the relevant Associate Dean (Research) will arrange for an internal review of the thesis to determine whether the thesis is considered ready for examination. The candidate will be provided with a written assessment of the thesis.

   a) If the review deems the thesis can be submitted, the thesis may be submitted with a memorandum of endorsement signed by the candidate and the relevant Associate Dean (Research).

   b) If the review deems that the thesis is not ready for examination, the candidate will be required to address the deficiencies outlined in the written assessment. The candidate may then resubmit a request to the relevant Associate Dean (Research).

6.8.7 Unless the relevant Associate Dean (Research) otherwise determines, the text component of a thesis must be written in English. The oral examination of a thesis must be conducted in the English language.

6.8.8 The relevant Associate Dean (Research) may approve an amendment of the title of a thesis.

6.8.9 Except with the approval of the relevant Associate Dean (Research) a candidate must not submit for examination any work previously submitted for a degree of the University or of any other institution of higher learning.

6.8.10 Where a thesis contains confidential information belonging to a government agency or third party, the thesis must incorporate a statement signed by the candidate setting out the terms or conditions on which access was granted by the party or entity owning the confidential information and any stipulations regarding subsequent disclosure of the information provided.

[Rule 6.8 amended by Amending Rule 2 of 2018]

6.9 Appointment of Examiners

6.9.1 The relevant Associate Dean (Research) shall appoint persons to examine a thesis as follows:

   a) for a Masters Degree (Research), at least two examiners none of whom shall be a member of the academic staff of the University; or

   b) for a Doctoral Degree not requiring an oral examination, at least three examiners none of whom shall be a member of the academic staff of the University.
6.9.2 The relevant Associate Dean (Research) shall not appoint as an examiner a person who he or she believes has a conflict of interest (See Conflicts of Interest Policy).

[Rule 6.9 amended by Amending Rule 2 of 2018]

6.10 Examination of Thesis not requiring Oral Examination

6.10.1 The examiners shall independently and separately report to the Dean, Graduate Research School their assessment of the thesis within six weeks after submission of a Masters Degree (Research) or Doctoral Degree thesis.

6.10.2 In the event that only two examiners’ reports for a Doctoral Degree thesis have been received after eight weeks of the submission of that thesis, the Dean, Graduate Research School may recommend an outcome in accordance with rule 6.10.5 based on those two reports.

6.10.3 If an examiner identifies in their report material in the thesis which may be defamatory and the Dean, Graduate Research School is reasonably satisfied that the thesis contains material which is or may be defamatory he or she must notify the candidate and require that the material be removed from the thesis.

6.10.4 If the candidate is notified under Rule 6.10.3, the candidate must amend the thesis to remove the defamatory material before the candidate is permitted to re-submit the thesis for assessment.

6.10.5 The examiners’ reports shall include a recommendation to the Dean, Graduate Research School that the thesis be:

- a) passed without conditions;
- b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor;
- c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the relevant Associate Dean (Research);
- d) revised and re-submitted for examination; or
- e) failed.

[Rule 6.10 amended by Amending Rule 2 of 2018]

6.11 Examination of Thesis requiring Oral Examination

6.11.1 A Panel Chair, who is an academic staff member of the University at the level of Senior Lecturer or higher, must be appointed by the Associate Dean (Research) to oversee and coordinate the examination process.

6.11.2 The examiners shall report to the Dean, Graduate Research School their interim assessment of the written component of the thesis within six weeks after submission of a Doctoral Degree thesis.

6.11.3 If an examiner identifies in their report material in the thesis which may be defamatory and the Dean, Graduate Research School is reasonably satisfied that the thesis contains material which is or may be defamatory he or she must notify the candidate and require that the material be removed from the thesis.

6.11.4 If the candidate is notified under Rule 6.11.3, the candidate must amend the thesis to remove the defamatory material before the candidate is permitted to re-submit the thesis for assessment.

6.11.5 If a fail has been recorded for a candidate’s thesis under the Academic Misconduct Rules (Students) then no oral examination will occur with respect to that thesis unless the candidate has been successful in appealing that decision to record a fail.
6.11.6 The Dean, Graduate Research School may make a variation to the time, date, location or other aspects of the conduct of the oral examination for the purposes of ensuring:

a) the attendance of all persons required under these Rules to attend the oral examination;

b) the integrity of the oral examination; and

c) that the candidate is not unfairly disadvantaged by any factor outside of their reasonable control.

6.11.7 The examination process for a thesis requiring oral examination shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures approved by the Research and Higher Degrees Committee.

6.11.8 At the conclusion of the oral examination, the Panel Chair shall compile a report approved by the examiners which summarises and includes the examiners’ assessment of the thesis and oral examination, and includes a recommendation to the Dean, Graduate Research School that the thesis be:

a) passed without conditions;

b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor;

c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the relevant Associate Dean (Research);

d) revised and re-submitted for examination; or

e) failed.

6.11.9 If the Panel Chair is unable to obtain approval from all examiners with respect to a report containing a single recommendation of the type specified under Rule 6.11.8, then the Panel Chair must submit to the Dean, Graduate Research School for classification under Rule 6.12.1 a report containing:

a) the examiners’ assessments of the thesis and the oral examination; and

b) a statement summarising why the examiners were not able to agree on a single recommendation.

[Rule 6.11 amended by Amending Rule 2 of 2018]

6.12 Thesis Classification

6.12.1 After consideration of the examiners’ reports under Rule 6.10 or a report issued pursuant to Rule 6.11.8 or 6.11.9, along with any advice which the Dean, Graduate Research School might elect to obtain from any person (including any Associate Dean (Research)) with expertise relevant to the thesis the Dean Graduate Research School shall classify the thesis as either:

a) passed without conditions;

b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor;

c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the relevant Associate Dean (Research);

d) requiring revision and re-submission to the examiner/s who recommend re-examination; or

e) failed.

6.12.2 Where re-submission or amendment is required, the relevant Associate Dean (Research) shall determine the last day for re-submission of the candidate’s thesis, being not later than twelve months after the candidate has been notified of the examination outcome. If the revised thesis is not submitted within twelve months, the candidate must be awarded the result of fail, unless the Associate Dean (Research) grants an extension of an amount of time which they deem appropriate in consideration of
Procedure 8: Oral Examination

1. OVERVIEW

This document provides an overview of the oral examination process and the roles and responsibilities of the candidate and University. Doctoral degree candidates commencing on or after 1 January 2018 are required to undertake an oral examination of the thesis as part of their thesis examination. Candidates commencing prior to 1 January 2018 may elect to undertake an oral examination of the thesis as part of their thesis examination in consultation with their supervisors.

2. ROLE OF THE ORAL EXAMINATION

2.1 The main objectives of holding an oral examination are:

a) to provide candidates an opportunity to demonstrate their critical understanding of the research, its applications, and further directions in a constructive and supportive forum; and

b) to provide examiners the opportunity to further assess the quality and independence of the research, and discuss aspects of interest in the thesis.

2.2 It is not the purpose of an oral examination to test the candidate's command of spoken English.

2.3 The outcome of the oral examination and the assessment of the thesis together will inform the examiners' joint recommendation regarding the award of the PhD qualification being sought by the candidate.

3. ORAL EXAMINATION PROCESS

3.1 Appointment of Examiners and Panel Chair

a) Prior to the appointment of examiners, the Associate Dean (Research) may approve a variation to the arrangements for the oral examination. Variations may include an exemption from undertaking the oral examination only in extenuating circumstances.

b) Two external examiners will be appointed, as well as a panel chair who is an academic staff member of the University.

c) The examiners will be advised that an oral examination is required when they are invited to examine the thesis.

d) The panel chair will be an ECU academic staff member, who is appointed by the Associate Dean (Research) from the relevant School. An alternative panel chair may be appointed if required.

e) The panel chair must not be an examiner or a member of the candidate's supervisory panel.

f) The panel chair may be from a different discipline, but should be conversant with the methodology used in the candidate's research.

g) The panel chair must attend professional development provided by the Graduate Research School prior to chairing an oral examination.

3.2 Approval to Proceed to Oral Examination

a) Following thesis submission, the Student Services Centre will send the thesis to the two external examiners for assessment. The panel chair will also receive a copy of the thesis at this point.

b) Examiners will be asked to independently read the thesis and provide an interim examiner report, based on the criteria for the award of the degree, within 6 weeks of
c) The interim report should assess the quality of the thesis and provide sufficient detail of any revisions required. The report will also include the proposed questions to be asked at an oral examination.

d) Once the examiners’ reports are received, these will be forwarded by the Student Services Centre to the Dean, Graduate Research School.

e) The Dean, Graduate Research School may determine that a candidate may not progress to oral examination, or that a variation to arrangements be made.

f) If an oral examination is approved to proceed, the interim examiner reports will be sent to both examiners and the panel chair.

### 3.3 Oral Examination Participants

a) The oral examination must be attended by:
   - the panel chair;
   - the candidate;
   - at least one examiner;
   - at least one of the candidate’s supervisors (preferably the principal), to whom the panel may address questions during the oral examination.

b) Administrative support will be provided for the panel chair. The administrative support person will not participate in the formal deliberations of the meeting, but may advise the panel chair on process, assist with any connection issues and complete other tasks as relevant to the conduct of the oral examination.

c) The Dean, Graduate Research School (or proxy), or the relevant Associate Dean (Research) (or proxy) may choose to attend any oral examination as an observer.

d) Following consultation with the candidate, the panel chair may also elect to invite to the oral examination:
   - other members of the candidate’s School (to whom the panel may address questions during the oral examination);
   - Other parties as deemed appropriate, for example a support person for the candidate or industry representative (such parties will not usually contribute to any discussions).

### 3.4 Timing

a) The oral examination is scheduled for a date approximately 10 weeks after the thesis is submitted. If the examiners’ reports are not received in a timely manner the oral examination will have to be rescheduled.

b) The oral examination must not be held until both examiners’ written reports on the thesis have been submitted.

c) An administrative support person will liaise with the panel chair to arrange:
   - the date, time and location; and
   - technology support for video conferencing and/or recording facilities.

d) The candidate and panel members will receive at least two weeks’ notice of the time and location of the oral thesis examination and any other requirements.

e) If the oral examination needs to be rescheduled due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. illness), all parties will be notified as soon as possible.
3.5 Venue
a) Candidates are normally required to attend the oral examination in person at their home campus.
b) The examiners may attend the oral thesis examination via video-conference or in person at the expense of the candidate’s School.
c) All participants will test connectivity prior to the oral examination.
d) Remote participants in the examination should use a headset where possible to reduce audio feedback.

3.6 Preparation
a) The Student Services Centre will send the interim examiners’ reports to the candidate at least two weeks prior to the oral examination. This will give the candidate the opportunity to prepare for the types of questions they may be asked during the oral examination. The interim examiners’ reports sent to the candidate will only include the comments on the thesis, and not the assessment of the quality of the thesis or the proposed questions for the oral examination.
b) The candidate should attend oral communication training provided by the Graduate Research School prior to the oral examination.
c) The examiners and panel chair are required to read all interim examiners' reports prior to the oral examination.
d) The panel chair will devise a list of questions for the oral examination based on the those proposed by the examiners in the interim examiner report. These will not be provided to the candidate prior to the oral examination.
e) The candidate and the supervisors are not permitted to engage in any correspondence with the examiners before the oral examination commences. Any dialogue with the examiners must be via the panel chair.

3.7 Duration and Format
a) On the day of the oral examination, the panel chair will meet the examiners to discuss their interim reports and set an agenda with points for discussion and issues requiring clarification.
b) The oral examination should normally include an assessment of the candidate’s ability to:
  • display detailed knowledge of the thesis;
  • locate their research in the broader context of their discipline;
  • demonstrate the originality of the thesis and the contribution it makes to knowledge; and
  • defend the methodology and conclusions of the thesis.
c) A standard oral examination is two hours, and may run for up to four hours.
d) The panel chair will act as a facilitator and will manage the event including:
  • welcoming all parties and providing a brief introduction to the conduct of the oral examination;
  • allowing all parties to ask and fully answer questions;
  • asking questions from non-attending examiners;
  • ensuring the requirements of the oral examination are followed; and
  • ensuring that a final recommendation is made at the conclusion of the examination and this is communicated clearly to the candidate.
e) The format of the oral examination will vary from case to case, and should be decided upon with reference to the considerations outlined in the objectives listed above. A standard format might include:

- A pre-meeting of the panel chair and examiners.
- Panel chair introduction.
- A brief overview of the thesis by the candidate.
- Questions from examiners on substantive issues to which the candidate responds.
- The panel members deliberate in private and come to a collective recommendation.
- The candidate may be verbally informed of the recommendation of the panel and any required corrections or revisions.
- After the oral examination, the panel chair must complete a report which includes any required corrections or revisions.

f) The oral examination may be recorded, with the approval of the panel members and the Dean, Graduate Research School, and any absent examiner sent a copy so he/she can contribute to the final recommendation.

g) In the case of an absent examiner, the report will be deferred until the final examiner can contribute to the recommendation. This should be completed within 2 weeks, unless approved by the Dean, Graduate Research School.

4. EXAMINATION RESULT

4.1 Once the oral examination has concluded, the chair and the examiners will confer in private and the examiners will decide on their joint recommendation to the University regarding the award of PhD.

4.2 Following their deliberations, the chair and examiners may verbally communicate their recommended result and any required corrections or revisions to the candidate. This is not an opportunity for the candidate to challenge the result. In the event that the examiners cannot reach agreement about a joint recommendation, no immediate feedback will be provided to the candidate or supervisors.

4.3 Before the examiners disband, a list of matters to be corrected and amended must be produced and a recommendation made for the final single result. The report should be written by the chair and agreed between both examiners. The final report should take account of both the initial examination of the thesis and the oral examination and be submitted to the Dean, Graduate Research School. In exceptional circumstances, where additional consultation between examiners is required before the report can be finalised, the final report may be submitted within two weeks.

4.4 Possible outcomes from the examination are that the thesis be:

a) passed without conditions;

b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor;

c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean (Research);

d) revised and re-submitted for examination; or

e) failed.

4.5 If the examiners disagree about the result and a consensus cannot be reached, the panel chair must advise the Dean of the Graduate Research School, who may refer the matter to the Graduate Research Committee.

4.6 After consideration of the examiners’ report, the Graduate Research Committee will
classify the thesis as:

a) passed without conditions;
b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor;
c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean (Research);
d) revised and re-submitted for examination; or
e) failed.

4.7 If a thesis is to be revised and re-submitted, only the written thesis is re-examined and a second oral examination is not held.

A flow chart of the oral examination process described in these procedures is provided in Appendix A.
6. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

The Research Journey, The Assessment Process
Doctoral Thesis Examination Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission &amp; Examination - Thesis</th>
<th>Approval to proceed to oral exam (Dean GRS)</th>
<th>Examination - Oral</th>
<th>Submission &amp; Examination - Revised Thesis</th>
<th>Examiner Reports</th>
<th>Thesis Classification GRC</th>
<th>Admission to Degree BGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiners assess thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Examination - Revised Thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Examination Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Examiner Report * includes comments on the thesis and a 5-point scale judging the quality of the thesis</td>
<td>Proceed to oral exam (Dean GRS)</td>
<td>Oral examination held</td>
<td>Examiner Report: a) passed without conditions; b) passed, subject to minor amendments; c) passed, subject to major amendments; d) merits and re-submitted for examination; e) failed.</td>
<td>Thesis Classified by GRC: a) passed without conditions; b) passed, subject to minor amendments; c) passed, subject to major amendments; d) revised and re-submitted for examination; e) failed.</td>
<td>Admitted to Degree BGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Thesis Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiners assess thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Can only be re-examined once
Guidelines for the Examination of PhD Theses with Oral Examination

1. Standard of Examination

**Traditional PhD Thesis**

To qualify for the degree, the candidate is required:

a. to carry out independent research involving a comprehensive study of a scope and size that could normally be expected to be completed in the equivalent of three to four years full-time study.

b. to make a substantial contribution to learning and demonstrate a capacity to relate research undertaken by the candidate to the discipline or disciplines within which it falls, at the standard internationally recognised for the degree in the relevant discipline or disciplines.

A thesis is to be a complete study incorporating an account of the result of the candidate’s work during his/her approved course. The thesis must be a connected piece of writing, and can be presented as a:

1. **Traditional Thesis** – a series of sequential chapters outlining the research, or
2. **Thesis with Publication** – a combination of publishable work based on original research and a substantive written, integrating component. The thesis or component parts thereof may, if already published, be submitted in the published form. For more information see Procedure 5 – Requirements of a Thesis with Publication (http://intranet.ecu.edu.au/research/for-research-students/research-journey/forms-policies-and-guidelines)

Where part of the work has been undertaken with others, the Supervisor(s) will have certified to the University that, to the best of their knowledge, the statement provided by the candidate as to the extent of the candidate’s contribution is correct. Examiners should in such cases satisfy themselves that the contribution is sufficient to qualify the candidate for admission to the degree.

Theses are normally submitted for examination when both Supervisor(s) and the candidate agree that the thesis is ready for examination. However, to protect the rights of candidates, a candidate may submit a thesis for examination, even if this is against the advice of the Supervisor(s). Where a thesis has been submitted for examination without supervisor approval, the Associate Dean (Research) will arrange for an internal review of the thesis prior to the examination of the thesis.

**PhD in Creative Research Disciplines**

The Doctor of Philosophy in various modes of creative research is an independent study based upon the perspective that creative art practices are alternative forms of knowledge embedded in investigation processes and methodologies of the various disciplines of performance (theatre, dance and/or music), the visual and audio arts, design and creative writing. The course is normally completed after three years of full-time equivalent study. It consists of a major creative project and a related exegesis. To be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy degree, the candidate will demonstrate in the practice of the discipline or disciplines and through the interrelated exegesis that the work is a substantial and original contribution to the knowledge/s of the discipline/s.
The thesis will normally consist of the following:

A *creative project* or series of related projects in the practice of the chosen discipline or disciplines that demonstrates through practice:

- a substantial and thorough conceptual understanding of the discipline/s.
- the candidate's overall knowledge of, and original, creative and innovative contribution within, the discipline/s.
- appropriate technical excellence in the relevant skill area outlined in the candidate's thesis. The clarity of the candidate's major concern is crucial for the examination process since measurement of levels of technical excellence varies depending on whether the research is couched in a specific genre of practice, experimental treatment across media of a particular theme, or in alternative methods where the focus is on process rather than on product (although the two may be intertwined).

and a written *exegesis* supporting, contextualising and/or amplifying the creative project that:

- reflects a substantial and thorough understanding of the conceptual, theoretical and/or cultural context, aims and methods of the discipline/s.
- demonstrates the candidate's overall knowledge of, and creative and innovative contribution within, the discipline/s.
- demonstrates how the research is a substantial and original contribution to knowledge.
- demonstrates evidence of a thorough critical and discriminatory review of the previous material in the relevant field of inquiry or creative arts genre or tradition.
- includes any other matter agreed upon with the candidate's supervisor and appropriately approved.

Unlike traditional theses, which are assessed on a single thesis submitted for examination, the creative research Doctor of Philosophy may consist of multiple components. Where the research contains a substantial creative component, the expected word count of the thesis/exegesis is correspondingly reduced. Please note that:

- In Performing Arts, an examiner may sometimes be asked to attend a live event/s prior to receiving the exegesis (or written component). In such cases, the examiner may be provided with a short contextualising document.
- In Visual Arts, the exegesis (40,000-60,000 words) will normally be provided to the examiners 4 to 6 weeks prior to the exhibition.
- Video-recording documentation is a necessary attachment to the written exegesis both for examination purposes and, if the degree is awarded, for ‘publishing’ of the thesis in the University library. Video-recordings may also be necessary where the candidate’s inquiry involves a series of stages in the investigation and where the focus is on process rather than on product.

**PhD in Writing**

The Doctor of Philosophy in the field of writing is designed for those who wish to undertake advanced studies in the field. The course duration is four-year full-time (minimum) and may be done part-time. It consists of a major creative project and a related critical essay/exegesis. The thesis will normally consist of the following:
A creative project (a substantial, original manuscript which is publishable) in one of the following forms:

- a novel
- a book of poems
- a full-length stage/radio play
- a collection of short fiction
- a biographical/historical work, or
- other work of non-fiction

and a critical essay, or set of essays (20,000 to 30,000 words in total), which may involve one or more of the following in relation to the creative project:

- relevant theoretical issues
- conceptual and/or cultural context
- aims and methods
- relation to other writers or writing within the genre, or
- any other matter agreed upon with the candidate’s supervisor and appropriately approved.

2. Examiners’ Interim Reports and Recommendations

Each examiner is asked to submit an independent report to Research Assessments, Student Services Centre. Examiners are asked to report as promptly as possible, and within six weeks of receiving the thesis or exegesis. If some delay appears likely, Research Assessments should be advised (telephone: (08) 6304 3911 or email: researchassessments@ecu.edu.au) so that alternative arrangements may be made if this seems to be desirable.

The Examiner’s interim report comprises of two sections:

Section 1 (shared with the candidate)

- a report of feedback and comments for the consideration of the candidate

Section 2 (not shared with the candidate)

- an interim thesis classification
- an assessment of the quality of work
- consideration for a university medal
- proposed questions to form part of the oral examination discussion.

The examiner is asked to make an interim thesis classification of one of the following:

a. passed without conditions;
b. passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor;
c. passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the Associate Dean (Research);
d. revised and re-submitted for examination; or

e. failed.

An explanation of the recommendations is included at this end of this document.

Guidance for any revision or textual correction referred to in the examiner’s summary recommendation should be included. If the summary recommendation is for admission to the degree subject to minor amendments, it should clearly specify what is required of the candidate before admission to the degree.

When a recommendation is made that the candidate be allowed to revise and resubmit the thesis, it is particularly important to give sufficiently specific indications of the nature of the required revisions.
Examiners are invited to provide reports on the basis of a written undertaking from the University that their reports will be treated on an *in confidence* basis. Other than as set out below, access to such reports will normally be limited to the Dean of the Graduate Research School, Associate Dean of Research, supervisors(s), the candidate and, where appropriate, to committees considering the awarding of prizes for excellence in higher degrees by research.

3. Oral Examination

Following the interim assessment of the thesis by examiners, an oral examination will be scheduled for candidates. The main objectives of holding an oral examination are to:

- provide candidates an opportunity to demonstrate their critical understanding of the research, its applications, and further directions in a constructive and supportive forum; and
- provide examiners the opportunity to further assess the quality and independence of the research, and discuss aspects of interest in the thesis.

The outcome of the oral examination and the assessment of the thesis together will inform the joint recommendation of the examiners regarding the award of the PhD qualification being sought by the candidate. A final report will be compiled by the Panel Chair (an ECU academic assigned to chair the oral examination) and signed off by both examiners.

For further information on oral examinations, please find detailed procedures here (http://intranet.ecu.edu.au/research/for-research-students/research-journey/forms-policies-and-guidelines).

4. Subsequent University Procedures

The Dean, Graduate Research School will determine the outcome of the thesis examination and recommend that: the thesis be passed in its current form; or the candidate be required to make amendments to the thesis that are checked and certified by the relevant Associate Dean (Research); or the thesis be revised and submitted for re-examination; or the thesis be failed. Where a thesis is to be revised and submitted for re-examination, the candidate will be required to submit the thesis within one year for re-examination, and it will normally be returned to those examiners who recommended the re-examination. A second oral examination will not be held.

More information

Research Assessments, Student Services Centre
Telephone: (61 8) 6304 3911
Email: researchassessments@ecu.edu.au
## Guidelines for Examiner Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Length of time for corrections</th>
<th>Corrections reviewed by</th>
<th>Examples of typical issues that help guide decision making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Passed without conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| b) Passed, subject to minor amendments | 6 weeks | Principal supervisor | • Overall Thesis Presentation: **minor** formatting or typographical errors that would be acceptable in a published format without rectification.  

**And, or:**
- Missing Literature: that would strengthen the thesis.  
- Presentation of Data: additional summary tables/graphs suggested.  
- Creative component: Additional documentation and/or integration suggested |
| c) Passed, subject to major amendments | 3 months | Associate Dean (Research) | • Overall Thesis Presentation: Errors in formatting or typographical errors that require rectification, or  
- Missing Literature: that would strengthen the thesis, or  
- Presentation of Data: additional summary tables/graphs suggested.  

**And, or:** **Non-critical problems/issues** in one or more of the following areas: [for major problems possibly consider a Level d]  

- Literature Review: out-of-date, limited relevant literature, gaps in review  
- Conceptual Framework: weak presentation of work/argument within an overall conceptual framework or illogical flow of ideas  
- Research Design/Methodology: issues where additional work required to strengthen/correct  
- Analysis, Statistics, Interpretation, Presentation of Data: issues where additional work required to strengthen/correct  
- Discussion and Interpretation: further work required regarding the discussion of results in a broader concept, answering research questions, conceptualisation and/or contribution to knowledge.  
- Creative component: Additional documentation and/or integration suggested |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Revised and re-submitted for examination</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>Examiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Overall Thesis Presentation: Errors in formatting or typographical errors that require rectification, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Missing Literature: missing literature that would strengthen the thesis, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation of Data: additional summary tables/graphs suggested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative component: Additional documentation and/or integration suggested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And, or: **Major flaws/problems/issues** in one or more of the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And or:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Literature Review: out-of-date, limited relevant literature, gaps in review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conceptual Framework: weak presentation of work/argument within an overall conceptual framework or illogical flow of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research Design/Methodology: issues where major additional work required to strengthen/correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis, Statistics, Interpretation, Presentation of Data: issues where major additional work required to strengthen/correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion and Interpretation: significant further work required regarding the discussion of results in a broader concept, answering research questions, conceptualisation and/or contribution to knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative component: significant further work required regarding documentation and/or integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And or:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• not sufficiently substantial for the award of PhD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Plagiarism, and/or Academic or Research Misconduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where of any of the issues/problems outlined in d) above are so significant that rectification by the candidate could not be achieved within a 12 month (full-time) period.
Oral Examination Timeline

• Student submits thesis to SSC (Assessments) and the Panel Chair and Examiners receive a copy. Oral exam scheduled 10 weeks post submission.

• Examiners will independently read the thesis and provide an interim report within 6 weeks to SSC

• Interim reports forwarded to Panel Chair, examiners and candidate by SSC

• Panel members and candidate informed of the time and location of the oral exam (at least 2 weeks prior)

• Panel chair will prepare a draft agenda including the list of questions, and this is sent to examiners 1 week prior to oral exam

• Chair oral examination and submit Panel Chair report
The Panel Chair

The Panel Chair will coordinate and facilitate the oral examination session. They will be involved in the organization of an oral exam session and take responsibility for reporting on the outcome of the session.

Attributes of a Panel Chair
Panel chairs should be senior experienced supervisors and researchers, and also be:

- Good communicators: Ensures that the oral examination is a conversation between the candidate and the examiners, and one that is collaborative and collegial. The tone of the examination is very important.
- Good facilitators: Encourages examiners and candidates to clarify all issues and help improve the feedback provided on the thesis

Eligibility for being a Panel Chair
- Nominated by the school’s Associate Dean (Research)
- Be an academic staff member of the university (including adjuncts, emeritus professors, and visiting scholars) at the level of Senior Lecturer or higher.
- Complete the training provided by GRS
- Be conversant with the methodology used in the candidate’s research, but can be from a different discipline
- Must not be an examiner or a person appointed as a supervisor to the candidate

Roles of the panel chair
- Coordinator: Oversee and coordinate the oral examination by
  - Ensuring that they are familiar with the candidate’s thesis
  - Reading the interim examiner reports
  - Devising an agenda for the oral examination based on the proposed questions set by examiners
  - Liaising with an administrative support person to determine the arrangements for the day
- Facilitator:
  - Meet with the examiners to clarify any issues prior to inviting the candidate to join the discussion
  - Welcome all parties and provide a brief introduction
  - Allow participating parties to ask and fully answer questions
  - Ensuring that questions from non-attending examiners are considered
  - Ensuring all requirements for the oral examination are followed
  - Ensuring a final joint recommendation is made by the examiners and reported to SSC.
- Mediator
  - The purpose of the oral examination is to collaboratively discuss the thesis
  - The tone should be collegial and collaborative – the panel chair should step in if participants are veering away from the tone e.g. if examiners start interrogating the student instead of conversing
Oral Examination Proceedings

The following checklist can be used by a panel chair to guide the proceedings for oral examinations:

On the day
- Time: Standard oral examination is two hours, but can vary. Times should be communicated to all participants via the agenda.
- Regular breaks should be built into the agenda if necessary
- Format will vary from case to case, dependent on who is able to be physically present, including remote participants, observers etc
- Refer to Template: Oral Examination Agenda for an example of how to structure an appropriate session

Remote Participants
- The candidate, candidate’s supervisor, or examiners may be participating remotely. Any remote participants should be briefed on what is required for the oral examination and how this may be impacted by them participating remotely
- All participants will test communication connectivity prior to the oral exam
- Participants should use a headset where possible to reduce audio feedback
- An IT support person will be present at all times at ECU campus

Pre-meeting
- The Panel Chair will meet with all attending examiners to discuss their interim reports and the agenda, including the list of questions
- The pre-meeting is used to clarify questions, and which examiner is going to ask each question
- Generally takes no more than 30 minutes, but if the panel chair foresees this will take longer than 30 mins, a draft agenda and questions for the candidate should be circulated to examiners for discussion over email at least one week before the oral examination.
- Refer to Interim Examiner Report Template

Panel Chair Introduction
- Complete any confidentiality requirements (e.g. signing paperwork etc.)
- Acknowledge the efforts of the candidate and the role of the examiners in the process and their contribution
- Clearly state rules for observers e.g. supervisors
- Make a comment on the purpose of the research, and a positive remark in relation to the work the candidate put into the research
- Hand over to the candidate to give a brief overview of the work
Candidate’s overview of the thesis

- Candidates should attend training prior to the oral examination, and will be provided with information on how to prepare
- The overview provides the candidate with time to go over anything in their research that they feel is important
- The Panel Chair should make sure the candidate keeps to time as specified in the agenda
- The overview should be informal, without PowerPoints, or the need to include an aspect of their creative work (for those in a creative discipline)

Questions from Examiners

- The Panel Chair should ensure that the candidate and examiners have the opportunity to fully ask and answer questions
- The Panel Chair may ask questions of others attending the oral examination, but observers would not contribute unless called upon
- Ensure that all questions are addressed
- The Panel Chair may need to interject if they feel that the tone of the examination has changed and become negative, aggressive or combative

Panel Chair and Examiner deliberation

- The Panel Chair may need to help guide the negotiation between examiners regarding an appropriate recommendation
- The final recommendation of the examiners may or may not change from their interim assessment of the thesis
- Refer to Guidelines for Examiner Recommendations (Within the Guidelines for Examination document)

Formal end to proceedings

- At the end of the questions, the candidate and all observers will be asked to leave the room, so that the Panel Chair and examiners can deliberate
- If the examiners agree on a recommendation, then the candidate may be verbally informed of the recommendation. It should be made clear that this is only a recommendation, and that the final grade will ultimately need to be classified by the Dean (GRS) and Board of Examiners.
- If no recommendation can be made, the Panel Chair will inform the candidate of the next steps
- The Panel Chair should thank all participants and formally end the proceedings
8:50 am  | Arrive and test IT facilities  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Examiners, Candidate, Observers  

9:00 – 9:30 am  | Panel Chair and examiner pre-meeting  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Examiners  

9:30 – 9:35 am  | Panel Chair introduction & confidentiality requirements (if applicable)  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Panel Chair, Examiners, Candidate, Observers  

9:35 – 9:45 am  | Overview of the thesis by the candidate  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Examiners, Candidate, Observers  

9:45 – 11:00 am  | Examiner questions to the candidate  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Examiners, Candidate, Observers  

11:00 – 11:10 am  | Break  

11:10 – 11:30 am  | Panel Chair and examiner deliberation  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Examiners  

11:30 – 11:45 am  | Formal end to proceedings and recommendations by examiners  
| Attendees: Panel Chair, Examiners, Candidate, Observers  

EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY  
ORAL EXAMINATION FOR THE AWARD OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
Insert Candidate Name
Doctor of Philosophy
Interim Examiner Report

Name and Institution of Examiner:
Name of Candidate:
Title of Thesis/Exegesis:

INTERIM REPORT SECTION 1: RECOMMENDATION AND REPORT OF EXAMINATION - WILL BE SHARED WITH THE CANDIDATE, SUPERVISORS, EXAMINERS AND PANEL CHAIR PRIOR TO ORAL EXAMINATION.

Please identify the number of theses marked previously at this level:

Report of Examination
Summarise for the candidate the quality of the work submitted which will also be used in the panel chair report (following oral examination). It would be useful to consider the criteria listed on the following page.

(Expand the box as required)
Interim Thesis Classification

My preliminary recommendation prior to oral examination is that the thesis/exegesis be (check one only):

- a) passed without conditions
- b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor
- c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the relevant Associate Dean (Research)
- d) revised and re-submitted for examination
- e) failed

Rating the Quality of the Thesis/Exegesis

Please indicate your rating of the candidate’s work against each of the criteria by placed a tick in the appropriate box.

- Significance and originality of the contribution to new knowledge in the discipline.
- Potential impact of the research within and beyond the discipline.
- Quality of the literature/practice review, synthesis and interpretation.
- Choice of technique, and interpretation and discussion of the results/findings.
- Literary quality, clarity and cohesion.

- Any additional examinable creative component (if applicable)

- Potential significance and impact of the creative project in relation to audience/suitability for publication or performance.
- Appropriate technical excellence in the relevant skills area.
- Quality of the expression in the discipline/s: clarity, cohesion and integration into the writing and argumentation: quality of the documentation.
Scale of Scores

Exceptional: Of the highest merit, at the forefront of research in the field. Fewer than 5% of candidates worldwide would be in this band.

Excellent: Strongly competitive at international levels. Fewer than 20% of candidates would be in this band.

Very good: Interesting, sound and compelling research. Approximately 30% of candidates would be in this band.

Good: Sound research but lacks a compelling element in some respect. Approximately 30% of candidates would be in this band.

Fair: The research has potential but requires major revisions. Approximately 20% of candidates would be in this band.

Flawed: The research does not meet the required standard for this criterion.

University Medal

Recommendation regarding the award of a university medal for research:

- Not recommended
- Recommended
- Highly recommended

Proposed questions to guide the oral examination discussion

The oral examination will provide the opportunity to discuss aspects of the thesis/exegesis further with the candidate. Please include a list of questions you would like to ask the candidate. These together with the questions proposed by the other examiner will be complied by the Panel Chair and finalised at the pre-meeting on the day of the oral examination (or earlier if deemed necessary by the Panel Chair).

- 

The Examiner's interim report comprises of two sections:
  • Section 1 (shared with the candidate) remove the bullet point
  • a report of feedback and comments for the consideration of the candidate

Guidance for any revision or textual correction referred to in the examiner’s summary recommendation should be included. If the summary recommendation is for admission to the degree subject to minor amendments, it should specify clearly what is required of the candidate before admission to the degree.”

Examiner
Signed:
Date:

Please return completed reports to: researchassessments@ecu.edu.au
Panel Chair Report

This is a document compiled by the Panel Chair, outlining the examiners’ joint recommendations and any required corrections and revisions. It will take into account the preliminary examination of the thesis as well as the oral examination. This report should be submitted to the Student Services Centre (Assessments) within two days of the oral examination.

In the case of an absent examiner, the report will be deferred until the final examiner can contribute to the recommendation. The absent examiner will be sent a copy of the recording. If the recording fails, then the recommendation will be based only upon the examiner’s assessment of the written thesis.

Refer to Panel Chair Report Template.

Examiner recommendations
A) Passed without conditions

B) Passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor

C) Passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the AD(Research)

D) Revised and re-submitted for examination

E) Failed

If agreement between examiners could not be reached, additional consultation between examiners may be required before the report can be finalised, and an extension of 2 weeks is granted for the submission of the report.
Doctor of Philosophy
Panel Chair Report
(To be completed by the Panel Chair in conjunction with the examiners following an oral examination)

Name of Panel Chair: 
Name of Student: 
Student ID: 
Thesis/Exegesis title: 
Date of Oral Exam: 
Start time: 
End time: 

Oral Examination Panel Members
Examiners Institution Attendance
Videoconference/In-person
Videoconference/In-person

Others in attendance (please list)
Attendee Role Attendance
Videoconference/In-person
Videoconference/In-person
Videoconference/In-person

Timing of Oral Examination
Examiners and Panel Chair pre-meeting commenced at:
Oral examination commenced at:
Oral examination ended at:

Report of Examination
Summary of Oral Component
The examiners comments regarding the presentation and their research are as follows:
(Note for panel chair – the examiner questions can be included in this section. Expand as required.)
Required Amendments
The specific amendments to the thesis/exegesis agreed to by the examiners are:

(Note for panel chair: Prior to the oral examination, copy the suggested changes from both examiners into this section from the interim reports. These can be edited, and agreed to, immediately following the oral exam. Expand the section as required.)

Recommended Thesis Classification
The examiners jointly recommend (check one only):

- a) passed without conditions
- b) passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor (within 6 weeks)
- c) passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the relevant Associate Dean (Research) (within 3 months)
- d) revised and re-submitted for examination (to nominated examiner: ) (within 12 months)
- e) failed
- Or Agreement between the examiners could not be reached (please provide details below)

Signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examiner 1</th>
<th>Examiner 2</th>
<th>Panel Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed:</td>
<td>Signed:</td>
<td>Signed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return completed reports within two days* to: researchassessments@ecu.edu.au

* If this is not possible, contact the Dean (Graduate Research School) for an extension.
Mock Examiner’s reports on the written thesis with an Oral

Report on PhD thesis submitted by Chris Jones

I would like to commend the candidate on an outstanding thesis. This comprehensive thesis identifies a distinct and significant area of research. The thesis demonstrates that the candidate has prepared a sustained, scholarly work of high standards.

The candidate demonstrates originality and independent critical thinking with lucid and perceptive analysis. This analysis is a great deal more detailed, sophisticated and provocative than much that is available at present. Despite its comprehensiveness the candidate has remained focused and has coherently discussed the issues.

I look forward to being able to discuss the following points with the candidate when we meet in the oral.

- An elaboration of the applicability of the findings to the broader discipline
- Topics and journals for potential publication
- Future research and career options

---

1 Any resemblance to reports you have written or received is purely coincidental (and not surprising). These ‘mock’ reports have come from snippets from well over 100 different reports and then modified to maintain anonymity.
Mock Examiner’s reports on the written thesis with an Oral

Examination report on thesis submitted by Pat Brown

This thesis has the makings of a good research project, however, the reader is overwhelmed with detailed information. There is no doubt that the primary data is there but it needs more work to become a thesis, that is, an argument. At times the writing was quite superficial and very descriptive and while the analysis that is there is quite good, it is not sustained throughout. In particular it contains too much information that is not crucial. Bigger themes are effectively submerged in the detail. At times it appears that there is quantification for its own sake.

The thesis does not build up a solid argument for its position often because it ‘states’, rather than ‘argues.’ This stems principally from the lack of rigour in the way the arguments are formulated. The author’s assertions and opinions are confused with critique and there is a lack of distinction drawn between the presentation of facts, theory and speculation.

At the beginning of the thesis a number of issues were defined as the focus. These would seem to be the logical subject of the final chapter, the real purposes of the thesis. The present final chapter is much too discursive for the purpose of drawing final conclusions, still introducing new material for discussion. To be a successful doctoral thesis it requires rounding off by writing a final section which brings all the diverse discussions together.

If the university decides to invite the candidate to revise and resubmit prior to a later oral exam I will send through some more detailed comments. Alternatively, I hope that by discussing the following issues in the oral the examiners might be able to assist the candidate with the re-development of the thesis.

- What is the specific focus of the study?
- Why is that the stated methodology is not used throughout the study?
- How does the candidate see the findings relating to the theory presented as framing the study?
- What does the candidate see as the “So what” factor arising from the research?
- How might the candidate bring together the different threads to make a coherent conclusion?
- How might the candidate rework the text to avoid so many errors?
Possible questions in the Oral

Trafford (2003) suggests that in most oral exams, examiners will ask a range of different types of questions. Within these different types, in your groups discuss some specific questions that you anticipate an examiner might ask of your candidate and how you might prepare them for these sorts of questions.

Note that these categories of question move from more simple, technical questions through to the more sophisticated, complex questions.

*Questions that address issues such as resolving research problems, content, and structure that will demonstrate that the candidate has ownership of the research*

*Questions about the research question, choice of topic, location of study*

*Questions that allow the candidate to discuss the implications, awareness of, and their familiarity with the wider literature and the context for their study*

*Questions where the candidate can outline “doctorateness”, highlight their contribution to knowledge, their ability to critique research, and synthesize concepts*

Final question: If you were to do this research again, is there anything you would do differently? If so, can you elaborate?

Chairing the oral component of the PhD examination process

In my bedroom
The oral, using Zoom, starts well. The candidate has returned to her home country of Nigeria, one examiner in the UK, one in Sydney, and you, as Chair are in Perth. After about 10 minutes the technology from the candidate’s end fails. You phone her to ask her to get technical support only to find that she is sitting in her bedroom at home, using her mobile phone as means of accessing wifi and no matter what she is not able to connect to other wifi.

As Chair what do you do?

Supervisor who can’t keep quiet
The candidate appears to be nervous and quietly spoken, but answering most questions well until the examiners move into questions about the theoretical aspects of the work. Once this occurs the candidate falters a little and the supervisor answers for them. As Chair, you remind the supervisor that she is there as an observer only, for over the next ten minutes the supervisor answers for the candidate three times.

As Chair, what do you do?

The interrogator
You are chairing the oral examination panel and invite Professor Jones to ask the questions determined earlier and he immediately starts to interrogate the candidate. For example he asks a new questions part way through the answer to a previous one, increasingly raises his voice and leans into the camera which shows him as dominating the screen. The speed of questioning and voice level constantly increase until after seven or eight minutes of this the candidate bursts into tears.

As Chair, what do you do?

I don’t know
With the examiners, in advance of the oral, you have determined the order of issues for discussion and which of the examiners will lead for each. To open up the international examiner invites the candidate to explain why he had adopted the research method reported in the thesis. From the candidate’s response it quickly becomes clear that the he is confused and not able to give a clear answer. This continues when Examiner 2 asks the candidate to explain how some of the particular data were collected. It becomes obvious that the candidate is getting anxious and the examiners annoyed.

As Chair, what would you do?
Training support for oral examinations

HDR Communication Advisers and the Graduate Research School will provide targeted training for oral examinations for HDR candidates. The introductory PROCEDURE sessions are being held in semester 2, 2018, with further training commencing in 2019. Training sessions will be made available for booking through the GRS training calendar. Training will be accessible on-campus and online.

The training provided for the oral examinations is optional but highly recommended. There will be five sessions over the course of a doctoral degree.

Overview of HDR training for oral examinations

Session 1: PROCEDURES WORKSHOP
Policy and guidelines for a PhD examination with oral component

Session 2: Q & A PANEL
Panel of academics or past students who have completed doctoral oral examinations

Session 3: PREPARATION WORKSHOP
Managing self and stress
Responding to questions

Session 4: PRACTICE WORKSHOP
Developing a 10 minute oral presentation of your thesis
Speaking confidently

Session 5: DISCIPLINE-BASED EVENT
Individual HDR student mock oral examinations as required, arranged in Schools with supervisors, HDR coordinators and ADRs

Other resources to help with the oral examination process

In addition, HDR Communication Advisers and SOAR Ambassadors can provide advice to research students about their oral examinations in individual consultations. To make an appointment with a HDR Communication Adviser, please email hdrca@ecu.edu.au. SOAR Ambassador appointments can be made by emailing SOAR@ecu.edu.au.

HDR candidates can also self-access online resources on the Research Skills Centre Community site and GRS Community sites on Blackboard. (Oral examination material will be available in 2019).

On admission to ECU, all HDR candidates are automatically given access to the Research Skills Centre Blackboard Community site. You will find it listed under MY COMMUNITIES on Blackboard. If you are not enrolled, search for the site in the COMMUNITY SITE SEARCH box and self-enrol.
Please be aware that the following suggested readings and web-links do not reflect ECU’s particular procedures and policy in relation to the oral examination. Please follow the ECU Oral Examination handbook for exact ECU requirements. The resources below, however, provide a range of excellent insights about doctoral oral examinations.

Some further reading


Wisker, G. (2012). *The good supervisor: Supervising postgraduate and undergraduate research for doctoral theses and dissertations* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [See, in particular, Chapter 19: The examination process and examiners; and Chapter 20: Supporting students towards a successful PhD viva.]

Useful websites

Cardiff University: mock viva video [https://vimeo.com/29731605](https://vimeo.com/29731605)

University of Malaya: Common PhD viva question slideshare [https://www.slideshare.net/MohammadHafizHamzah/common-phd-viva-question](https://www.slideshare.net/MohammadHafizHamzah/common-phd-viva-question)

Flinders University [YOUTUBE] PhD Surgery: how do I prepare for a PhD oral examination (viva)? [https://youtu.be/votVgyFO8cA](https://youtu.be/votVgyFO8cA)