**Doctor of Philosophy/Master by Research**

**Examiner Report**

**(For candidates without an oral examination)**

**Name and Institution of Examiner:**

**Name of Candidate:**

**Title of Thesis/Exegesis:**

**REPORT SECTION 1: RECOMMENDATION AND REPORT OF EXAMINATION**

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

**Recommendation**

*My recommendation is that the thesis/exegesis be* ***(check one only)****:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. passed without conditions
 | [ ]  |
| 1. passed, subject to minor amendments being made to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor
 | [ ]  |
| 1. passed, subject to major amendments being made to the satisfaction of the relevant Associate Dean (Research)
 | [ ]  |
| 1. revised and re-submitted for examination
 | [ ]  |
| 1. failed
 | [ ]  |

**Report of Examination**

Summarise for the candidate the quality of the work submitted. It would be useful to consider the criteria listed on the following page.

|  |
| --- |
| *(Expand the box as required)* |

**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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair  | Flawed |
| 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)* | Exceptional | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair  | Flawed |
| 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 | [ ]  |

**Required Amendments**

The specific amendments to the thesis/exegesis:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Examiner** |
| Signed: Date: |

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