**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, EXAMINERS AND PANEL CHAIR PRIOR TO ORAL EXAMINATION.**

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

**Interim Recommendation**

*My preliminary recommendation prior to oral examination 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 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 REPORT SECTION 2: WILL BE SHARED WITH THE EXAMINERS AND PANEL CHAIR ONLY PRIOR TO ORAL EXAMINATION (NOT TO BE PROVIDED TO THE CANDIDATE)**

**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 | [ ]  |

**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).* |

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

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