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**Joint Examiners’ Report Form for Final Viva**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student ID No.** |  |
| **Student Name** |  |
| **Faculty** |  |
| **Programme** |  |
| **Title of the Thesis** |  |
| **Date of Viva Voce** |  |
| **Name of Examiner(s)** |  |
| **Director of Studies** | **Present:** ☐ Yes ☐ No  **Name:** |

*This joint report form should be completed following the Viva and should record the agreed views of both examiners*

*NB: If the answer to any section is* ***PARTIALLY****, the extent to which the criteria are not met should be discussed further in the report, with reference to remedial actions and required amendments.*

1. **Specific comments relating to assessment criteria**

Are you satisfied that the candidate has demonstrated the following?

| **Assessment Criteria** | **Yes** | **Partially** | **No** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Identification of key issues and recognition of leading edge ideas**   Wide range of background reading including classic and contemporary sources; explicit identification of theoretical formulation of argument; explicit identification of significant themes that recur and of areas of dissonance between studies/ authors/domains within the overall field. |  |  |  |
| 1. **Awareness of a variety of standpoints**   Attention drawn to the level of consistency evident within the accounts of leading authors / researchers / commentators; attention drawn to the chronology of ideas and practices; challenges to prevailing views highlighted |  |  |  |
| 1. **Extension and application of theoretical knowledge to generate new understandings**   Integration and synthesis of accounts of published authors; extrapolation from theory to generate further hypotheses; attention to the ways in which theoretical arguments and / or research findings have been or could be used to inform practice and make an original contribution to knowledge. |  |  |  |
| **4. Critical analysis of the sources or evidence bases**  Depth of background reading with attention to genre and epistemological assumptions; independent critical evaluation of the reliability of ‘evidence’; independent critical evaluation of the validity of claims made; quality of evidence to support claims; attention to features of research and design methodology. |  |  |  |
| **5. Suitability and /or potential for dissemination / publication**  Purpose, audience, message, quality of presentation and communication; overall coherence and attention to detail |  |  |  |

1. **Examiners’ Joint Report (***Please insert additional pages if required)*
2. **Examiners’ joint Recommendation:**

**Category A: Award**

☐ **Recommendation A** Award with no corrections

**Category B: Referral to Minor Corrections**

☐ **Recommendation B** Award subject to minor corrections – 3 months period

*The thesis meets the criteria for the degree but some minor corrections are necessary. Minor corrections examples include (a) typographical errors, (b) Minor alterations and/or replacement of, or additions to, the text or to references or diagrams, and (c) Other more extensive corrections may be made as long as they do not require significant (as defined by the examiners) re-working or re-interpretation of the substantive content of the thesis.*

**Category C: Referral to Major Corrections**

☐ **Recommendation C(i)** Award subject to major corrections – 6 months period

*The thesis is satisfactory in substance, but defective in presentation or detail and does not require a further viva*

☐ **Recommendation C(ii)** Award subject to major corrections and oral re-examination – 6 months period

*The thesis is satisfactory in substance, but defective in presentation or detail and requires a further viva*

**Category D: Referral to Substantial Revisions**

☐ **Recommendation D** Award subject to substantial revisions and oral re-examination – 12 months period.

*The thesis is unsatisfactory in substance, defective in presentation or detail and requires further research and a further viva*

**Category E: Fail**

☐ **Recommendation E** Fail

*The thesis and viva have not met the standards required, and the examiners have not found evidence that the thesis could be corrected under category A, B, C, or D.*

***The revised thesis will be approved by:***

External ExaminerInternal ExaminerBoth

**External Examiner:**

Name …… ………………………………………….. ……………………………………..…………..

Signature: ………………………………………………..…... Date: ………………………....................

**Internal Examiner:**

Name …………….……………………………………………………………………………………..

Signature: ……………………………………………..……... Date: ………………………………...

**Chair of the Examining Panel:**

Name …………… ……………………………………………………………………………………..

Signature: ……………………………………………..……... Date: ……..……………………...

Comments

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Decision by RDC:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**To be implemented by: DoS/Both Examiners/Other**

**Chair of the RDC:**

Name ………………..…………….………………………………………...….

Signature: ……………………………………………..……... Date: ……………...…........................

**Release of Joint Examiner Report:** ☐ Yes ☐ No