

### MPhil

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| STUDENT NAME |  |
| STUDENT NUMBER |  |

# REPORT OF THE EXAMINERS FOR THE DEGREE OF

## MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

|  |
| --- |
| For the use of the Dean of Postgraduate Research only: |
| *Options at first submission:* | *Options following resubmission:* |
| [ ]  a) Award MPhil | [ ]  a) Award MPhil |
| [ ]  b) Minor amendments – then award MPhil | [ ]  b) Minor amendments – then award MPhil |
| [ ]  c) Major amendments – then award MPhil | [ ]  c) Major amendments – then award MPhil |
| [ ]  d) Resubmit for MPhil |  *d) not available* |
|  | [ ]  e) No degree awarded |
|  |
| Minor/Major amendments approved |[ ]  Minor/Major amendments approved |[ ]
|  |
| *I confirm that the recommendation of the Board of Examiners is appropriate. Following confirmation of the satisfactory completion of minor and major amendments as required, I recommend the student to Senate for the award of their degree.* |
| Dean of the Dean of Postgraduate Research (Signed): |
| Date: |

Code of Good Practice: The University’s ‘Handbook for Examination of Postgraduate Research programmes’ is available online at: <https://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/pgrexaminations/>

**Data Protection Notice:** Examiners **should** note that under the Data Protection Act 2018 all candidates may request access in full to all reports including the preliminary report. Furthermore, if there is any dispute over the outcomes of the examination their reports may be viewed more widely, including by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

PART I To be completed for all candidates

We have examined (student’s name in full):

for the Degree of Master of Philosophy in:

in the Faculty of:

by a dissertation entitled:

and by an oral examination (*viva voce*) if required held on:

We recommend *(tick appropriate box)*

OPTIONS a) – d) available on first submission

OPTIONS a) – c) and e) available on re-submission

[ ]  a) that the Degree of Master of Philosophy be awarded and no amendments to the dissertation are required.

[ ]  b) that the Degree of Master of Philosophy be awarded subject to the candidate making minor amendments to the dissertation within 12 weeks of notification *i.e. correction of typographical, spelling and grammatical errors to limited revisions not central to the dissertation, omissions, and improvements to the argument which do not materially alter the conclusions.*

 To be completed to the satisfaction (confirmed in writing) of the following Internal Examiner(s):

[ ]  c) that the Degree of Master of Philosophy be awarded subject to the candidate making major amendments to the dissertation within 6 months of notification *i.e.* *more extensive revisions than required for minor amendments but will not normally require any significant extension of the original research to be undertaken and which the examiners have agreed are necessary for the dissertation to reach an acceptable standard*.

 To be completed to the satisfaction (confirmed in writing) of the following Internal and External Examiner(s):

[ ]  d) that no degree be awarded but that the candidate be permitted to submit a revised dissertation for the degree of Master of Philosophy not later than (max 12 months) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: The following options are only available following re-submission:

When recommending e) please state in Part II why the student has not met the criteria for the award for which they are registered.

[ ]  e) that no degree be awarded

 .

PART II To be completed for all candidates

* The Examiners are requested to provide below, for the information of the candidate, a joint statement under each award criteria to justify the recommendation made in Part I, describing how the dissertation does or does not meet each award criteria.
1. evidence that it extends the knowledge of the subject;
2. evidence of the candidate's ability to relate the subject matter of the thesis to the existing body of knowledge within the field;
3. a satisfactory level of literary presentation.

Any other general comments on the oral examination (if applicable)

*[Please delete as appropriate]*

1. We have satisfied ourselves that the thesis is genuinely the work of the candidate. YES/NO
2. We have attached the list of amendments required. YES/NO
3. The candidate should take into account the feedback and context provided in Part II of

this report to help them to complete the required amendments listed in Part III YES/NO

PART III To be completed for minor amendments, major amendments and resubmission only

Examinersare required to indicate below **for the information of the candidate**, theamendments which must be completedto meet the assessment criteria for award**.**

Guidance should be clear and unambiguous. Additional feedback for the future development of the thesis, or amendments which are discretionary, should be distinguished in the report from the amendments required to reach the standard for award.

Annotations on the thesis may be used to provide supplementary notes only and must be clear, reasonable, and unambiguous. Annotated theses must not be used as a substitute for the Board of Examiners’ report form which takes primacy. Please refer to [regulation 8.9.4](https://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/pgrexaminations/#after) for full guidance.

All candidates should respond to all the amendments raised in Part III, and are encouraged to take into account the feedback and context provided in Part II of this report.

Please refer to section 8.9 of the [*Handbook for Examination of Postgraduate Research programmes*](https://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/pgrexaminations/) for the full guidance on completing the report, noting the following:

*6.3.6 Students do not receive a copy of the preliminary report, and therefore examiners should be aware that any amendments identified as recommendations at the preliminary report stage that are pertinent to the final amendments specified by the examiners for completion will need to be clearly included within the final Board of Examiners' report (see section 8.9, below).*

*8.9.3 The Board of Examiners’ report form must be suitably detailed and of sufficient quality to allow the candidate, with the support of their supervisory team, to have a clear understanding of the reworking required. The Board of Examiners should note that a member of the supervisory team may approach the lead internal examiner for clarification of the amendments required on one occasion only.*

*8.13.2 c) Candidates* *****must not***** *contact any member of their Board of Examiners with regard to their examination. To do so will be treated as research misconduct under the ‘*[*Procedure for Graduate Research Students suspected of Research Misconduct*](http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/researchmisconduct/)*’*

Report *Please enter your report below or provide* *a separate sheet if necessary*

NB (for minor and major amendments only) examiners should include in their report for the information of the candidate the format that should be used to submit the amended thesis to aid the process of checking the amended thesis e.g. track changes, an accompanying table of amendments or report.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

* Immediately following the *viva voce* examination, or after preliminary reports have been exchanged where no *viva* is held, you must complete and submit this report together with all preliminary reports to the relevant Faculty PGR Support Office.
* The PGR Administration Office will ensure that the report is submitted to the Dean of Postgraduate Research for approval and then communicate the decision of the examiners to the student, sending them a copy of Part II and Part III of the report with any accompanying list of amendments if applicable.

Vivas by video-conference (applicable if one or more participant attended the viva virtually)

The board should note that by signing below they confirm that all present, including the student, agreed at the conclusion of the viva that holding the examination with the use of a video-link had no substantive bearing on the examination process. Please contact the Department Director of PGR immediately if any participant disagreed.

External Examiner

(print name)

signature Date

2nd External Examiner (if applicable)

(print name)

Signature Date

Internal Examiner

(print name)

Signature Date

2nd Internal Examiner (if applicable)

(print name)

Signature Date

Non-Examining Independent Chair (if applicable)

I confirm that the examination was conducted in accordance with the procedure laid out in the [Handbook for Examination of Postgraduate Research programmes](http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/pgrexaminations/).

*If applicable:* I attended and chaired the *viva voce* and will be able to provide a report on the conduct of the *viva* should this be required.

(print name)

Signature Date

Approved by Faculty or Department Director of PGR students:

I confirm I have read all preliminary reports, the comments in Part II, the report in Part III, and agree that the decision is in line with the examiners’ comments and the outcomes as set out in the [Handbook for Examination of Postgraduate Research programmes](https://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/pgrexaminations/). I also confirm that the report in Part III gives sufficient information and guidance to enable the student to undertake the amendments required.

Print name

 Signature Date