**Form E-PhD.4**

**Recommendation of the Examiners on the Re-examination of a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

The Examiners are required where possible to complete a joint report on this form on the re-examination of a thesis under Regulation 11.3(i) or an oral or alternative examinations under Regulations 11.3(iii) or (iv), the result of the examination as a whole and the recommendations to be made to the Board of Studies for Research Degrees. The completed form should be forwarded to the Research Degrees Administrator.

*(If an agreed report cannot be submitted, each Examiner should report separately)*

**1. The Candidate**

Name in full:

Title of thesis:

**2. The Examination Board**

Names of the Examiners appointed for the re-examination

External Examiner(s)

Internal Examiner(s)

Names of any supervisors present (if any)

*(Regulation 7.5 refers)*

**3. Report of the Examiners on the oral examination (if appropriate)**

The Examiners are requested to report below on the oral examination of the candidate giving a reasoned assessment of the candidate's performance.

**3.1** Are you satisfied that the thesis presented is the candidate's own work?

**3.2** Did the candidate show a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of:

(i) matters relating to the thesis

 (ii) background studies and methodological issues

relating to the subject of the thesis?

**3.3** In the case of a candidate whose research programme was part of a

collaborative group project, did the oral examination demonstrate that

the candidate's own contribution was worthy of the award?

**3.4** Other comments on the oral examination:

**4. Report of the Examiners on the approved alternative Re-examination (Regulations 7.4 and 11.3(v) refer)**

Where an alternative form of examination has been approved by the Research Degrees Committee a report on the candidate's performance should be given below; the form of examination must be specified.

**5. Further comment (if any) on the revised thesis**

If the provisional recommendations of the Examiners in their independent preliminary reports were not in agreement, an explanatory statement of the final joint recommendation must be made below. If the Examiners are not in agreement and are therefore completing separate copies of this form, details of the disagreement should be stated below and, where appropriate, related to the preliminary report.

**6. Recommendation (Regulations 11.6 to 11.12 refer)**

**The Examiners should strike out the recommendations which do not apply:**

**6.1** The candidate is recommended for the award of the degree of PhD.

**6.2** The candidate has not satisfied the Examiners as a candidate for the degree of PhD for the following reasons:

**6.3** The candidate is recommended for the award of the degree of PhD subject to completing either (a) minor editorial corrections to the thesis (Regulation 10.4 (i)), (b) non-major changes to the thesis (Regulation 10.4 (ii)) or (c) major changes to the thesis (Regulation 10.4 (iii)) to the satisfaction of the \*internal Examiner and/or \*external Examiner(s) (amendments to be noted in the Appendix).

**6.4** The candidate is not recommended for the degree of PhD but is recommended for the degree of MPhil directly or subject to the presentation of the thesis amended to the satisfaction of the Examiners *(if paragraph 6.2 does not confirm that the candidate's thesis and performance in the oral examination was of a satisfactory standard to merit the award of the degree of MPhil, then a statement signed and dated by the Examiners must be appended to this form).*

**6.5** The candidate is not recommended for the degree of PhD and should not be permitted to be re-examined (if paragraph 6.2 or 6.4 above does not explain why this recommendation is made, a short report signed and dated by the Examiners must be appended to this form).

*(\* delete as appropriate)*

Date Signed (Examiners)

**APPENDIX**

***(Notes of amendments to be made to the thesis under 6.3 above)***