

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH
REPORT OF EXAMINERS ON A THESIS PRESENTED FOR
THE DEGREE OF PhD BY RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

PART I

Please complete Part I and return it, as soon as possible, before the oral examination to the Secretary to the Postgraduate Studies Committee, College of

Confidentiality: Please note that although your comments on the Part I of this form are confidential they might have to be disclosed to the candidate in the event of a complaint, an appeal or a Data Protection Subject Access request. Please also note that the Part II form will be provided to the candidate in its entirety.

(It is a convenience if the report is typed.)

If possible, please complete the report in typescript. Part I of the report should, wherever possible, be completed without consultation among the examiners. If you do find it necessary to consult at this stage, this fact and the reason(s) for it must be noted in your report under **DETAILED COMMENTS** below.

Name of Candidate:

Title of Submission:

Name of Examiner:

Address:

PLEASE WRITE YOUR DETAILED COMMENTS HERE

SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT OF THE SUBMISSION

Please indicate your assessment below by deleting words which do not apply and adding your comments either in the spaces provided, or on page 1. If any reply is negative, please state in detail the grounds for your criticism.

The submission (including the published work and the critical review):

- | | | |
|---------------|--|--------|
| 1. | is of PhD quality and standard | YES/NO |
| 2. | makes a significant contribution to knowledge in or understanding of the field of study | YES/NO |
| 3. | presents a coherent body of work understandable to a scholar in the same general field with regard to intentions, context, methods and conclusions | YES/NO |
| 4 | indicates, where appropriate, an appropriate methodology | YES/NO |
| 5 | indicates a critical judgement with regard to the candidate's work and that of other scholars in the same general field | YES/NO |
| 6. | is the candidate's own work | YES/NO |
| AND/OR | | |
| | in the case of multi-authored work the candidate has made a major contribution to the submitted work | YES/NO |
| 7 | [the critical review] is satisfactory in its literary style and presentation | YES/NO |

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION

I understand that the examiners will hold an oral examination unless this is, for exceptional and special reasons, waived by the Postgraduate Studies Committee. It will be waived only if the Committee accepts my specific and reasoned recommendation to that effect. (Please indicate your recommendation below by deleting the alternative which does not apply.)

I RECOMMEND THAT:

1. an oral examination be held.
2. the degree should be awarded without an oral examination. My reasons for recommending that the oral examination be waived are as follows:

Date _____

Signature _____

PART II

Candidate's name _____

Examination of thesis for PhD (by research publications)

If an oral examination is to be held, please detach and *retain* this part of the form (pages 3 to 6) and complete it (or another examiner's copy) *after* the oral examination. If an oral examination is *not* recommended, please leave this part blank and return it with pages 1 and 2 to the Secretary to the Postgraduate Studies Committee, College of

FINAL RECOMMENDATION *AFTER* ORAL EXAMINATION

The examiners must report a joint recommendation or, if they are unable to reach agreement, separate recommendations, in one of the forms below. **Please delete all but one of the following recommendations:**

1. The candidate satisfies the requirements for the award of the degree of PhD (by research publications) as laid down in Regulations **3.11.10 – 3.11.14** and the degree ought accordingly to be awarded.
- or* 2. The candidate satisfies the requirements for the award of the degree except that minor editorial corrections must be made to the critical review, and the degree ought accordingly to be awarded subject to certification by the internal examiner(s), and by the external examiner where the examiner so requests, that the corrections have been satisfactorily made. *The editorial corrections are to be completed within a period of _____ months.*
- or* 3. The candidate satisfies the requirements for the award of the degree except for stated minor deficiencies in the critical review, and the degree ought accordingly to be awarded subject to certification by the internal examiner(s), and by the external examiner where the examiner so requests, that specified minor modifications have been satisfactorily made. *The minor modifications are to be completed within a period of _____ months.*
- or* 4. The submission and/or the candidate's defence of it in oral examination are so fundamentally deficient in respect of all or any of the requirements for the degree that the candidate ought not to be awarded the degree of PhD.

Note to Examiners: The maximum period permitted for any corrections is three months.

COMMENTS MADE *AFTER* THE ORAL EXAMINATION

Examiners are reminded that this (Part II) report will also be made available to the candidate and his/her supervisor(s) after ratification by the Committee. If examiners have any concerns about this they should contact the relevant College Postgraduate Office.

A. Report to the Committee

This section should comment on how criticisms made in the initial reports were resolved or reinforced by the candidate's performance at the oral examination and any further criticisms which arose during the examiners' discussion or in the course of the oral examination. If necessary continue on a separate sheet which should be dated and signed by the examiners.

Date of oral _____ *Signature(s) of External Examiner(s)* _____

Signature(s) of Internal Examiner(s) _____

Examination of thesis for PhD (by research publications)

Candidate's name _____

B. Specific criticisms for transmission to the candidate

(To be completed in all cases where Recommendation 1 is not made)

If minor editorial corrections are recommended in terms of recommendation 2, or if minor modifications are recommended in terms of recommendations 3, then these should be detailed. If recommendation 4 is made then the main reasons for rejecting the submission for PhD should be given. *Please note that in the case of recommendations 2, or 3 a list of minor corrections may be passed to the candidate. They will, however, be regarded as **recommendations** only until ratified by the Committee.*

Date of oral _____ Signature(s) of External Examiner(s) _____

Signature(s) of Internal Examiner(s) _____

GROUNDS FOR THE AWARD OF PhD BY RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS

EXTRACTS FROM THE POSTGRADUATE REGULATIONS

1. The grounds for the award of PhD by research publications are the submission of a portfolio of published work judged satisfactory by the examiners and a satisfactory performance at an oral examination.
2. The submitted portfolio of published research must add up to a substantial and coherent body of work which would have taken a diligent student the equivalent of three years of full-time study to accomplish, which makes a significant contribution to knowledge in or understanding of the candidate's field of study, and which is of a scholarly standard normally expected of a candidate who submits a PhD dissertation.
3. The portfolio of published work must consist of either one or two books or at least six refereed journal articles or research papers, which are already in the public domain. The total submission, including the critical review (see Regulations **311.12** and **3.11.14**) should not normally exceed 100,000 words.
4. Candidates must either be the sole author of the portfolio of published works or must be able to demonstrate in the critical review of the submitted work that they have made a major contribution to all of the work that has been produced by more than one author.
5. The portfolio of published work must be accompanied by an abstract and also by a general critical review of all the submitted work. This critical review should summarise the aims, objectives, methodology, results and conclusions covered by all the work submitted in the portfolio. It should also indicate how the publications form a coherent body of work, what contribution the candidate has made to this work, and how the work contributes significantly to the expansion of knowledge. It should be at least 10,000 words, but not more than 25,000 words in length.