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**RS14c**

**Recommendation of Examiners**

**Following Resubmission of PhD**

|  |
| --- |
| Following resubmission, the Chair is required to make a recommendation based either on the examiners’ reports or to request that the candidate attends a further oral examination in order for a recommendation to be made. |
| **Student** |
| Name:       | Degree Registered For: PhD |
| Campus:  | Faculty:   |
| Title of Research Programme:       |
| **The Examination Board** |
| External Examiner (i) |       |
| External Examiner (ii) |       |
| Internal Examiner |       |
| Chairperson of Board |       |
| **Report of the Examiners on the Thesis** |
|       |
| **Report of the Examiners on the oral examination** |
| Was a further oral examination held: Yes [ ]  No [ ] If so, please comment on the candidate's performance at the oral examination     and on the conduct of the viva:      |

|  |
| --- |
| **TurnitIn Similarity Report** |
| There is a formal requirement for the Faculty to process each candidate’s submission through TurnitIn software for the purposes of identifying potential plagiarism. The Board of Examiners will discuss the report at the pre-meeting regardless of the similarity results obtained through TurnitIn.In this section the Chair of the Board of Examiners should report on the discussion held and provide comments on the TurnitIn results.Similarity results obtained:      Internet Sources:      Publications:      Student Papers:      Board of Examiners Comments:     Recommendation: (note that all instances of plagiarism should be dealt with in accordance with the framework of penalties detailed on <https://www.ulster.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/152218/Plagiarism-Policy.pdf>)      If there is established evidence of plagiarised material in the thesis please discuss this with the student at the end of the examination and provide a summary of the discussion below:      |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommendations** |
| The Examiners are requested to check the recommendation which applies:*NB – See Section 5 (Examiners Reports) of the Handbook for Examiners for further Guidance** 1. that the candidate should be awarded the degree [ ]
	2. that the degree should be awarded subject to minor corrections to the thesis being [ ]

 made, or to clarifications and/or enhancements being completed, to the satisfaction  of the internal examiner within three months of the oral examination. *A typed list of these amendments should be attached to this form.** 1. that the degree should be awarded subject to corrections to the thesis being [ ]

made to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six months of the oral examination. *A typed list of these amendments should be attached to this form.***6.4** that the candidate should be awarded the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation [ ]  of the thesis amended in accordance with the provisions for the presentation of a  thesis for the degree of MPhil. *A typed list of the deficiencies of the thesis should*  *be attached to this form** 1. that the candidate should not be awarded the degree and no resubmission permitted [ ]

for the following reasons:      |
| Signed:……………………………………………………… (External Examiner (i))       (date)……………………………………………………… (External Examiner (ii))       (date)……………………………………………………… (Internal Examiner)       (date)……………………………………………………… (Chairperson)       (date) |
| **Recommendation by Research Director** |
| Signed:……………………………………………………… (Associate Dean, R&I)       (date) |

(This form should be returned to the Doctoral College, Jordanstown, for research students on the Jordanstown and Belfast campuses; or to the Doctoral College, Coleraine for research students on the Coleraine and Magee campuses.)