****

**Examination for Research Masters Awards**

*please note this form should also be used for re-examinations*

**Report of Examiners**

**Section A**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a) | Full name of candidate |  |
| b) | Candidate Student ID Number |  |
| c) | Please indicate the intended Award being examined for:MPhil/LLM by research |  |
| d) | College |  |
| e) | Long Thesis Title |  |
| f) | Short Thesis Title *(only required if long title more than 150 characters including spaces)* |  |
| g) | Date of Submission of Thesis |  |
| h) | Please indicate if this is a re-examination |  |

1. The Examiners report that they have:

[ ]  Examined the thesis

[ ]  Examined the candidate orally on …………………………………(date)

1. The Examiners RECOMMEND:

[ ]  That the candidate should be awarded the degree specified above (*having met the criteria as specified by Senate set out in Senate Regulation 5.2(a-d) and Senate Regulation 5.3 to 5.5.*

 [ ]  That the candidate should be awarded the degree specified above, subject to amendments to the thesis being completed to the satisfaction of the examiners within six months of formal notification to the candidate.

[ ]  That the degree should not be awarded but the candidate be allowed to resubmit the thesis in a revised form for re-examination within twelve months, with a further viva voce examination.

 (*please note this recommendation is not available if the candidate has already been re-examined*)

[ ]  That the thesis has met the standards for the award, but the candidate has failed to satisfy the Examiners at the viva voce examination and the candidate be allowed to re-submit the same thesis for re-examination at a second viva voce examination within three months.

[ ]  That the degree be not awarded

**Section B**

**JOINT REPORT OF EXAMINERS**

Examiners are asked to state briefly below the grounds on which their decisions are based. Examiners should refer to the standards defined in [Senate Regulation 5](http://www.brunel.ac.uk/about/documents/pdf/SR5-with-effect-1-sept-2015.pdf)

*(NB This section of the form will be copied to the candidate)*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Should the recommendation of examiners be to require the candidate to either:

* *Make amendments within six months*
* *Re-submit a revised thesis for re-examination for the intended award within 12 months;*

the examiners should provide a dated and signed record of the requirements below.

In the case of amendments within six months, it should be made clear below which examiner will assess amendments to the thesis. This section of the report will be sent to the candidate.

|  |
| --- |
| (*Please indicate if a separate list of required corrections/revisions is attached)* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Please indicate if the Internal or External Examiner(s) will complete and sign the Satisfactory Completion of Amendments form | Internal Examiner |  |
| External Examiner |  |

Please comment on the examination process, in order that the University can ensure that best practice is being implemented. Please make your comments in this space. Thank you.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Signature | Name (please print or type) | Date |
| External Examiner 1 |  |  |  |
| External Examiner 2 (*if appointed*) |  |  |  |
| Internal Examiner |  |  |  |