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**Examination Committee Decision Report**

The form is completed jointly by all examiners after the oral examination has ended. Examiners may make their joint recommendation known to the candidate at the end of the oral examination. Collectively, the Chair of DEC is responsible for completing this report and communicating its outcomes formally to the candidate no later than **three days** after the date of the oral examination.

This report should be signed by the College Dean (or nominee), notification of its content should be made available to GPC and DGSR. This report is formatted to allow cells to expand to match their content. Hand-written reports will not be accepted.

| **Full name of candidate:** |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Candidate ID Number:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Degree examined:** |  |
| **Candidate's college** |  |
| **Supervisor(s):** |  |
| **Title of dissertation/thesis:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DEC’ names  (please specify whether internal or external examiner in each case, and stated clearly the Chair of the DEC) |  |
| Independent Chair’s name, if appointed |  |
| Observer’s name, if appointed |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Date of the oral examination** |
|  |

Reports must be informative and specific to the candidate and their dissertation. Generic reports will not be accepted.

You should make a joint recommendation in Section 1 and provide a supporting rationale for the recommendation in Section 2. When deciding on your recommendation, you should consider the criteria for the award of a research degree (as presented in the annex to this report).

| **Section 1: Examiners’ recommendation to the Research Degrees Examination Board** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | We recommend that: | **Please tick one box only** | |
| **A** | The dissertation/thesis has been approved unconditionally | |  |
| **B** | The dissertation/thesis has been approved, subject to the correction of minor errors to the satisfaction of the principal supervisor. Revised dissertation/thesis should be submitted within two weeks from the date that the student has been notified by the decision.  (Equally, the approval for the revised version can be approved by the Internal examiner or the Independent Chair, if applicable) | |  |
| **C** | The dissertation/thesis has been approved, subject to a major revision without oral examination. The approval is granted once errors or omissions of substance have been corrected to the satisfaction of the DEC without oral examination within a period of:   * Minimum of three months * Maximum of one year | |  |
| **D** | The dissertation/thesis has been approved, subject to a major revision with oral examination with two possible outcomes:   * Dissertation/thesis has been approved unconditionally * The dissertation/thesis is rejected | |  |
| **E** | The dissertation/thesis is rejected. | |  |
| **Notes:**   1. For minor errors (recommendations B), examiners must provide the candidate with written details of the corrections required. 2. For errors of substance or resubmission (recommendations C), examiners must provide clear and comprehensive written guidance for the candidate and attach a copy of it to this report. 3. Resubmission (D) will normally require a full re-examination including a further oral examination. Resubmission can only take place once. | | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Supporting rationale for the examiners’ recommendation (the Chair of EC is responsible to complete this report jointly with all examiners)**: Explain the reasons for your joint recommendation:   * give specific justification of why the degree should, or should not, be awarded; * consider the criteria for a research degree (as set out in the annex to this report), * confirm which criteria have been satisfied, and * provide feedback on any of the criteria that have not been satisfied; * include appropriate reference to the written submission and the performance in the oral examination; and * if relevant, include the reason why your final recommendation differs from any recommendations in the preliminary reports.   Guidance on any corrections or for a resubmission must be supplied separately to the candidate as soon as possible after the oral examination so that the candidate may begin their revisions, on the understanding that the Research Degrees Examination Board may require that the guidance is enhanced, or the outcome changed, when it considers the examiner’s reports. |
|  |

**Declaration**

We individually declare that we do not have any connection with the candidate, the supervisors, the research project or (external examiners only) with the University, which might impair our ability to make a fair and impartial assessment of the candidate's work.

**External examiner**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Print name | Date |
|  |  |

**Internal examiner**

|  |
| --- |
| In addition to the declaration above, the internal examiner also declares the following:  Subject to any comments or observations below, I am satisfied that the examination was conducted in accordance with AU’s regulations and procedures.  (Where an Independent Chair has been appointed, a separate report from the Independent Chair is required.) |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Print name | Date |
|  |  |

**Second internal/external examiner, if appointed** *(please delete as appropriate)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Print name | Date |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Head of School (or nominee) declaration:**  I confirm that I have reviewed the examiners’ reports and completed this declaration as evidence of that review. | | |
| **Signature of the College Dean (or nominee):** | | |
| Signature | Print name | Date |
|  |  |  |

**Appendix: Criteria for the award of doctoral degrees**

1. The dissertation/thesis should:
   1. embody the results of research, carried out by the candidate, which may reasonably be expected of a capable and diligent student in the period of study specified in the Regulations for the degree;
   2. consist of the candidate's own account of their investigations;
   3. make clear the sources from which information has been derived, the extent to which the work of others has been used, and the areas which are claimed as original;
   4. show the exercise of critical judgment with regard to both the candidate's own work and that of other scholars in the field; and
   5. be an integrated whole and present a coherent argument.
2. The dissertation/thesis and the oral examination together must demonstrate that the candidate has:
   1. an adequate knowledge and understanding of the discipline and the context within which the research is grounded and of the literature relevant to the research; and
   2. the ability to put forward arguments in an appropriate form, both orally and in writing.
3. The dissertation/thesis submitted for a doctoral degree should, in addition to the requirements in 1) and 2), represent a significant and original contribution to knowledge, worthy of publication or dissemination in whole, or in part, in a form appropriate to the discipline.
4. For candidature by published work, the work submitted should in addition:
   1. relate in a coherent way to the field of knowledge and represent a significant and original contribution; and
   2. be accompanied by a substantial commentary in the candidate's own words linking the published work and outlining its coherence and significance and making clear the extent of the contribution of others to the work submitted.
5. For candidature by dissertation/thesis or by published work, the work submitted, and the oral examination together must, in addition to the requirements in 4), demonstrate that the candidate has the capacity to pursue independently original research based on a good understanding of the relevant techniques and concepts.

**NB**: The following rubric gives more information as what to expect on dissertation/thesis and presentation (vary from one college to another)

Subject to each college specific requirements, the following is an example of a detailed rubric for a master’s thesis

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Thesis components** | **Unacceptable**  **(2-2.99) (≥70%)** | **Acceptable**  **(3-3.99) (≥80%)** | **Mastery**  **(4-5) (≥90%)** | **Score** |
| Introduction | Demonstrates minimal knowledge and application of presenting the introduction. | Demonstrates adequate competence in establishing a framework for the research; lays the broad foundation for the problem; creates reader interest; places the study within the larger context of the scholarly literature. | Demonstrates exemplary competence in establishing a framework for the research; creates reader interest; lays the broad foundation for the problem; places the study within the larger context of the scholarly literature. |  |
| Research Questions | Demonstrates minimal knowledge and application of presenting the research question. | Demonstrates adequate, critical knowledge and application in presenting clear interrogative statements to be answered by the research. | Demonstrates exemplary, critical knowledge and application in presenting clear interrogative statements to be answered by the research. |  |
| Review of the Literature | Demonstrates minimal knowledge and application of presenting the review of the literature. | The candidate’s performance is adequate in reviewing, describing, summarizing, and evaluating the relevant literature; fairly well organized; related directly to the research questions; | Demonstrates exemplary performance in presenting a comprehensive grasp of the……. by reviewing, describing, summarizing, and evaluating the relevant literature; well organized and related directly to the research questions. |  |
| Research Design and Methodology | Demonstrates minimal knowledge and application of presenting the research design and methodology. | Demonstrates adequate competence in presenting the methodology for the study. | Demonstrates a high level of competence in presenting the proposed methodology for the study. |  |
| Significance of the Study | Demonstrates minimal knowledge and application of presenting the significance of the study. | Demonstrates adequate competence in presenting how results of the study may affect scholarly research, theory, practice, policy, etc. | Demonstrates exemplary competence in presenting how results of the study may affect scholarly research, theory, practice, policy,  etc. |  |
| Organization And Presentation | The proposal is somewhat unfocused or unclear; weak; abrupt in transition; disconnected with random thoughts with no discernable points; sketchy, missing important details; inaccurate or erroneous information is provided. | The proposal is generally focused and logical  with identifiable thesis; generally well organized with apparent structures and transitions; accurate with clearly stated ideas; appropriate style/tone; needs minimum revisions. | The proposal is very clearly focused; exceptionally organized with very apparent structures and transitions (e.g., written with intact paragraphs; coherent; highly appropriate style/tone. |  |
| References | Demonstrates minimal knowledge and application of presenting the references. | Demonstrates an acceptable level of presenting references according to APA guidelines. | Demonstrates competence in presenting references according to APA guidelines. |  |
| Quality of Writing | The proposal is limited in vocabulary; unclear with misused parts of speech that impair understanding; inadequate in standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing. | The proposal is readable and the writer’s meaning on a general level is clear; adequate in standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing); moderately ready for approval to conduct research. | The proposal is precise, interesting, specific, and accurate; excellent in standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing); generally ready for conducting research. |  |
| **Final score out of -------** | | | |  |

**Student’s Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Date of Proposal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Title of Thesis \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Signature of Evaluating Committee Member \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Subject to each college specific requirements, the following is an example of a detailed rubric for a doctorate’s dissertation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Unsatisfactory (1)** | **Satisfactory (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** | **Score** |
| **Ability to choose the appropriate research method** | The research methodology is not appropriate for the research question and objectives. | The research methodology is appropriate but will not lead to strong analysis. | Research methodology is appropriate, build on existing literature but less relevant to the practice. | Research methodology relevant to the practice and leads to strong analysis. | Advanced research methodology is used which is highly relevant to the theory and practice. |  |
| **Quality of research questions** | Develops poor research questions, little match with theory and practice. | Research questions are appropriate and related to the research problem. | Research questions are derived from the current literature, relevant to the practice, and useful in analysing organizations. | Research questions are original, relevant to the theory and practice, and very useful in analysing the business situation. | High quality of research questions, highly relevant to the theory and practice, introduces new ideas and very creative. |  |
| **The relevancy of data collection and analysis** | Collected data is irrelevant to the research problem and objectives. | Data interpretation is inappropriate and/or uses incorrect methodology; and with weaknesses in interpretation | Data interpretation is appropriate, but analysis is limited. | Data interpretation is appropriate and uses correct methodology; with good analysis. | Data interpretation is appropriate and advanced analytical methods are used. |  |
| **Ability to integrate literature to the research problem.** | Literature is unrelated to the current research topic. | Aware of the research literature in the field but coverage is not enough. | Select and summarize the current research literature to explain the current business issue. | Select, summarize, and analyze the relevancy and use of the literature in a given business issue. | Critically synthesize and evaluate existing literature and explain it contribution to the business problem. |  |
| **Literature paragraphs are all related to the topic** | Paragraphs seem unrelated | Paragraphs relevant to topic but connections are unclear | Most paragraphs clearly relevant, supporting and explaining the business issue. | Paragraphs all clearly related to central focus of essay. | Paragraphs all clearly related to the research issue contribute to the body of knowledge. |  |
| **Quality of summary and interpretation of the literature** | Literature summary is misleading and includes errors. | Summarizes accurately but with little interpretation. | Interprets literature analytically, understands the intent and supports research with appropriate detail, and useful summary | Analyses literature perceptively, using summarizing as needed, and provides useful interpretation. | Summary reflects what is needed by the business issue, well interpreted, and has clear contribution. |  |
| **Impact of research on the local context** | Dissertation is not relevant to the local context, not innovative, and has no impact on the decisions. | Dissertation is based on global data but has little impact and less relevant to the local context. | Select some global theories and explain their relevancy to the local context. | Dissertation reflects local context with globally generalized findings. | The findings are innovative, lead to effective decisions, and relevant to the global and local context. |  |
| **Able to analyze a situation for potential ethical decisions and problems** | The dissertation shows no awareness of potential ethical problems and decisions. | Appears to be aware of some ethical problems but are not able to analyze their impact on decisions. | Analyzes the major ethical problems and reflects their implications on the management decisions. | Able to analyze a complex ethical situation and demonstrate an understanding of major and subtle ethical problems, their implications and relevancy to the local context. | Analyzes and predicts complex ethical situation, clearly identifies their implications and relevancy to local and global contexts. |  |
| **Ability to draw reasoned conclusions and findings based on analysis applied by the research** | Little discussion of project findings/outcomes; poor conclusion/ summary, or not supported by findings/outcomes. | Inaccurate description of major topics or concepts; Considerable relevant discussion missing; Conclusions little supported by findings/outcomes | Discussion sufficient and with few errors; Greater foundation needed from past work in area; Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included some recommendations. | Accurate and engaging discussion; Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and based on outcomes. | Superior, distinguished, accurate, and engaging discussion; Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes. |  |
| **Critical analysis** | Analysis is superficial based on opinions and preferences rather than critical analysis. | Demonstrates general understanding with limited critical analysis of the research topic, and summarizes perspectives, counterarguments, or opposing positions. | Adequately compares/contrasts perspectives, counterarguments, or opposing positions but broader connections and/or implications are not as thoroughly explored. | Demonstrates a critical analysis of the research topic. Compares/contrasts perspectives, considers counter arguments or opposing positions, and useful conclusions with expected future implications. | Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding and careful, critical analysis of the research topic. Compares perspectives, considers counter arguments or opposing positions, and draws original and thoughtful conclusions with future implications. |  |
| **Implication of analysis on the management problems** | Little or no contribution of the research findings to management problems; weak analysis, and no discernible implications. | Somewhat able to analyze and assess data but face difficulty in relating them to the research problem. | Useful research findings, based on reasonable analysis, and have their implications on the research problem. | Develops a practical model based on deep analysis and end up with very strong findings that contribute to management problems. | Critical analysis that lead to the development of a theoretically applied model. Findings and implications are valuable and generalizable. |  |
| **Research creativity** | The research is generic, applies traditional approaches, and findings are similar to previous research. | The research applies recent and updated methods, and somewhat distinguished from previous research. | Introduces creative opinion, methods, but has little impact on business activities and problems. | Develops new and creative approaches, findings are creatives, and has a clear contribution to the business practice. | The research applies highly creative approaches, creative analytical methods, and the findings are highly valuable to the different aspects business. |  |
| **Research approaches and strategies** | Research strategy is not clear and has no implications on the organization. | Identifies one or more approaches for solving the problem that do not apply within a specific business area. | Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context or business area. | Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem and apply within a specific context. | Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within different aspects of the organization and set strategic solutions for expected business, leadership, and finance issues. |  |
|  |  | | | | |  |
| **Oral presentation and defense of dissertation** | Does not adequately  defend research;  does not answer key questions; frequently  shows a need for deeper reflection on vital points;  Reads the  material from  presentation to make the report and is clearly not comfortable with the topic. | Adequately defends  research; answers  questions, but often  with little insight;  frequently shows a need for deeper reflection on major points; Relies too much on presentation and has difficulty speaking freely to the audience and is somewhat comfortable with the topic. | Adequately defends  Research by providing reasonable answers to the questions;  May occasionally manifest  need for further  reflection on minor  points; and has difficulty speaking freely to the audience and is comfortable with the topic. | Competently defends research  by providing very  helpful answers  to questions;  Uses presentation resources as a guide, is easily understandable, and keeps eye contact with the audience. | Masterfully defends  research by providing  clear and insightful  answers to questions;  Uses presentation resources as  a guide, gives detailed explanations, easily understandable, and keeps appropriate eye contact and joyful with the audience. |  |
| **Pacing and Poise** | Tension and nervousness, either too quick or too slow delivery, and has trouble recovering from mistakes. | Displays mild tension; does not meet apportioned time, and has trouble recovering from mistakes. | Makes minor mistakes, but quickly recovers from them; displays little or no tension but struggling to complete on time. | Displays relaxed, self-confident nature about self, with no mistakes. | Highly relaxed, self-confident, powered with knowledge, no mistakes, and easily responding to any discussion. |  |
| **Voice** | Consistently uses a monotone voice. | Displays some level of inflection throughout delivery. | Satisfactory use of inflection but does not consistently use fluid speech. | Use of fluid speech and inflection maintains the interest of the audience. | Use of high fluid speech, inflection maintains the interest of the audience, and highly interacting. |  |
|  |  | | | | |  |