



HEAD OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES REPORT ON HDR THESIS EXAMINATION

PART 1: HDR CANDIDATE DETAILS

Given names	
Family name	
Student number	
Degree	
School or institute	
Faculty	
Principal supervisor	
Co-supervisors	
HPS Name	

PART 2: GENERAL OVERVIEW OF EXAMINATION PROCESS

Please utilise the reports of examiners to outline your recommendation. For more information, consult the [HPS handbook](#). In the box below and in one to three paragraphs

- reiterate the outcome that each examiner recommended,
- indicate whether you believe the comments of examiners are compatible with these recommendations,
- if only one examiner believes the thesis might be worthy of a degree, even after corrections, decide whether to recommend a third examiner,
- acknowledge circumstances in which examiners recommended the award with commendation,
- end with a summary of your recommendation.

PART 3: HPS DRAFT RESOLUTION TO THE THESIS EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

I recommend that the candidate

<input type="checkbox"/>	be awarded the degree without revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	be granted up to 3 months to revise the thesis to the satisfaction of the University, because minor concerns need to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	be granted up to 6 months to revise the thesis to the satisfaction of the University, because some substantive concerns need to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	be granted up to 12 months to revise the thesis, because the candidate must complete further work and resubmit the thesis to _____ [specify relevant examiner or examiners].
<input type="checkbox"/>	be informed that, because of a discrepancy between the two examiners, the thesis will be distributed to a third examiner.
<input type="checkbox"/>	be considered for a Master of Philosophy instead.
<input type="checkbox"/>	not be awarded a Higher Degree Research degree.

Divergence from examiners. If your draft resolution differs from the recommendations of examiners, please justify your decision here.

PART 4: EXEMPTIONS TO THE REQUESTED REVISIONS OF EXAMINERS

If supervisors believe the suggestions of examiners are unnecessary or unsuitable, they should challenge these suggestions in their response to examiners. However, in exceptional circumstances—such as when examiners have recommended a revision that diverges from UOW policy—the HPS may use the following table to seek an exemption. If the TEC approves the exemption, the candidate can disregard the requested revision.

Examiner	Specify the requested revision	Justify why this request should not be fulfilled

PART 5: HPS SIGN OFF

I have liaised with the supervisors to prepare this report.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
I believe this thesis is worthy of commendation, as recommended by both examiners.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
HPS signature		
Date		