



# 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

---

Please indicate your overall recommendation. I believe the candidate should be

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | awarded the degree without revision  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | granted up to 3 months to revise the thesis to the satisfaction of the University, because only minor errors need to be addressed  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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"/> | 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"/> | informed that, because of a discrepancy between the two examiners, the thesis will be distributed to a third examiner  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | considered for a Master of Philosophy instead  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | not awarded a HDR 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   |                              |                             |