|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Details for the Examiners for the degree of** | Choose an item. |
| **Programme Director** | Choose an item. |
| **Student Name** |  |
| **Student ID** |  |
| **Research based dissertation type** | [ ]  **Primary Research Study**  |
| [ ]  **Analysis of Existing Data** |
| [ ]  **Systematic Literature Review** |
| [ ]  **Research Grant Proposal** |
| [ ]  **Academic Public Health Report** |
| [ ]  **Qualitative Study** |
| **Title of Dissertation** |  |

The University and the student reserve the copyright and all other intellectual property rights in both the Dissertation and the data which it contains. The contents of the Dissertation and the data are proprietary, and must be held strictly in confidence. No copies may be taken, and no disclosure of the contents may be made without (in each case) the prior written permission of the University.

**Examiner Report Form – Research Based Dissertation Format**

The Master’s degree is awarded on the basis of coursework and/or examinations plus a dissertation.

The examination system requires independent examination of the dissertation by two examiners, one of whom will be the supervisor. Following completion of the form, the examiners should confer to agree a final mark (see Guidance Notes).

The dissertation should be given a percentage mark according to the above marking scheme. Examiners who consider that the dissertation has passed at distinction (>70%), or merit level, should indicate this clearly.

**NOTE:** Under the terms of the Data protection Act, effective from 1st March 2000, all sections of this report will be made available to the candidate.

**Examiners: Please ensure that the comments on the written feedback form are in line with the actual marks given.**

**How to create updated fields (weighted marks)**

Enter your marks for each section (out of 100) in to the ‘Mark’ column

Right click the 0.0 in the ‘Weighted Mark’ column for **each** **relevant**\* section (in black text) including the ‘Total Weighted Mark’, then select ‘Update Field’

*\*Where the Results section is omitted you should complete the Design of Study and Discussion sections in red* ***instead*** *of black, as these have an even distribution of the marks (30% for each area).*

**Examiner No.1 Marks**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mark**  | **Weighting** | **Weighted Mark\*** |
| **Introduction/Literature Review**  |  | 15% | 0.0 |
| **Case for the study/Hypothesis/Aims/Objectives** |  | 15% | 0.0 |
| **Design of study or Methods** (only a grant proposal would have costings in it) |  | 20% | 0.0 |
| **Results** (this section is omitted for the Research Grant Proposal, with the 20% distributed evenly for Design of study and Discussion) |  | 20% | 0.0 |
| **Design of study or Methods** (if Results section is omitted) |  | 30% | 0.0 |
| **Discussion** |  | 20% | 0.0 |
| **Discussion** (if results section is omitted) |  | 30% | 0.0 |
| **Presentation** |  | 10% | 0.0 |
| **Total Weighted Mark %** | **0.0** |

*\*Please ensure that you right click on 0.0 and choose ‘update field’ in each relevant section* ***and*** *the total weighted mark*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Examiner No.1 Name:** |  |
| **Examiner No.1 Signature:** |  |
| **Examiner No.1 Date:** |  |

**Examiner No. 1 Feedback**

The examiners are required to give feedback to the student on the following aspects of the dissertation. Please expand to ensure each section has supportive feedback.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The extent to which the project reported on within the dissertation is based upon a clearly formulated problem/research question and sound rationale informed by a critical understanding of relevant existing evidence/knowledge base.**
 |
|  |
| 1. **The clarity, depth and repeatability of methods of the study/review (including detail re: ethical/regulatory issues).**
 |
|  |
| 1. **The clarity of key study/review findings and reporting of any statistical tests and or narrative/qualitative synthesis.**
 |
|  |
| 1. **The depth of discussion including summary of key findings, critical appraisal of study/review reported upon in the dissertation, degree of self-reflection and implications for practice, policy and/or research.**
 |
|  |
| 1. **In addition, please give further detail regarding the strengths of the dissertation providing encouragement and guidance for any future academic study, submission for publication and so on.**
 |
|  |

**Examiner No.2 Marks**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Mark**  | **Weighting** | **Weighted Mark\*** |
| **Introduction/Literature Review**  |  | 15% | 0.0 |
| **Case for the study/Hypothesis/Aims/Objectives** |  | 15% | 0.0 |
| **Design of study or Methods** (only a grant proposal would have costings in it) |  | 20% | 0.0 |
| **Results** (this section is omitted for the Research Grant Proposal, with the 20% distributed evenly for Design of study and Discussion) |  | 20% | 0.0 |
| **Design of study or Methods** (if Results section is omitted) |  | 30% | 0.0 |
| **Discussion** |  | 20% | 0.0 |
| **Discussion** (if results section is omitted) |  | 30% | 0.0 |
| **Presentation** |  | 10% | 0.0 |
| **Total Weighted Mark %** | **0.0** |

*\*Please ensure that you right click on 0.0 and choose ‘update field’ in each relevant section* ***and*** *the total weighted mark*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Examiner No.2 Name:** |  |
| **Examiner No.2 Signature:** |  |
| **Examiner No.2 Date:** |  |

**Examiner No. 2 Feedback**

The examiners are required to give feedback to the student on the following aspects of the dissertation. Please expand to ensure each section has supportive feedback.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The extent to which the project reported on within the dissertation is based upon a clearly formulated problem/research question and sound rationale informed by a critical understanding of relevant existing evidence/knowledge base.**
 |
|  |
| 1. **The clarity, depth and repeatability of methods of the study/review (including detail re: ethical/regulatory issues).**
 |
|  |
| 1. **The clarity of key study/review findings and reporting of any statistical tests and or narrative/qualitative synthesis.**
 |
|  |
| 1. **The depth of discussion including summary of key findings, critical appraisal of study/review reported upon in the dissertation, degree of self-reflection and implications for practice, policy and/or research.**
 |
|  |
| 1. **In addition, please give further detail regarding the strengths of the dissertation providing encouragement and guidance for any future academic study, submission for publication and so on.**
 |
|  |

**Final Agreed Mark (subject to Exam Board Ratification)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Agreed Mark %** |  |

**Examiner Resolution of Discrepancy Comments**

*(please provide detail about how differences in marks were resolved between examiners, where there was a greater than 5% difference between the marks)*

|  |
| --- |
| Comments/show how resolved: |
| Date of Discussion: |
|  | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Confirmation if 3rd Examiner is required to adjudicate between examiner 1 and 2**  |[ ] [ ]

**Examiner No. 3 Comments (ONLY to be completed if ‘Yes’ is marked in box above)**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Examiner No.3 Name:** |  |
| **Examiner No.3 Signature:** |  |
| **Examiner No.3 Date:** |  |

**Guidance notes and marking scheme**

1. Mark the dissertation giving a separate percentage mark under each category marked on the report form, using the marking scheme provided. Note that separate descriptors are given for dissertation content and presentation.
2. Calculate the weighted total for each category and indicate this in the relevant box at the bottom of the form. Sum the weighted totals to give a final percentage mark.
3. Presentation – although the marking scheme refers to work that requires correction, such corrections will only be required if the dissertation is referred. Thus if a dissertation fails on the presentation element, but obtains a pass mark overall, the student will not be required to submit a corrected dissertation. However, in such cases where the student chooses to make the corrections, the original mark will not be altered.
4. Comment on the dissertation under each category 1 to 5 in the feedback section. Note that the whole of the dissertation examiner report is made available to the student.
5. On completion of the form confer with the other examiner:
6. Where there is a relatively small difference (i.e. <=5%), the agreed mark is reached by taking the mean of the two marks.
7. In cases where the difference between the two markers is <=5% but one marker has awarded a pass and the other awarded a fail, then the final mark is agreed through discussion and negotiation.
8. Where differences are greater than 5% and in particular when they straddle critical boundaries, markers should endeavour to come to an agreed mark through discussion and negotiation.
9. Where agreement cannot be reached, a third internal marker, will examine the work (including the original examiners’ reports, comments and marks) and award the mark.
10. The Chair of the Examination Board (or nominee) will have responsibility for the appointment of a third marker. In such cases, the third marker’s decision is final.
11. All work where this occurs will be sent to the external examiner with an explanation of the original discrepancy between markers, the process that has been followed and the final mark awarded. The external examiner will be asked to particularly comment on any such pieces of work. In all cases of assessment feedback, students will be given one agreed mark only.
12. Fail (2016 PGT Regulations) – students may be referred for any marks achieved between 49-30%. Students achieving a mark below 30% for their dissertation are not permitted to resubmit and will be given an exit award.
13. Fail (2012 Regulations) – students may be referred for any marks achieved below 50%.
14. **Referral** – A candidate who is referred may be given the opportunity to resubmit their dissertation within 6 months. The reasons for referral may be investigated by Faculty. In the case of referrals, assurances will be required that supervisory support is available to enable the student to attempt a revised dissertation.

***N.B.*** *When examiners recommend a referral, they must provide a statement (in addition to the report) which can be sent to the candidate. This statement should indicate quite clearly, what revisions are required to be made to the dissertation.*

The following table gives a breakdown of the standard required to achieve a grade within a particular marking band:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mark  | **Explanation**  |
| 90-100%  | **Exceptional** (allows award of distinction): Exceptional work, nearly or wholly faultless for that expected at Master’s level. Perfect presentation.  |
| 80-89%  | **Outstanding** (allows award of distinction): Work of outstanding quality throughout. Excellent presentation.  |
| 70-79%  | **Excellent**(a*llows award of distinction):* Work of very high to excellent quality showing originality, high accuracy, thorough understanding, critical appraisal. Shows a wide and thorough understanding of the material studied and the relevant literature and the ability to apply the theory and methods learned to solve unfamiliar problems. Very good presentation.  |
| 60-69%  | **Good Pass**(allows award of merit): Work of good to high quality showing evidence of understanding of the research topic, good accuracy, good structure and relevant conclusions. Shows a good knowledge of the material studied and the relevant literature and some ability to tackle unfamiliar problems. Good presentation.  |
| 50-59%  | **Pass*:*** Work shows a clear grasp of relevant facts and issues and reveals an attempt to create a coherent whole. It comprises reasonably clear and attainable objectives, adequate literature review and some originality. Presentation is acceptable, minor errors allowed.  |
| 40-49%  | **Referral*:***  Work shows a satisfactory understanding of the research topic and basic knowledge of the relevant literature but with little or no originality and limited accuracy. Shows clear but limited objectives, and does not always reach a conclusion. Presentation adequate but could be improved.  |
| 30-39%  | **Referral:** Work shows some understanding of the main elements of the research topic and some knowledge of the relevant literature. Shows a limited level of accuracy with little analysis of data or attempt to discuss its significance. Presentation poor.  |
|  | **Students starting their programme:** |
| **From September 2012**  | **From September 2016**  |
| 20-29%  | **Referral:** Limited relevant material presented. Little understanding of research topic. Unclear or unsubstantiated arguments with very poor accuracy and understanding. Presentation unacceptable.  | **Fail with no opportunity to resubmit:** Limited relevant material presented. Little understanding of research topic. Unclear or unsubstantiated arguments with very poor accuracy and understanding. Presentation unacceptable.  |
| 10-19%  | **Referral:** Limited understanding of the research process. The topic is largely without evidence to support its exploration for research and the arguments are supported by poor sources of evidence. The dissertation is disjointed and does not demonstrate logical coherent thinking with unacceptable presentation.  | **Fail with no opportunity to resubmit:** Limited understanding of the research process. The topic is largely without evidence to support its exploration for research and the arguments are supported by poor sources of evidence. The dissertation is disjointed and does not demonstrate logical coherent thinking with unacceptable presentation. |
| 0-9%  | **Referral:** The text demonstrates no understanding of the research process. The topic is totally inappropriate and there is no evidence to support its exploration as an area of interest for research. Presentation is extremely poor and is not in an appropriate format for submission as a Master’s dissertation. The topic would need to be reconstructed and totally rewritten if it were to be presented for resubmission.  | **Fail with no opportunity to resubmit:** The text demonstrates no understanding of the research process. The topic is totally inappropriate and there is no evidence to support its exploration as an area of interest for research. Presentation is extremely poor and is not in an appropriate format for submission as a Master’s dissertation. The topic would need to be reconstructed and totally rewritten if it were to be presented for resubmission. |