Examiners’ Joint Report and Recommendation Form:

MPhil/PhD Health Psychology Research & Professional Practice

Portfolio of Competence

All postgraduate research awards at the University of Southampton are governed by the [Regulations for Research Degrees and Higher Doctorates](https://www.southampton.ac.uk/about/governance/regulations-policies/research-students/general/candidature-supervision) and the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](https://www.southampton.ac.uk/about/governance/regulations-policies/research-students/general/candidature-supervision). The [Guidance for Examiners of Postgraduate Research Awards](https://www.southampton.ac.uk/~assets/doc/quality-handbook/Guidance%20for%20Examiners%20of%20PGR%20Awards.pdf) supplements the information from these sources and should be consulted to aid the completion of this form, but the Regulations and the Code of Practice must be consulted where clarification is required or where dispute arises during the examination process.

Each examiner will have made their independent report on the basis of the portfolio of competence, prior to any *viva voce* and subsequent final recommendation. This form sets out the criteria for assessing the candidate and the recommendations that are available to the examiners and is used to record the examiners’ agreed views in relation to the core outcomes of the portfolio of competence for the MPhil/PhD Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice programme, and to confirm their agreed recommendation. The form must provide a sufficiently detailed statement to justify the examiners’ recommendation. A candidate must satisfy the examiners in both the portfolio of competence and the *viva voce* and they may fail the examination either because of the portfolio, the *viva voce,* or both. The examiners may therefore recommend re-examination only in that part in which the candidate has failed and this report must therefore address both aspects of the examination.

The form should be completed and signed by all members of the examining team, before being submitted by the chair to the Doctoral College (Faculty) Team, Faculty of Environmental and Life Sciences, Highfield, Southampton, SO17 1BJ (email [fels-gradschool@soton.ac.uk](mailto:fels-gradschool@soton.ac.uk)). This should be done within **one working week** of the *viva voce*.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of candidate |  | | |
| Date of *viva voce* |  | | |
| Title of thesis |  | | |
| This report refers to the submission of a revised portfolio or an additional *viva voce* | | Yes󠄀 󠄀󠄀 | No 󠄀󠄀 |

The outcome criteria indicated in Part A are intended to permit a clear record of the candidate’s performance (a combination of the portfolio of competence and *viva voce*) and to enhance consistency in the examination process, whilst allowing for differences between disciplines.

**Part A Are you satisfied that the candidate has demonstrated the following?**

If the answer to any of these statements is NO, the candidate cannot be awarded the degree without further work/amendments and, if appropriate, an additional *viva voce*. In such circumstances, the examiners may not recommend (1), (2) or (3) in Part C.

If the answer to any of these statements is YES (SUBJECT TO SPECIFIC AMENDMENT), the extent to which amendment is required should be discussed further in the report, with reference to remedial actions and required amendments. In such circumstances, the examiners may not recommend (1) in Part C.

If the answer to all of these statements is **YES**, a recommendation of (1), (2), or (3) in Part C should be selected.

At the end of the examination process, the examiners must be able to certify that they are satisfied that the criteria have been met in full.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Yes | | Yes (subject to  specific amendment) | No |
| Quantity or demonstration of each of the competencies (i.e. there should be no major omissions of work, lack of detail and explicitness in the Practice Diary and/or in the Supervision Log, or insufficient presentation of Supporting Evidence). | |  | |  |  |
| *Comment here on the extent to which the criteria have not been met* | | | | | |
|  | | Yes | Yes (subject to  specific amendment) | No |
| Apparent quality of practice (as indicated by the Practice Diary, Supervision Log, Record of Completion forms, the Supporting Evidence which has been supplied, or by the quality of understanding of other aspects of performance evidence during the *viva voce*. | |  |  |  |
| *Comment here on the extent to which the criteria have not been met* | | | | |

**Part B Commentary**

This section should comment on the candidate’s portfolio of competence and on their performance in the *viva voce*. In addition to the criteria set out in Part A, the examining team may wish to comment on evidence of appropriate documentation and generic/communication skills. Any required amendments must be clearly specified here so as to ensure that the candidate has a clear understanding of what is expected of them in order to demonstrate, at the end of the examination process, that the criteria set out in Part A have been fully met.

|  |
| --- |
| Report on the portfolio of competence |
|  |
| Report on the performance of the candidate in the *viva voce* |
|  |

**Part C Recommendation**

The examiners for the candidate shall recommend one of the following outcomes. Note that if this **form** refers to the submission of a revised portfolio or an additional *viva voc*e, the examiners may not recommend (4) or (5) as an outcome.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Recommendation | | |
| (1) | 󠄀 | That the criteria for the portfolio of competence have been satisfactorily demonstrated. | | |
| (2) | 󠄀 | That the criteria for the portfolio of competence have been satisfactorily demonstrated, subject to minor amendments being completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner. The date specified for the submission of the minor amendments should normally be no later than three months after the formal notification to the candidate. | | |
| (3) | 󠄀 | That the criteria for the portfolio of competence have been satisfactorily demonstrated, subject to the correction of modest amendments being completed to the satisfaction of the internal and external examiners. The date specified for the submission of the modest amendments should normally be no later than six months after the formal notification to the candidate. Should the examiners wish to request a longer time period (of nine months), an academic rationale should be provided below. | | |
|  |  | Timeframe | | Academic Rationale |
|  |  | Six months | 󠄀 | Not required |
|  |  | Nine months 󠄀 | 󠄀 |  |
| (4) | 󠄀 | That the candidate is required to attend a further *viva voce*. | | |
| (5) | 󠄀 | That the candidate is required to submit, by a date specified, a revised portfolio of competence for the same degree for re-examination (including attendance at an additional *viva voce*) on one subsequent occasion. The date specified for submission of the revised porfolio should normally be no later than twelve months after the formal notification to the candidate. | | |
| (6) | 󠄀 | That the criteria for the portfolio of competence have not been demonstrated and that resubmission of the portfolio is not permitted. | | |

We, the examining team, have completed the examination of this research student according to the [Regulations for Research Degrees and Higher Doctorates](https://www.southampton.ac.uk/about/governance/regulations-policies/research-students/general/candidature-supervision) and the [Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidature and Supervision](https://www.southampton.ac.uk/about/governance/regulations-policies/research-students/general/candidature-supervision) and recommend the outcome as specified above to the Faculty Director of the Graduate School.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| External Examiner name |  | Institution/Department |  | Date |  |
| Internal Examiner name |  | School/Faculty |  | Date |  |
| Additional Examiner name |  | Institution/Department |  | Date |  |

As the Faculty Director of the Graduate School (and in my capacity as Chair of the Faculty Graduate School Subcommittee), I have scrutinised the examiners’ independent and joint reports, and approve their recommendation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name |  | Date |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is restricted access to the portfolio of competence required?  *This should only be granted in exceptional cases and for a period not exceeding three years. Restricted granted by the Faculty Director of the Graduate School should be reported to Senate.* | | Yes  No | 󠄀  󠄀 |
| If yes, how long must the portfolio of competence be retained? [insert date] |  | | |