

JCU Graduate Research School (GRS)

This summative report should accompany your written formative report to the University. This report is also used to report on an Exegesis/Creative work for Candidates who have undertaken Arts-based and/or practice-led research. Reasons for the recommendation should be able to: (1) be understood by an independent committee, which will include academics from a range of disciplines, and (2) stand scrutiny in an appeal process. Examiners are requested to set out in their detailed report, reasons for the recommendations they make on this thesis to the University.

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|------------|
| Candidate: | | | | Examiner # |
| Masters by Research <input type="checkbox"/> | PhD <input type="checkbox"/> | Professional Doctorate <input type="checkbox"/> | PhD by Prior Publication <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Section 1: Summative Evaluation of Thesis - Please nominate one grade only

| Formative recommendation for revision prior to conferral of the degree | Criteria for recommendation |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation NA. The thesis be passed with no requirement for correction or amendments | The candidate has fulfilled the requirements of the degree. The thesis/exegesis is ready for permanent binding and placement in the University Library without any changes or emendations. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation MA. The thesis be passed after the candidate has made the minor textual corrections I have recommended to the satisfaction of the Dean of College. | The candidate will have fulfilled the requirements the degree when the minor textual amendments and corrections specified (approx. 1 week of work) are made to the satisfaction of the College Dean. The thesis/exegesis will then be ready for permanent binding and placement in the University Library. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation SA (a). The thesis be passed without further examination provided that the candidate has rewritten specific sections of the thesis I have identified to the satisfaction of the Dean of College; this rewriting will clarify but not change the substantive conclusions of the thesis. | The candidate will have fulfilled the requirements of the degree when the passages specified (approx. maximum of 6 weeks of work, which may include some data re-analysis) are rewritten to the satisfaction of the College Dean. This rewriting will not change the substantive conclusions of the thesis/exegesis. The thesis/exegesis will then be ready for permanent binding and placement in the University Library. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation SA (b) The thesis be passed provided that the candidate has rewritten specific sections of the thesis I have identified, to my satisfaction: I request to see the rewritten sections. This rewriting will not change the substantive conclusions of the thesis. | The candidate will have fulfilled the requirements of the degree when the passages specified are rewritten to my satisfaction (approx. maximum of 6 weeks of work which may include some data re-analysis) This rewriting will not change the substantive conclusions of the thesis/exegesis. The thesis/exegesis will then be ready for permanent binding and placement in the University Library. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation RR. The thesis be resubmitted for examination after re-writing specified sections of the thesis as recommended by the examiner/s. You will be asked to re-examine the revised thesis if it is resubmitted within 12 months. | The candidate should not be admitted to the degree on the basis of this thesis/exegesis, which contains flaws that have the potential to affect its substantive conclusions. However, if the additional work is done as specified (approx. maximum of 3 months of work), the thesis is likely to fulfil the requirements of the degree. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation F. The thesis be failed. | The candidate should not be admitted to the degree on the basis of this thesis/exegesis, which does not meet the criteria of the degree as specified by the University. These flaws are irredeemable and make it inappropriate to award the degree for this work. |

Section 2: Quality of Work

The University monitors the quality of work submitted. Please indicate, with a number (1-6: from best to worst) in the box against each of the following criteria, how you would rate that aspect of the candidate's work. The scale of scores is defined below.

| | |
|--|---|
| | A. The thesis/exegesis/creative work as a whole is a substantial and original contribution to knowledge of the subject with which it deals. |
| | B. The candidate shows familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature. |
| | C. The techniques adopted are appropriate to the subject matter and are properly applied. |
| | D. The candidate demonstrates a capacity for independent, critical thinking. |
| | E. The results are suitably set out, and accompanied by adequate exposition. |
| | F. The quality of English and general presentation are of a standard for publication. |

Scale of Scores:

| | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| 1 | Exceptional | Of the highest merit, at the forefront of research in the field. Fewer than 5% of candidates worldwide would be in this band. |
| 2 | Excellent | Strongly competitive at international levels. Fewer than 20% of candidates would be in this band. |
| 3 | Very good | An interesting, sound and compelling thesis/exegesis/creative work. Approximately 30% candidates would be in this band. |
| 4 | Good | A sound thesis/exegesis/creative work, but lacks a compelling element in some respect. Approximately 30% of candidates would be in this band. |
| 5 | Fair | The thesis/exegesis/creative work has potential, but requires major revisions. Approximately 20% of candidates would be in this band. |
| 6 | Flawed | The thesis/exegesis/creative work does not meet the required standard for this criterion. |

Please complete this table only if the assessment includes assessing Creative Work
 Summative Evaluation of Creative Work: (Please tick the appropriate standard for each Criterion)

| Criteria | Outstanding Standard | High Standard Student should consider the following in future work. | Average Standard To be re-examined to the satisfaction of the College Dean within 12 months | Poor Standard The candidate should not be admitted to the degree on the basis of this Creative Work |
|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Cultural significance | | | | |
| Embodied meaning | | | | |
| Craft | | | | |
| Insight | | | | |
| Form | | | | |
| Conceptual basis and ability to strength of relationship to the claims made in the exegesis | | | | |
| Contribution to the field | | | | |
| Instilling / presentation / catalogue if appropriate | | | | |
| other if appropriate | | | | |

Please complete only if Thesis meets the Criteria for recommendation of Cum Laude.

The thesis will only be awarded Cum Laude by the Research Education Sub-Committee (or nominee) after: (1) independent recommendation by two external examiners; (2) consideration of all the examiners' Formative and Summative Reports including the tables on the Quality of Work and Generic Attributes of the Candidate in the Summative Report and the Written Justification for Cum Laude; (3) the Candidate's Publication Record from the Thesis; (4) Interview of the Chair of the Candidature Committee and The Primary Advisor by the Dean, Graduate Research.

CUM LAUDE University Medal for Excellence for Doctorates Only.

Please tick this box and provide written justification below if you consider that on the basis of both the originality of the research and the quality of presentation that the thesis should be passed "Cum Laude" (approximately top 5% of theses from all Universities see criteria below) and the candidate awarded the degree.

Justification for Cum Laude nomination:

Criteria to be used for recommendation of Cum Laude by an examiner:

1. This thesis is excellent in that it shows flair and originality beyond what would usually be expected for a Doctoral Research thesis.
2. This thesis displays excellent capacity for independent research.
3. This thesis presents an outstanding contribution to scholarship and a significant contribution to knowledge.
4. The aims and conclusions are succinctly stated within the context of a range of appropriately synthesised relevant literature.
5. The literature reviewed has been critiqued and synthesised with a high level of critical acumen.
5. The discussion of the findings demonstrates a capacity for assessing their significance and shows awareness of the limitations, implications and applications of the research, including a keen sense of the policy directions and/or theoretical implications of the research for practice in the discipline where appropriate.
6. The research has resulted in at least one publication accepted in a high impact journal or produced output of equivalent distinction.
7. The thesis will only be awarded Cum Laude by the Research Education Sub-Committee (or nominee) after: (1) independent recommendation by two external examiners; (2) consideration of all the examiners' Formative and Summative Reports including the tables on the Quality of Work and Generic Attributes of the Candidate in the Summative Report and the Written Justification for Cum Laude; (3) the Candidate's Publication Record from the Thesis; (4) Interview of the Chair of the Candidature Committee and The Primary Advisor by the Dean, Graduate Research.

Name of Examiner:

Signature of Examiner:

Date:

I wish to remain anonymous

I agree to having my name revealed to the candidate

I agree to my report being used (anonymously) for Quality Assurance purposes.

Yes

No