**To be completed and signed by the examiners**

**(Please return to Derilyn Frusher, Programme Manager (Research Degrees), Graduate School, IMBE, Sixth Floor, Hunter Wing –** **dfrusher@sgul.ac.uk****)**

Name of Student: Current Registration: MD(Res)

Supervisors:

Research Institute/Faculty:

Title of Report:

Examiner 1:

Examiner 2:

Date of Viva: Duration of viva:

The examiners are satisfied that

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Yes | No |
| a | The transfer report is of appropriate format and length (30 pages, not including figures, references, plan of study) |  |  |
| b | The planned project can produce original findings that will advance the subject  |  |  |
| c | The planned project can generate a PhD thesis that is an integrated whole and of appropriate depth |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Fully  | Partially | Not at all |
| d | The student demonstrated appropriate knowledge of their research topic |  |  |  |
| e | The student demonstrated an appropriate understanding of the research methods used |  |  |  |
| f | The report includes an achievable plan of study to complete the necessary research within the time available (3 years from registration for full-time students)  |  |  |  |

Are there any concerns which would need to be addressed in order to allow successful completion on schedule (3 years from registration for full-time students)? *(can be attached as separate sheet)*

Examiners comments on the transfer report, viva performance and planned project, with particular reference to the change from MD(Res) to PhD
*(200-500 words, can be attached as separate sheet)*

**Based on the opinions summarised above, we recommend that:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The Research Degrees Committee transfer the candidate to PhD Registration  |  |
| The Research Degrees Committee transfer the candidate to PhD Registration upon fulfilment of specified conditions |  |
| The candidate continues their current registration pending submission of a revised transfer report within 1 month |  |
| The candidate continues their current registration pending a resit examination (requiring a revised transfer report followed by a resit viva) |  |
| The candidate continues their current registration with no further attempt at transfer |  |

**Name…………………………… Signature…………………………… Date……………**

**Name……………….…………… Signature…………………………… Date……………**

# Guidelines for Examiners

The purpose of this transfer examination is:

1. to assess whether the student is capable of eventually producing a successful PhD thesis
2. to investigate whether there are any problems in support and resources (e.g. supervision, equipment, access to patient date etc.) necessary for the student to submit on time (4 years for full-time, 7 years for part-time), or pro-rata for an MD(Res) to PhD – this should be covered in the student’s report.
3. to ensure that the student has a clear idea of the “research question” the project is addressing, and has a reasonable research strategy to approach this question in the time available
4. to give the student practice for the final *viva* for their degree

This examination process is **not** a test of the student’s eligibility for the PhD degree. It should also take place early enough to head off problems (normally during the first nine to twelve months) for both full and part-time students and should not be delayed until most of the data have been collected.

The examiners should read the report and arrange the *viva* within a reasonable period (e.g. one month) of receiving it. However, if there are substantial defects in the report, the examiners can insist that these be rectified before carrying out the *viva*. Reports which are substantially over length may be returned for editing before the *viva*.

At the end of the examination, the examiners should decide whether or not they recommend transfer of registration and fill out the recommendation form accordingly. This form **must also** contain a thorough written report and further sheets can be used if appropriate. If the transfer is from MD(Res) to PhD, then this should also be referred to in the examination report. The completed and signed form should be sent to Derilyn Frusher, Senior Postgraduate Officer (Research Degrees).

If there are any significant amendments or changes required to the report, you should not, at this time, recommend the transfer but indicate, for the Committee, a timescale in which you expect to see a revised report. You should also indicate to the student why transfer is not recommended, clearly stating the problem area(s). The report should be given to and discussed with the student as part of constructive feedback and a copy should also be given to the student’s supervisory team.

If the only problem is the student’s background knowledge, the examiners can arrange a second *viva* after a period to allow the student to improve his/her knowledge. In this case, there would be no need for the report to be re-written. However, in the case where an additional viva is required, a member of the RDC must be present as Independent Chair.

Even if you are satisfied that the student has met the standard for transfer to be recommended, it is helpful to indicate any perceived problem areas in the research project, general knowledge of the subject, production of the written report or conduct of the oral defence both to the student and to the supervisor(s).

There is often some confusion about how much a student should have achieved by the transfer stage. Some indicators are given here.

**GUIDANCE FOR EXAMINERS ON EXPECTATIONS OF WHAT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE AT THE TRANSFER EXAMINATION STAGE (REPORT AND ORAL)**

**QUANTITATIVE PROJECTS**

1. A clearly defined research question, aims and objectives for the project.
2. Hypothesis (or hypotheses) to be tested by the work if relevant.
3. A review of the literature to provide the context and rationale for the study.
4. A good understanding of the general subject area into which the work will fit.
5. A clear description of the methods to be used with a critical discussion of the strengths and limitations of the proposed approach/es.
6. A description of how methods are to be assessed for validity and reliability (and piloted/tested if new).
7. Data and appropriate analysis of work carried out in the first six to twelve months and ability to discuss these in the context of existing literature.
8. A realistic timetable for completion of the work linked to objectives (and hypothesis/ses as relevant) to be addressed by each phase/set of experiments and an outline of resources needed for this.
9. Proposed analysis methods with rationale for use of statistical tests suggested.
10. Potential outcomes anticipated.
11. Identification of ethical and research governance issues arising from the project.

**QUALITATIVE PROJECTS**

1. A clearly defined research question, aims and objectives for the project.
2. A review of the literature to provide the context and rationale for the study.
3. A clear description of the methods to be used with a critical discussion of the proposed theoretical underpinning of this methodological approach.
4. A good understanding of the general subject area into which the work will fit.
5. Data and sample analysis from a pilot of the methods and ability to discuss these in the context of existing literature.
6. A realistic timetable for completion of the work and outline of resources needed to achieve this.
7. A description and rationale for the analysis method/s to be used.
8. Potential outcomes anticipated.
9. Identification of ethical and research governance issues arising from the project.