

MEMORANDUM FOR EXAMINERS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Timetable for the Examination	Para. 1
Duties of the examiners	Para. 2
Subject of thesis	Para. 3
Standard required	Para. 4
The oral examination	Para. 5
Formal requirements	Para. 5.1
Arrangements for the oral examination (including dress)	Para. 5.2
Conduct of the oral examination	Para. 5.3
Form and content of the examiners' report	Para. 5.4
• general	Para. 5.4.1
• reports which are not unequivocally favourable	Para. 5.4.2
Submission of Major Corrections	Para 5.5
Examination of a resubmitted thesis	Para. 5.6
Recommendations available to the examiners	Para. 6
Award of the degree of DPhil	Para. 6.1
• Minor corrections	Para. 6.1.1
• Major corrections	Para. 6.1.2
Reference back for resubmission	Para. 6.2
• Reference back for DPhil or award of MLitt/MSc (Res) as the thesis stands	Para. 6.2.1
• Reference back for DPhil or MSc (Res)/MLitt	Para 6.2.2
• Reference back for MLitt or MSc (Res) only	Para 6.2.3
• Reference back on first examination	Para 6.2.4
Award of MLitt/MSc (Res)	Para 6.3
Outright failure	Para 6.4
Examiners divided in their opinion	Para. 7
Communication with the supervisor	Para. 8
Communication with the candidate about the proposed recommendation	Para. 9
Return of thesis to candidate	Para. 10
Copyright and confidentiality	Para. 11
Complaints about the conduct of examinations	Para. 12
Tasks to be completed after the viva	Para. 13

1 Timetable for the examination

Unless a specific date for the oral examination has been agreed beforehand, examiners are expected to complete the examination and submit their joint report as soon as reasonably possible (and normally within **three months** of receipt of the thesis). If this is impossible, they are asked to notify the Research Degrees Team of the reasons for the delay. Candidates are advised that they may approach the Research Degrees Team if they have not been contacted by their examiners about the date of the viva within one month of submission of their thesis. The University is particularly concerned to avoid candidates facing lengthy delays during the examination process.

Viva examinations should not be held within four weeks of the examiners receiving their copies of the thesis.

However, if circumstances necessitate a viva examination to be held within four weeks, notification should be sent to the relevant board, and the permission of the board (usually of the Director of Graduate Studies on behalf of the board) must be sought. Requests for vivas to be held fewer than 14 days after the thesis has been made available to the examiners will only be granted in the most exceptional circumstances. Further guidance is available in Annex D of the [Policy and Guidance on Research Degrees](#).

2 Duties of the examiners

These are prescribed in the [Examination Regulations](#) as follows:

- (i) to consider the thesis and the abstract of it submitted by the student, provided that they shall exclude from consideration in making their report any part of the thesis which has already been accepted, or is being concurrently submitted, for any degree or other qualification in this University or elsewhere otherwise than as part of the requirements of this University for the Degree of Bachelor of Philosophy or of Master of Philosophy or of Bachelor of Civil Law, or as part of the dissertation submitted by a Student for the Degree of Master of Science by Coursework or of Master of Studies, and shall have the power to require the candidate to produce for their inspection the complete thesis so accepted or concurrently submitted;
- (ii) (in the case of Fine Art candidates offering studio practice as part of their submission) to consider the portfolio or exhibition of work documented under section 4 (i) of the regulations, and presented or mounted by the candidate in partial satisfaction of the examination requirements;
- (ii) to examine the candidate orally in the subject of the thesis;
- (iii) to satisfy themselves by examination (oral, written, or both) whether the student possesses a good general knowledge of the particular field of learning within which the subject of the thesis falls;
- (iv) to report to the board through the Registrar on the scope, character, and quality of the work submitted¹;
- (v) to delete all digital copies of the thesis and return to the student any soft-bound copies of the thesis received from the Research Degrees Team.

The examiners **must only** consider the copy of the thesis issued to them by the Research Degrees Team for the oral examination. Any other copies obtained in either hard print or electronically should not be consulted. Under no circumstances can the examiners use a copy of the thesis supplied directly by the candidate.

It is the responsibility of the internal examiner to complete and submit the Viva Notice to give public notice of oral examination. The requirement to give notice is dispensed with if the viva is being held remotely via video call.

¹ Examiners are reminded that under the Oxford examining system they should produce a single joint report approved by both examiners.

3 Subject of the thesis

A candidate must obtain the approval of the faculty board for the subject and title of the thesis. It can therefore be assumed by examiners that the faculty board considers the subject of a thesis to be *prima facie* a suitable topic for the degree in question.

4 Standard required

Examiners are asked to bear in mind that their judgement of the substantial significance of work submitted should take into account what may be reasonably expected of a capable and diligent student after three or at most four years of full-time study. (Possible interruptions and unforeseen difficulties will, of course, often mean that more than three or four years have elapsed between admission and submission.)

5 The oral examination

5.1 Formal requirements

The purpose of the oral examination is three-fold;

- (i) to enable the examiners to assure themselves that the thesis is the candidate's own work;
- (ii) to give the candidate an opportunity to defend the thesis and to clarify any obscurities in it;
- (iii) to enable the examiners to assess the candidate's general knowledge in their particular field of learning.

A candidate submitting a thesis **must** be orally examined except where the examiners have previously determined that the candidate should make major corrections and that a further oral examination is not required (Outcome C). In such cases a candidate may be dispensed from the oral examination by the board of the faculty concerned, provided that the examiners are able to certify that they are satisfied, without examining the candidate orally, that they can recommend to the board in the terms required that the candidate be given leave to supplicate for the degree of DPhil. Examiners should only make this decision once they have reviewed the revised thesis. A candidate **must** however be orally examined before the examiners can recommend major corrections, reference back for resubmission, the award of the degree of MLitt or MSc (Res), or, in the case of second or subsequent examinations, outright failure.

The examination may be attended by any member of the University in academic dress. Non-members of the University may attend it only with the consent of both examiners. In the event that the examination is held remotely via video call, no party other than the examiners/assessors and the candidate may attend (with the exception of a support person permitted to attend as an adjustment for the candidate's disability). The relevant board has the power, either at its own discretion or at the request of the candidate, supervisor or department, to restrict access to a viva, without application needing to be made to the Proctors. Further guidance is available in Annex D of the [Policy and Guidance on Research Degrees](#). Where such a request is made and granted, the examiners will be informed prior to the oral examination, with details of any conditions imposed by the board.

5.2 Arrangements for the oral examination

Examiners are asked to take responsibility for all communications with each other, for arranging the oral examination and for notifying the candidate of the arrangements made. The candidate's address is the relevant college unless the candidate has otherwise indicated. Please let the candidate know the date of the oral examination **within one month** of receiving the thesis, even if the date is some time ahead, and publish notice of it (see the Viva Notice sent to the internal examiner). Publication of a notice is not required if the examination is being held remotely via video call.

The oral examination should be held in Oxford in a suitable university or college building, unless the relevant board (usually the Director of Graduate Studies on behalf of the board) gives special permission for it to be held elsewhere, or remotely via video call. It should, except for special circumstances, begin not earlier than 9am nor later than 5pm and may be held in term or vacation. Examiners wishing to explore the possibility of holding the examination remotely via video call should contact the relevant GSA. Further guidance on approving and holding remote vivas is available in Annexes D and E of the [Policy and Guidance on Research Degrees](#).

If, owing to illness or other urgent and unforeseen cause, an examiner is unable to attend the examination, it may be postponed to a later date. However, if it seems likely that postponement would be a serious hardship for the candidate, the Proctors should be notified since in appropriate circumstances they may authorise another member of the faculty concerned to attend the examination as a substitute.

All DPhil examinations are official examinations of the University, and internal examiners and candidates should therefore wear black gown, hood, square and subfusc for the examination. External examiners may, if they wish, wear the appropriate academic dress of their own university. However, in the event that the examination is being held remotely via video call there is no requirement to wear such academic dress.

Candidates are strongly recommended to take a copy of their thesis to the examination.

Where examiners are likely to want minor corrections completed before they make a positive recommendation, they are asked to have the lists of required corrections available to pass on to the candidate at the viva, or, at the latest, within two weeks of the viva taking place.

5.3 Conduct of the oral examination

Care should be taken to encourage candidates to feel at ease so that they can display their knowledge and abilities to the best effect, and the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the thesis should be acknowledged and explored. At an early stage in the proceedings, candidates should be given an opportunity to explain precisely what their thesis is intended to achieve and wherein they see its significance as a contribution to knowledge. If there appears to be a major discrepancy between the candidate's aims and the content of the actual thesis, the reasons for the mismatch should be explored. Likewise, candidates should be asked to explain their choice of title when there appears to be an imperfect correspondence with the contents of the thesis. Candidates should also be given the opportunity to explain any apparent failure to use important materials, whether primary or secondary, or neglect of relevant approaches or methodologies.

It is essential that where a thesis reveals significant deficiencies which might lead to a report that is not unequivocally favourable, a representative sample of these should be drawn to the candidate's attention, and specific time for explanation and defence should be allowed for within the oral examination.

Examiners are reminded that the oral examination is an integral part of the examination process for a research degree, with the specific purposes set out in paragraph 5.1, and care should be taken to avoid giving the impression at any time during the *viva voce* that the oral examination and the subsequent consideration of the examiners' report and recommendation by the faculty board are in any sense mere formalities.

Education Committee has agreed that the normal expectations relating to the length of an oral examination should be a minimum of one hour and a maximum of three hours.

5.4 Form and content of examiners' joint report

5.4.1 General

The joint report should be sufficiently detailed to enable members of the relevant graduate studies committee and faculty board to assess the scope and significance of the thesis and to appreciate its strengths and weaknesses. It should, as far as possible, be expressed in terms that are intelligible to those who are not specialists in the particular field of the thesis. Hence the joint report should include, preferably near the beginning, a statement of what the thesis

purports to do, and an account of what it actually covers. Evaluative comments should be as full as possible and should include an indication of strengths as well as of limitations, weaknesses, and lacunae. The candidate's performance in the oral examination should receive comment. Candidates' explanations for any deficiencies in the thesis should receive appropriate mention.

5.4.2 Reports which are not unequivocally favourable

Recommendations which are not unequivocally favourable should be supported by full, reasoned explanations sufficient to enable the responsible graduate studies committee and faculty board to make a properly informed decision. A recommendation involving review following major corrections or referral for resubmission should be accompanied by a clear statement of what is wrong with the thesis. In such cases, examiners should either include this statement within the report, or draw up a separate statement for the same purpose. In either case they should indicate clearly and precisely in what respects the thesis falls short of the required standard and how the candidate should revise it to remedy these defects. Prescriptions for revision should be stated categorically and in as much detail as seems reasonable. Examiners should be aware that the full report will be available to the candidate.

5.5 Submission of major corrections

A candidate submitting major corrections for review must satisfy the examiners on the particular points made in the previous examiners' statement (see 5.4.2) only. Examiners may recommend major corrections once before they must recommend either the award of a degree (whether it be the DPhil or a lower award), referral back for resubmission or, in the case of a second or subsequent examination, outright failure.

Following the submission of major corrections, if recommending the award of the degree, examiners are asked to submit a new report describing the revised version of the thesis, following the guidelines given in paragraph 5.4 above.

5.6 Examination of a resubmitted thesis

A candidate resubmitting a thesis must satisfy the examiners not only on the particular points made in the previous examiners' statement, but also that the thesis *as a whole* is of sufficient merit to qualify the candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (or MLitt, MSc by Research, as the case may be), and that the candidate possesses a good general knowledge of the particular field of learning within which the subject of the thesis lies. The range of recommendations available to the examiners depends on the previous outcomes of the candidate. An oral examination is required, which need not necessarily be confined to the points noted by the previous examiners, except where the candidate was given Outcome C (resubmit after major corrections without mandatory viva) and the examiners are able to certify that they can recommend the award of the DPhil without examining the candidate orally. However, in a case where the candidate has clearly made a substantially satisfactory response to those points, examiners should be particularly careful to justify any recommendation of an outcome less favourable than that envisaged in the previous examination.

Candidates resubmitting a thesis must include a separate report indicating the specific changes made to the thesis for resubmission. For students in the Humanities, Medical Sciences and Social Sciences Divisions and the Department for Continuing Education, the word limit for the accompanying report is 1,000 words; for students in the Mathematical, Physical and Life Sciences Division, the word limit is 2,000 words.

6 Recommendations available to the examiners

The various recommendations provided for in the [Examination Regulations](#) are set out on the joint report. Further details of the available options are set out below.

6.1 Award of the degree of DPhil

The [Examination Regulations](#) prescribe that the faculty board shall in no case permit the candidate to supplicate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy unless the examiners have jointly reported in the following terms:

- (i) that the candidate possesses a good knowledge of the particular field of learning within which the subject of the thesis falls;
- (ii) that the candidate has made a significant and substantial contribution in the particular field of learning within which the subject of the thesis falls;
- (iii) that the thesis is presented in a lucid and scholarly manner;
- (iv) that in their opinion the thesis merits the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; and
- (v) that the candidate has presented a satisfactory abstract of the thesis

Set out below is further information on the options available to examiners where they cannot unequivocally report that they are satisfied that the candidate fulfills all outlined criteria. Additional information is also available from the [Policy and guidance on research degrees](#) (Annex F) and in the Examination Regulations, [General Regulations for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy: Part 7 Examination](#)

6.1.1 *Corrections of minor errors in theses (Outcome B)*

If an otherwise satisfactory thesis contains minor errors, omissions or faults in presentation, such as would render it unsuitable as it stands for scholarly consultation, the examiners may make a favourable recommendation conditional upon the deficiencies being corrected by the candidate. Subject areas will of course differ as to what in practice constitutes a 'minor error'. In general, the definition encompasses typographical errors, mistakes or inconsistencies in references or equations, spelling errors or inaccuracies in transcription (whether in English or in foreign language citations), incomplete references to bibliographical items, and so on. Such errors should not affect the substance of an argument in the thesis, and they should not indicate a candidate's lack of grasp of the regular procedures for presenting research in their subject.

In making their judgement whether the errors in question can be treated in this way, or whether they more properly merit review following major corrections or the referral of the thesis for re-examination, examiners should consider whether it is sufficient for the correction of the errors to be routinely certified, or whether an element of judgement is required. In the former case, the examiners may agree that it would be sufficient for the required corrections to be certified by one (normally the internal) examiner acting alone; that examiner should delay endorsing the appropriate section of the joint report form and require the candidate to correct and return the thesis by some early date. However, the examiners should immediately complete a Minor Corrections Notice, noting the date when the minor corrections list was given to the candidate (which must be within two weeks of the oral examination) and also which examiner will be checking the corrections via the Research Degrees Examiner Portal. When the examiner is satisfied and has certified that the minor corrections have been made satisfactorily, the joint report may be submitted via the Research Degrees Examiner Portal without recalling the candidate. The joint report should not be submitted until the corrections have been satisfactorily completed (but see also paragraph 12).

If on the other hand the thesis requires correction, amplification, extension or re-writing sufficient for the amended version to require an element of judgement as to whether the required amendments have been satisfactorily carried out, and hence necessarily the judgement of both examiners, then the examiners should normally recommend that the thesis be reviewed following major corrections or referred back for re-examination. These recommendations imply that the work, while potentially acceptable as a DPhil thesis, does not as it stands justify the award of the degree. Further guidance on determining whether the thesis needs minor or major corrections before leave to supplicate can be granted is available in Annex F of the [Policy and guidance on research degrees](#). **Examiners with any doubt as to the appropriateness of minor corrections as against review of major corrections or reference back for resubmission may also consult the relevant Director of Graduate Studies or Graduate Studies Assistant.**

It is only in the case of minor corrections that the examiners may provide relevant guidance to the candidate at the oral examination. In cases involving review of the thesis following major corrections and reference back for resubmission, any information provided for the candidate must be included within the examiners' joint report and only made available to the candidate following the faculty board's decision. No additional guidance or instructions should be provided for the candidate.

Examiners will understand that where they agree to recommend the award of the degree subject to the satisfactory correction of minor errors, **it is essential that the candidate is provided with the list of required corrections as soon as possible, and, at the latest, within two weeks of the oral examination.**

Candidates must complete minor corrections within two months of receipt of the list of minor corrections.

It is recommended that examiners, following the receipt of minor corrections from the candidate, should submit their joint report within one month of receipt of the corrections.

6.1.2 *Review of a thesis following major corrections (Outcomes C and D)*

If unable to report as at 6.1.1 above, the examiners have the power, **after having completed the examination** (i.e. including the oral examination), to recommend that the board should return the thesis to the candidate in order that they may complete major corrections. There are two outcomes that can be chosen: without a mandatory viva (Outcome C) and with a mandatory viva (Outcome D)

These outcomes should only be recommended if the examiners are satisfied that the candidate's thesis is of sufficient potential merit to qualify for the degree but consider, nevertheless, that before the thesis is deposited the candidate should make major corrections (which are not sufficiently substantial to justify reference back for re-examination and which should be possible to complete within six months). If the Examining Board endorses this recommendation, these major corrections must be completed and reviewed by both examiners, who will produce a second report for the board. Examiners must hold a second viva examination before producing this second report if Outcome D was chosen and may do so if Outcome C is chosen. A viva must always be held if they recommend reference back, a lower award or outright failure.

Where a recommendation of approval subject to major corrections has been made, the examiners, on receipt of the corrected thesis, may conclude and report one of the following:

- (a) the original recommendation is now fully substantiated;
- (b) the work as submitted still requires minor corrections prior to confirmation of the original recommendation and a further two months may be allowed for this from the date on which the student is informed of the result;
- (c) the work as now submitted still requires further work before a recommendation for the DPhil can be made. The examiners must choose one of Outcomes E-G (see below and Annex F of the [Policy and guidance on research degrees](#)).

Where Outcome C has previously been given, recommendation (a) or (b) may be made without a further oral examination on condition that both examiners have reviewed and approved the major corrections. A further oral examination must be held if either of the examiners requires it or if the recommendation is likely to be (c) or if Outcome D was previously given.

Examiners may only recommend review of major corrections once during the first examination. Once they have received and considered the major corrections, they must recommend either:

- (i) award of the DPhil (Outcome A or B);
- (ii) the choice between resubmission for the DPhil or accepting a lower degree (Outcome E);

- (iii) the choice between resubmission for either the DPhil or a lower degree (Outcome F).
- (iv) resubmission for a lower degree only (Outcome G);
- (v) award of a lower degree (Outcome H or I);
- (vi) outright failure (Outcome J).

Following the submission of major corrections, if recommending the award of the degree, examiners are asked to submit a new report describing the revised version of the thesis, following the guidelines given in paragraph 5.4 above.

In all cases where the recommendation is for the award of a degree, this may be subject to completion of minor corrections also (Outcomes B and I).

6.2 Reference back for resubmission

If unable to report as at 6.1 above, the examiners have power, **after having completed the examination** (i.e. including the oral examination), to recommend that the faculty board should refer the thesis back to the candidate in order that the candidate may revise the thesis and present it for re-examination. Examiners will normally be expected to agree to re-examine in due course if they recommend reference back. The referral options are as follows:

6.2.1 *Reference back for the DPhil or award of the MLitt/MSc (Res) as the thesis stands (Outcome E)*

If the examiners are satisfied that the thesis as it stands does not merit the DPhil, they are required, on first examination, to recommend that the thesis be referred back for resubmission for the DPhil. On subsequent examination, examiners who are not able to recommend the award of the DPhil, are asked to consider whether major corrections would be an appropriate recommendation in the light of the revised thesis. Major corrections implies a judgement on the part of the examiners that the candidate is academically capable of revising their thesis to the appropriate standard within the 12 months allowed for such revision. Examiners who recommend that a thesis be referred back for resubmission for the DPhil should supply an agreed statement setting out the respects in which the thesis falls below the standard required for the degree. Examiners may either submit a separate statement or include a statement with their joint report, but in either case, examiners should ensure that the candidate has fully adequate guidance in revising the thesis (but please see in addition para. 6.2.4 below). Examiners should be aware that the full report will be available to the candidate. Candidates who seek elucidation of the examiners' statement will be asked to do so through the supervisor and not by direct communication with the examiners. **Such correspondence should *not* however be started before the decision of the relevant board on the examiners' joint report is communicated to the candidate and supervisor by the Research Degrees Team.**

Reference back for the DPhil under this heading is only appropriate if examiners consider that the thesis as it stands has reached the standard required for the MLitt/MSc (Res). If the faculty board accepts this recommendation, candidates will be offered the choice between (a) reference of the thesis back for revision for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and (b) leave to supplicate for the Degree of Master of Letters or of Master of Science, as appropriate.

6.2.2 *Reference back for the DPhil or MLitt/MSc (Res) (Outcome F)*

If the examiners recommend that the candidate be given the option of reference back for resubmission for either the DPhil or the MLitt/MSc (Res), they should supply a statement setting out the respects in which the thesis falls below the standards respectively required **both** for the DPhil **and** for the MLitt/MSc (Res).

6.2.3 *Reference back for the MLitt or MSc (Res) only (Outcome G) [not available on first examination].*

If the examiners of a thesis submitted on a second occasion consider that the candidate should not be given the option of major corrections or reference back for resubmission for the DPhil (depending on the outcome previously given), but consider that the thesis could be revised for resubmission for the MLitt or MSc (Res), they may so recommend; and in submitting their joint

report they should indicate clearly in what respects the thesis as it presently stands falls below the standard required for the MLitt or MSc (Res), and what changes the candidate should make before resubmission.

6.2.4 *Reference back on first examination*

On a first examination, and only in exceptional circumstances where the examiners can see no way in which the thesis could be successfully revised and re-submitted for the DPhil, within the time allowed, examiners are permitted to certify as an appendix to their report (and having indicated the respects in which the thesis falls below the standard required for the degree in question) that they are unable to set out how the thesis might be changed, within the time allowed, in order to reach the required standard for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The University expects that this provision will be very rarely used.

6.3 **Award of the MLitt/MSc (Res) (Outcome H) [not available on first examination]**

If, in the opinion of the examiners on a second or subsequent examination, the work done by a DPhil candidate as tested by the thesis and oral examination, although not of sufficient merit to qualify the candidate for the degree of DPhil has nevertheless reached the standard for the degree of MLitt/MSc (Res), they may report in this sense to the board (on the joint report form). They may require the candidate to make minor corrections (Outcome I).

6.4 **Outright failure (Outcome J) [not available on first examination]**

If the examiners for a second or subsequent examination are satisfied that the thesis is not of sufficient merit to qualify the candidate for the degree of DPhil or for the degree of MLitt/MSc (Res), and do not consider that the candidate will be able to revise the thesis to the required standard either through making major corrections to the thesis or through having the thesis referred back to them for resubmission (depending on the outcomes previously given), they may recommend that the candidate's application for leave to supplicate be refused. Note that a candidate cannot have two consecutive major corrections decisions or two consecutive reference back decisions, see Table 4 in Annex F of the [Policy and guidance for research degrees](#) for information on possible permutations of outcomes. The examiners should state **as fully as possible** the reasons why they are not prepared to recommend further significant work on the thesis.

7 **Examiners divided in their opinion**

It is possible for examiners to disagree to a greater or lesser extent in their evaluation of a candidate's work. Hence it is desirable for the examiners to confer before the oral examination and, if significant divergences of opinion are identified, to devise a strategy to resolve these differences by agreed means and by careful structuring of the *viva voce* examination. Plainly it is best if examiners can reconcile their views and produce an agreed joint report and recommendation. If that proves impossible, however, and examiners cannot agree either on the recommendation or the main lines of a joint report, examiners should not hesitate to report the difference of opinion to the faculty board, explaining the nature of and reasons for their disagreement.

8 **Communication with the supervisor**

The examiners should **not** contact the candidate's supervisor in connection with the examination except for the elucidation of any comments about the candidate, the thesis or the examination provided by the supervisor which the examiners may have received from the faculty board. Any enquiries concerning the examination should be addressed in the first instance to the relevant Director of Graduate Studies, via the [Graduate Studies Assistant](#).

9 **Communication with the candidate about the proposed recommendations**

The examiners' joint report is confidential to the faculty board which alone has authority to act on the examiners' recommendations. Particularly in cases of possible difficulty, examiners should take care not to intimate to the candidate the content of their joint report or what they propose to recommend (see also paragraph 5.3). **When examiners ask candidates to complete minor**

corrections before making a positive recommendation, candidates should be reminded that the final decision as to the outcome of the examination lies with the relevant divisional or faculty board. Before the examiners' joint report has been considered by the faculty board, enquiries as to the outcome of the examination may be addressed via the [Graduate Studies Assistant](#) to the Director of Graduate Studies under the relevant faculty board (who may, of course, decide to divulge nothing until the joint report has been formally considered by the faculty board).

10 Return of thesis to candidate

After the viva, examiners should delete all digital copies of the thesis and return to the student any soft-bound copies of the thesis received from the Research Degrees Team. If examiners require a digital copy for the purpose of writing their joint report to the faculty board, they may retain them and delete them after the submission of the report.

11 Copyright and Confidentiality

The University and the candidate reserve the copyright and all other intellectual property rights on both the thesis and abstract. The contents of the thesis and the abstract are proprietary, and examiners must hold them 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. The copyright in the examiners' joint report and in any statement under paragraph 5 above will be the examiners', but examiners must hold the contents of the joint report and statement strictly in confidence and not disclose them other than by submission of the joint report and statement to the University.

The examiner's full report will be made available to the candidate. Examiners should also note that a copy of their requirements prior to resubmission, in the case of a candidate whose thesis has been referred back, will be transmitted – after the recommendation has been accepted by the relevant faculty board – to the candidate and the candidate's college. The examiners' joint report form should be endorsed accordingly.

12 Complaints about the conduct of examinations

As part of its quality assurance mechanisms and in keeping with national guidelines, the University operates a procedure under which research students can submit complaints about the *conduct of examinations*. The Proctors are responsible for investigating such complaints and, where a complaint is upheld, determining what should be done to rectify the matter. Candidates are told that complaints must be submitted to the Proctors within three months of notification by the Research Degrees Team of the outcome of the examination. *The Proctors have no remit to question the academic judgement of examiners*, but will consider complaints on grounds such as procedural irregularity, bias or inadequate assessment on the part of the examiners (e.g. in not allowing the candidate sufficient opportunity to defend the thesis during the viva), failure by examiners to take into account special circumstances (e.g. a candidate's medical condition). As part of the process of investigating a complaint, the Proctors will typically invite the examiners to comment on specific issues raised by the candidate or supervisor.

13 Tasks to be completed after the viva

(i) Fees and expenses

On the date of the viva, examiners will be sent details of how to claim their fee and any appropriate expenses. The fee for examiners on the Oxford payroll will be paid automatically, and expenses will be claimable via SAP Concur. Examiners external to the University will be sent a claim form (GSO.10), which should be completed and returned to the Research Degrees Team along with relevant receipts. For full details please see the claim form.

For clarification, the fixed-rate examiner's fee is paid specifically as a contribution to the work involved in reviewing the thesis, i.e. for examiners overseas it is for work completed outside the UK. If for any reason travel expenses will be exceptionally higher than expected, please contact the Research Degrees Team, so that approval can be sought from the Divisional Board. Please note that the Research Degrees Team cannot arrange accommodation for external examiners. However, the internal examiner/department or faculty/college may be able to assist. Given that examiners are now

required to approve any minor corrections that they ask a candidate to make prior to the submission of the examiners' joint report, the claim form for fees and expenses may, in this circumstance only, be returned prior to the submission of the examiners' report. Examiners are asked to indicate on the form where this is the case.

(ii) Examiners' Joint Report

Examiners are reminded that where they wish to have minor corrections completed before making a positive recommendation, these should be seen and approved before the report is submitted. Otherwise, **examiners are asked to submit their joint report no later than one month from the date of the viva, and ideally within two weeks of the date of the viva, if no corrections have been required. A reminder to submit the report may be sent two weeks from the date of the viva.**

Version History

1.0	October 2025	First publication
-----	--------------	-------------------