



# The University of Sydney

## Degree of Doctor of Philosophy Appointment of Examiners

- Note:**
- Head of department/school is required to use this form in recommending the appointment of examiners to the faculty concerned.
  - Approved recommendations are then endorsed by the PhD Award Sub-Committee prior to the examination process commencing.
  - Nomination of examiners should be made at least 4 weeks prior to submission of thesis.
  - Please read the notes on the reverse of this form before completing the details below.
  - Forms must be completed using a word processor.
  - Please attach additional pages if required.

**SID:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Candidate's name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Thesis title:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty:** \_\_\_\_\_ **School/Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Anticipated date of thesis submission:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Supervisor:** \_\_\_\_\_

	Examiner 1		Examiner 2	
Name (including title)				
Academic Qualification				
Current position title				
Institution				
Postal Address				
email				
telephone				
fax				
<b>1. Justification for nomination</b>				
Currently active in research*	Yes	No	Yes	No
Previous experience as examiner*	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>2. Free from conflict of interest*</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>3. Agreed to act as examiner*</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>4. Willing to conduct oral examination</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>5. Willing to examine electronically</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Examiner 3		Examiner 4#	
Name (including title)				
Academic Qualification				
Current position title				
Institution				
Postal Address				
email				
telephone				
fax				
<b>1. Justification for nomination</b>				
Currently active in research*	Yes	No	Yes	No
Previous experience as examiner*	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>2. Free from conflict of interest*</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>3. Agreed to act as examiner*</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>4. Willing to conduct oral examination</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>5. Willing to examine electronically</b>	Yes	No	Yes	No

\* see notes on reverse of form. If no, please provide justification for the nomination of this examiner. # see notes on reverse of form.

Approved by the Head of department/school  
 .....  
 Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by/on behalf of the Board/Committee  
 of Postgraduate Studies of the Faculty  
 .....  
 Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date (of meeting if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Endorsed by/on behalf of the Chair  
 of the PhD Award Sub-Committee  
 .....  
 Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date of endorsement \_\_\_\_\_



The Resolutions of Senate relating to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy provide for faculties to appoint three examiners of a thesis submitted for the degree, two of whom shall be external to the University, and for the appointment to be reported to the Academic Board. The Academic Board has delegated its powers and responsibilities with respect to graduate studies matters to the Research and Research Training Committee, who in turn has established the **PhD Award Sub-Committee** to act on its behalf in the consideration of examiners appointed by faculties.

It is expected that heads of departments/schools, in recommending the appointment of examiners, have consulted the supervisor. This consultation should include a general discussion of a wide range of possible examiners with the candidate by the supervisor and/or head of department/school, which may be initiated by the candidate or the supervisor or the head of department/school.

Candidates may in addition, advise the names of persons they do not wish to see appointed as examiners giving their reasons in writing. The consultation process however, should not result in the candidate being given the names of his/her examiners and care must be taken not to jeopardise the integrity and independence of the examination process.

In order to reduce delays it is necessary to contact examiners in advance of their appointment to see if they are willing and able to act within the time frame expected. Provision is also made on the form for the nomination of a fourth person as an alternative examiner should one of the recommended examiners decline to act, later withdraw or not complete the examination within the time frame specified.

The following specific points should be noted:

1. The examiners should be known to be familiar with the supervision and/or examination of research theses for the University and/or other educational institutions (including overseas). Justification should be provided for examiners who have not had previous experience.
2. Recommendations for examiners who are not persons of obvious academic standing (i.e. who do not themselves hold a doctorate or do not hold an academic appointment) must be supported with justifying statements and documentation.
3. Examiners should normally be still active in research/scholarship thus ensuring that their knowledge of the field is current. Recommendations for the appointment as examiner of someone who has retired should be supported with a justifying statement including how long it has been since the person retired.
4. At least two examiners shall be external to the University.
5. Examiners should be free from bias, for or against the candidate or supervisor.
6. Conflict of interest. A person should not be nominated as examiner if he/she;
  - a. has had involvement in the student's research;
  - b. is a co-author on any part of the work;
  - c. has a close personal relationship with the candidate or supervisor; or
  - d. has had substantial contact with the candidate or supervisor in any other circumstance which might jeopardise the independence of the examination.
7. The examiners must be appointed under the agreement that the contents of the thesis, including any intellectual property rights contained in the thesis, remain strictly confidential and to use the thesis only for the purposes of performing the examination.
8. Thesis will be sent to the fourth examiner if reports from examiners 1, 2 and 3 are not received by the due date.
9. Following endorsement by or on behalf of the Chair of the Sub-Committee, the faculty may dispatch the thesis to the examiners.