Doctor of Philosophy (Music Composition)
Notes for Examiners

1. Governance

All matters pertaining to the PhD degree are the responsibility of the Graduate Research Committee under the general direction of the University's Academic Board.

2. The submitted work

2.1 The degree study program consists of research only leading to a substantial folio of original music compositions. A minimum of 50% of the music compositions in a folio must have been performed in public concerts, which must be evidenced by the concert program notes. The folio of music compositions must also include the concert program notes and a critical commentary on the compositions. The normal duration of the original music in the portfolio is between 50 – 80 minutes and the critical commentary is 20,000 – 25,000 words in length.

2.2 Examiners should note that the critical commentary should not be assessed as a separate research paper. It functions as a contextualisation of the research undertaken in the form of composition. In other words, the composition folio constitutes the research outcome and the critical commentary is intended to comment on that research. Please return the composition portfolio when you submit your report.

2.3 The examination of the work is undertaken by two independent and external examiners.

2.4 It is the practice at Monash to release the names of examiners who have agreed to act to the candidate.

2.5 The work is forwarded to an examiner in confidence. An examiner is under an obligation to maintain confidentiality and in no circumstance should the work or any part of the examination process be discussed with a third party without the prior approval of the Monash University Institute of Graduate Research.

2.6 Normally neither the candidate nor the supervisor are allowed to contact examiners directly during the examination process.

3. Examiner's assessment

3.1 The Committee wishes to receive clear advice on specific aspects of the work and, to this end, the examiner is asked to place a tick by each statement as deemed appropriate in the enclosed report form. If an examiner reports negatively on any aspects referred to in Section 1 of the form then comments should be made in the written section.

3.2 The composition folio should demonstrate that the candidate has acquired a good knowledge of music technology and an understanding of music technology as a compositional tool.
3.3 The critical commentary should demonstrate that the candidate has developed a research-based argument that provides a conceptual basis for the submitted compositions.

3.4 Recommendation 2(ii) should be made only when the examiner can specify amendments with reasonable precision.

3.5 An examiner may request that the University obtains from the candidate clarification of specific points in the work. Such requests should be made only through the Monash University Institute of Graduate Research.

3.6 Oral examinations are not normally a part of the examination process.

3.7 In cases where examiners deem it necessary to annotate the work, it should be done lightly in pencil or by the use of temporary adhesive labels.

4. **Following receipt of both examiners’ reports**

4.1 Unedited copies of the examiners’ reports are forwarded to the candidate in due course.

4.2 In the event that the two examiners disagree substantially in their assessment of the thesis, the relevant faculty is required to convene an advisory panel to determine a course of action. Most commonly an advisory panel will recommend either that:

- the work be revised and resubmitted to the original dissenting examiner(s) or
- an adjudicator be appointed to review the two examiners’ reports, the candidate’s response to the reports and the work. The names of the examiners are not revealed to the adjudicator.

Examiners will be advised when a candidate is asked to revise and resubmit his/her work. They will also be advised of the outcome of the examination.