

MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

REVISED GUIDELINES

FOR

EXAMINERS OF HIGHER DEGREE THESIS

*as approved by the Senate at its 126th meeting
held on*

1st February 2007

1.0 Introduction

The Senate at its 126th meeting held on 1st February 2007 approved the following guidelines for Examiners of higher degree theses. The guidelines for examiners to give comprehensive and critical review of the thesis/dissertation. In the course of doing this, the examiner should draw the attention of the Board of Research and Graduate Training to such circumstances and factors as he/she feels the Board should be made aware of. The examiner's report should be compiled using the following general format where applicable.

1.1 Background

This section must assess the theoretical and conceptual background, objectives, rationale and clarity and precision of presentation also needs to be assessed. **(Maximum score 5).**

1.2 Problem statement

Does the candidate clearly state the nature of the problem and its magnitude or extent? How concise is it? Is there reference to the issues detected in the background that either needs practical or theoretical sense? **(Maximum score 5).**

1.3 Research methods

Indicate whether the candidate has used an appropriate approach to investigate the subject and has not neglected other methods which could have yielded better results. Assess for adequacy and relevance of data analytical procedures/techniques. Assess the appropriateness of hypothesis, questions and relevant assumptions. **(Maximum score 20).**

1.4 **Results**

Evaluate for the adequacy of data analysis, effectiveness of results presentation, accuracy, transparency, contributions from the study. **(Maximum score 15).**

1.5 **Discussions**

Does the candidate discuss his/her own findings and relates them to other researched work? Does the writer show honesty and transparency in discussing limitations? **(Maximum score 10).**

1.6 **Conclusion**

Does the conclusion emerge from the candidate's own work? Does the study stimulate further inquiry or scholarship? **(Maximum score 5)**

1.7 **Recommendations**

Does the recommendation emerge from the candidate's own work? Does the study stimulate further inquiry or scholarship? **(Maximum score 5).**

1.8 **Originality of contribution**

Please, state clearly whether the thesis makes an original contribution to the existing fund of knowledge. For a PhD/Doctoral degree the contribution must be significant, worthy of for example 3-5 papers if the subject is scientific. To qualify for a Doctorate, there should be strong evidence that the subject is thoroughly understood, with some original thinking. **(Maximum score 15).**

1.9 **Literature citation**

Has the candidate made use of available and relevant literature? Does this adequately describe the background, and is she/he abreast of the current literature? Has the candidate exercised due diligence in scholarly bibliographic write-up **(Maximum score 10).**

1.10 Overall presentation of final write-up

Indicate whether the candidate has presented the data in a logical flow and concise manner for example with cross-references to other sections, and with specific objectives following through appropriate methods leading to the results and discussion of each objective, thus ensuring that conclusions can be logically drawn from the information gathered. Is the abstract informative or not? Does the presentation provide the flavour of scholarly and professional output? **(Maximum score 10).**

1.11 Corrections or Revision

Indicate exactly what corrections are necessary or whether the thesis needs to be revised. Occasionally, theses require extensive corrections or revision. If this is the case, please set out the corrections and paragraphs affected. Whether minor corrections are required, please indicate them (in ink on the thesis or in your report).

1.12 Final evaluation

Please state frankly and without ambiguity whether the thesis:

- i) is worthy of the degree award in the present form.
- ii) Is worthy of the degree award after effecting minor corrections indicated in section 1.11 to the satisfaction of the Internal examiner.
- iii) Must be revised according to your suggestions in section 1.11 and submitted for re-examination,
- iv) Is not worthy of the award.

REVISED GUIDELINES

1.13 Thesis grading following the universal grading system of the University.

- | | |
|----|--------------------------|
| A+ | Exceptional (90% - 100%) |
| A | Excellent (80% - 89%) |
| B+ | Very good (75% - 79%) |
| B | Good (70% - 74%) |

- C+ Good but within the category 1.12 (b) (65% - 69%)
- C Satisfactory but needs minor revision (60% - 64%)
- D+ Marginal fail but can be revised and re-submitted for re-examination (55% - 59%) should not proceed for viva voce.
- D Clear fail (50% - 54%)

- **A Masters candidate in category D+ will be permitted to re-submit ONLY once.**
- **A PhD thesis recommended for re-writing and re-examination by any of the examiners will be given a second chance. A re-submission that FAILS second time will be REJECTED.**

NOTE: The pass mark is 60%.

The Deputy Principal
College of Natural Sciences
Makerere University

Dear Sir/Madam

I have agreed to act as External/Internal Examiner for the thesis/dissertation of

.....

Entitled:.....

.....

.....

.....

Name: Signature:

Tel: Email:

Fax No: Date: