



UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

POSTGRADUATE ASSESSMENT GUIDE

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| GUIDE NUMBER | RI G2 | GUIDE OWNER | DVC: Research & Innovation |
| OVERSEEING COMMITTEE(S) | Higher Degrees Committee → Senex → Senate | | |
| APPROVAL DATE | 15 November 2022 | REVISION DATE | From-time-to-time |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 2 | DEFINITIONS..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 3 | EXIT-LEVEL OUTCOMES FOR POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH DEGREES ... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| | Bookmark not defined. | |
| 3.4 | Exit-level outcomes for a doctoral qualification | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4 | ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR MANUSCRIPTS | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.1 | General..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.2 | Assessment criteria for Honours research papers | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 4.3 | Assessment criteria for Master's dissertations and mini-dissertations | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| | Bookmark not defined. | |
| 4.4 | Assessment criteria for doctoral theses | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 5 | LENGTH AND FORMAT | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 5.1 | Length of manuscripts | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 5.2 | Format | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6 | APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6.2. | General..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6.2 | Criteria for the appointment of examiners..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6.3 | Honours and Coursework Master's | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6.4 | Research Master's..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6.5 | Doctoral Theses | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 6.6 | The appointment process | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 7 | SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 7.1 | General..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 7.2 | Submission date | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 7.3 | Process..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 8 | ASSESSMENT OF POSTGRADUATE DEGREES ... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 8.1 | General..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 8.2 | Assessment outcomes: Honours and coursework Master's degrees | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| | Bookmark not defined. | |
| 8.4 | Assessment outcomes: Doctoral degrees | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 8.5 | Assessment procedure | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 8.6 | On receipt of the reports from examiners | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 8.7 | The revision process..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 9 | PROCEDURE FOR AWARDING POSTGRADUATE DEGREES | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| | not defined. | |
| 9.1 | Process..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 9.2 | General..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 10 | ARBITRATION | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| | ORIGINALITY DECLARATION..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |

CONSENT TO SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT FOR EXAMINATION **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT FOR EXAMINATION **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

- ANNEXURE A:** CANDIDATE'S ORIGINALITY DECLARATION (RESEARCH PAPERS, MINI-DISSERTATIONS, DISSERTATIONS AND THESES)
- ANNEXURE B:** SUPERVISOR'S CONSENT, WITH HOD AND DEAN'S ENDORSEMENTS, TO SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT FOR EXAMINATION
- ANNEXURE C:** CANDIDATE'S NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A DISSERTATION OR THESIS FOR EXAMINATION
- ANNEXURE D:** REQUEST TO APPOINT EXAMINERS
- ANNEXURE E:** EXAMINERS' CONFIDENTIALITY/ NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT
- ANNEXURE F:** ASSESSMENT SHEET – HONOURS PAPER
- ANNEXURE G:** ASSESSMENT SHEET – COURSEWORK
MASTER'S MINIDISSERTATION
- ANNEXURE H:** ASSESSMENT SHEET – MASTER'S DISSERTATION
- ANNEXURE I:** ASSESSMENT SHEET – DOCTORAL THESIS
- ANNEXURE J:** CONSOLIDATION OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS – COURSEWORK
MASTER'S MINI-DISSERTATION
- ANNEXURE K:** CONSOLIDATION OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS – MASTER'S DISSERTATION
- ANNEXURE L:** CONSOLIDATION OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS – DOCTORAL THESIS

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

1 INTRODUCTION

Honours degrees comprise coursework and research modules. The coursework modules are assessed by means of examination, while the Honours research module is assessed by means of a research paper. Marks are awarded to all the modules, including the research papers. The degree may be awarded with merit or with distinction.

Master's degrees may be completed by means of coursework plus a mini-dissertation or by means of a dissertation only. Mini-dissertations and dissertations are similarly assessed, while the coursework component is assessed by means of an examination. Marks are awarded to dissertations, mini-dissertations and the coursework modules in Master's degrees. The degree may be awarded with merit or with distinction.

All doctoral degrees require the completion of a thesis. (Some doctoral programmes may have coursework components, but in such instances the successful completion of the coursework component serves merely as a prerequisite for the submission of the thesis for assessment. Only the thesis assessment is considered for the award of the degree.) Doctoral degrees are awarded pass or fail assessments. No marks are awarded and degrees are not awarded with merit or distinction.

Research work that is undertaken for dissertations and theses will normally be submitted in written form. However, in certain disciplines, which include the Performing Arts as well as the Visual and Tactile Arts, the requirements for the research degree may also be met, either partially or fully, by means of (inter alia) a set of original artworks, artefacts, conceptualizations, compositions, installation(s), performances and/or professional exhibitions. Here it is understood that where relevant to the discipline, the medium of communication required for a research dissertation or thesis may also include, apart from the text and/or spoken word the language of form, music, painting, sculpture, etc. In all such cases, the relevant Faculty Research and Higher Degrees Committee will consider the justification for obtaining or partially obtaining the research degree by means of the particular mode of research output and must specify conditions relating to the completion and submission of the research work.

Detailed requirements for the various postgraduate programmes can be found in the relevant sections of the Faculty Prospectuses.

2 DEFINITIONS

Coursework Master's

A Master's degree is obtained by completing coursework modules and a mini dissertation, sometimes also known as a "taught Master's"

Dean

Dean of a Faculty

Dissertation

A dissertation constitutes the research work that is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining a research Master's degree. A research Master's dissertation is an advanced research project of defined scope and length that usually addresses a theme or a problem. It is not required to be an original contribution to a particular field of knowledge, though it may be. The assessment of the dissertation contributes 100% towards the assessment of a research Master's degree.

DVC

Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Research and Innovation

Examiner

A person who sets and/or assess an examination paper for a module, and/or assesses every examination script or all the answers, and provides a balanced and unbiased view regarding the quality and appropriateness of an examination paper, examination answers and/or the standard and quality of marking. Unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the use the term "examiner" in this policy shall refer to both an examiner and a moderator.

External examiner

An examiner who is not attached to UNIZULU or the supervision of the candidate in any way, e.g. a supervisor, a UNIZULU office bearer, employee, research fellow, professor emeritus, or consultant

HoD

Head of Department

Internal examiner

An examiner who is not an external examiner, as defined

Manuscript

A research paper, mini-dissertation, dissertation or thesis, depending upon the context

Mini-Dissertation

A mini dissertation constitutes the research component which is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining a coursework Master's degree. It is a project of defined scope and limited length, and is not required to be an original contribution to a particular field of knowledge, though it may be. Although a mini-dissertation must comprise at least 33% of the overall assessment for a coursework Master's degree, UNIZULU requires that it comprises 50% of the overall mark, to enable students to qualify for National Research Foundation funding.

Moderator

A person who provides a balanced and unbiased view regarding the quality and appropriateness of an examination paper, examination answers and/or the standard and quality of marking. Unlike an examiner, a moderator is not expected to assess every examination script or all the answers that have been sent to him or her.

Postgraduate

Honours, Master's, and Doctor

Research Master's

A Master's degree by means of a dissertation only

Research Paper

A research paper (sometimes also called a treatise) constitutes the research component which is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining an Honours degree. It is a project of defined scope and limited length, and is not required to be an original contribution to a particular field of knowledge, though it may be. The research component of an Honours degree must comprise 25% of the overall assessment for the degree.

Thesis

The research work submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining a doctoral degree is called a thesis. A doctoral thesis usually addresses a theme or a problem and represents a high-level research project which constitutes an original contribution to knowledge.

3 EXIT-LEVEL OUTCOMES FOR POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH DEGREES

3.1 General

Level descriptors describe the learning achievement or outcomes that are expected for a qualification at a particular level of the NQF. The exit level for Master's degrees is Level 9 and for doctoral degrees at Level 10.

Every supervisor should be fully acquainted with the key outcomes expected of research degrees, and ensure that their candidates are informed accordingly.

The descriptions of exit-level outcomes for Master's and doctoral graduates are set out in the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) document entitled *Level Descriptors for the South African Qualifications Framework* (November 2012) and are quoted verbatim below.

3.2 Exit-level outcomes for an Honours qualification

Honours degrees are pegged at level 8 within the Qualifications Framework. The exit level outcomes for an Honours qualification are:

- Scope of knowledge, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate knowledge of and engagement in an area at the forefront of a field, discipline or practice; an understanding of the theories, research methodologies, methods and techniques relevant to the field, discipline or practice; and an understanding of how to apply such knowledge in a particular context.
- Knowledge literacy, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to interrogate multiple sources of knowledge in an area of specialisation and to evaluate knowledge and processes of knowledge production.
- Method and procedure, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate an understanding of the complexities and uncertainties of selecting, applying or transferring appropriate standard procedures, processes or techniques to unfamiliar problems in a specialised field, discipline or practice.
- Problem solving, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to use a range of specialised skills to identify, analyse and address complex or abstract problems drawing systematically on the body of knowledge and methods appropriate to a field, discipline or practice.
- Ethics and professional practice, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to identify and address ethical issues based on critical reflection on the suitability of different ethical value systems to specific contexts.
- Accessing, processing and managing information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to critically review information gathering, synthesis of data, evaluation and management processes in specialised contexts in order to develop creative responses to problems and issues.
- Producing and communicating information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to present and communicate academic, professional or occupational ideas and texts effectively to a range of audiences, offering creative

insights, rigorous interpretations and solutions to problems and issues appropriate to the context.

- Context and systems, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to operate effectively within a system, or manage a system based on an understanding of the roles and relationships between elements within the system.
- Management of learning, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to apply, in a self-critical manner, learning strategies which effectively address his or her professional and ongoing learning needs and the professional and ongoing learning needs of others.
- Accountability, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to take full responsibility for his or her work, decision-making and use of resources, and full accountability for the decisions and actions of others where appropriate.

3.3 Exit-level outcomes for a Master's qualification

Both Coursework Master's and Research Master's degrees are pegged at level 9 within the Qualifications Framework. The exit-level outcomes for a Master's qualification are:

- Scope of knowledge, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate specialist knowledge to enable engagement with and critique of current research or practices, as well as advanced scholarship or research in a particular field, discipline or practice.
- Knowledge literacy, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to evaluate current processes of knowledge production, and to choose an appropriate process of enquiry for the area of study or practice.
- Method and procedure, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate a command of and the ability to design, select and apply appropriate and creative methods, techniques, processes or technologies to complex practical and theoretical problems.
- Problem solving, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate: the ability to use a wide range of specialised skills in identifying, conceptualising, designing and implementing methods of enquiry to address complex and challenging problems within a field, discipline or practice; and an understanding of the consequences of any solutions or insights generated within a specialised context.
- Ethics and professional practice, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to make autonomous ethical decisions which affect knowledge production, or complex organisational or professional issues, and the ability to critically contribute to the development of ethical standards in a specific context.
- Accessing, processing and managing information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to design and implement a strategy for the processing and management of information, in order to conduct a comprehensive review of leading and current research in an area of specialisation to produce significant insights.

- Producing and communicating information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to use the resources of academic and professional or occupational discourses to communicate and defend substantial ideas that are the products of research or development in an area of specialisation; and use a range of advanced and specialised skills and discourses appropriate to a field, discipline or practice, to communicate with a range of audiences with different levels of knowledge or expertise.
- Context and systems, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to make interventions at an appropriate level within a system, based on an understanding of hierarchical relations within the system, and the ability to address the intended and unintended consequences of interventions.
- Management of learning, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to develop his or her own learning strategies, which sustain independent learning and academic or professional development; and can interact effectively within the learning or professional group as a means of enhancing learning.
- Accountability, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to operate independently and take full responsibility for his or her own work, and, where appropriate, to account for leading and initiating processes and implementing systems, ensuring good resource management and governance practices.

3.4 Exit-level outcomes for a doctoral qualification

Doctoral degrees are pegged at level 10 within the Qualifications Framework. The exit level outcomes for a doctoral qualification are:

- Scope of knowledge, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate expertise and critical knowledge in an area at the forefront of a field, discipline or practice; and the ability to conceptualise new research initiatives and create new knowledge or practice.
- Knowledge literacy, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to contribute to scholarly debates around theories of knowledge and processes of knowledge production in an area of study or practice.
- Method and procedure, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to develop new methods, techniques, processes, systems or technologies in original, creative and innovative ways appropriate to specialised and complex contexts.
- Problem solving, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to apply specialist knowledge and theory in critically reflexive, creative and novel ways to address complex practical and theoretical problems.
- Ethics and professional practice, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to identify, address and manage emerging ethical issues, and to advance processes of ethical decision-making, including monitoring and evaluation of the consequences of these decisions where appropriate.

- Accessing, processing and managing information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to make independent judgments about managing incomplete or inconsistent information or data in an iterative process of analysis and synthesis, for the development of significant original insights into new, complex and abstract ideas, information or issues.
- Producing and communicating information, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to produce substantial, independent, in-depth and

publishable work which meets international standards, is considered to be new or innovative by peers, and makes a significant contribution to the discipline, field, or practice; and the ability to develop a communication strategy to disseminate and defend research, strategic and policy initiatives and their implementation to specialist and non-specialist audiences using the full resources of an academic and professional or occupational discourse.

- Context and systems, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate an understanding of theoretical underpinnings in the management of complex systems to achieve systemic change; and the ability to independently design, sustain and manage change within a system or systems.
- Management of learning, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to demonstrate intellectual independence, research leadership and management of research and research development in a discipline, field or practice.
- Accountability, in respect of which a learner is able to demonstrate the ability to operate independently and take full responsibility for his or her work, and, where appropriate, lead, oversee and be held ultimately accountable for the overall governance of processes and systems.

4 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR MANUSCRIPTS

4.1 General

The assessment criteria will depend upon disciplinary conventions, the research field and the nature of the work undertaken, but criteria must in all instances be aligned with the exit-level outcomes set out above. To meet the required exit-level outcomes for Master's degrees, the scope and depth of research in a dissertation must necessarily be more advanced than those of a mini-dissertation, where the outcomes of the coursework component are also relevant in determining whether the standards have been met.

Faculties may set specific assessment criteria, provided that they are not in conflict with the provisions of this policy.

4.2 Assessment criteria for Honours research papers

The criteria set out below for Master's dissertations apply equally to Honours research papers, the only difference being that Honours students are not expected to evidence research maturity to the same extent as Master's candidates. The expected level of research and analytical skills, and rigour will therefore be consistent with that of entry level researchers.

4.3 Assessment criteria for Master's dissertations and mini-dissertations

4.3.1 Title

The title must be unambiguous, meaningful, demarcate the research topic and be aligned with the research problem and methodology

4.3.2 Research

- (a) The research objectives/aims/hypotheses must be clearly delineated
- (b) The scope of the study should be clear
- (c) The focus of the study should be consistent with the aims and objectives of the research

4.3.3 Conceptual and theoretical aspects

- (a) Relevant, contemporary and authoritative scientific sources and theories were consulted
- (b) The comprehensiveness of the literature study
- (c) Evidence of the candidate's understanding of the principles and theories used in the study
- (d) The candidate's ability to critically review and logically present the relevant literature in the field of study
- (e) The candidate's ability to draw sound theoretical conclusions

4.3.4 Research Design and Methodology

- (a) The extent to which the research design is a logical progression from the research objectives/aims/hypotheses
- (b) The relevance of the research design in serving the research process
- (c) The candidate's critical evaluation of the research design and method employed
- (d) The relevance and scope of the processes that are used to identify and collect the objects of the research (data, documents, artefacts, specimens, compositions etc.)
- (e) The candidate's understanding of research methods, techniques
- (f) The use of appropriate techniques for the analysis of the research objects in order to meet the objectives/aims/hypotheses of the study
- (g) The accurate interpretation and discussion of findings, well substantiated by the results of the analysis
- (h) The presentation of the results in terms of the research objectives/aims/hypotheses

4.3.5 Conclusions and Contributions

- (a) The extent to which the work reveals efficient and effective information retrieval and processing skills
- (b) The extent to which the work reveals an ability to engage with the current research in the discipline or field

- (c) The extent to which the work reveals specialist knowledge and advanced scholarship
- (d) Demonstration of an ability to present and communicate academic work appropriate to the context and level of the study
- (e) Logical conclusions based on the results and/or appropriate recommendations or proposals
- (f) The application, implication or contribution of the research findings in practical, scientific and/or research fields
- (g) The extent to which the work is presented as a meaningful and integrated unit

4.3.6 Technical and ethical issues

- (a) Appropriate layout and technical requirements such as abstract, table of contents, declarations, chapters and bibliography
- (b) The inclusion of appropriate annexures and/or appendices, such as questionnaires, computer programmes, and other research documents
- (c) The consistent and professional application of a particular referencing style appropriate for the nature and level of research
- (d) The overall linguistic and technical presentation of the dissertation, for example, the use of tables and/or graphic illustrations
- (e) Compliance with ethical standards relevant to the type of research conducted

4.3.7 For a distinction to be awarded the work must evidence additional criteria:

- (a) The candidate has assumed responsibility for the work and demonstrates an ability to operate independently
- (b) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of the research discipline or field
- (c) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the relevant research techniques and their application
- (d) The work reveals originality of approach and/or involves original research
- (e) The technical aspects of the work are excellent
- (e) The ease at which the dissertation can be read, the information should be presented in a lucid and readable manner.

4.4 **Assessment criteria for doctoral theses**

4.4.1 Important considerations in judging the quality of doctoral theses are:

- (a) The extent to which candidates reveal an extensive as well as intensive knowledge of their subject
- (b) An advanced level of competence in addressing problems that are directly or indirectly relevant to the particular topic
- (c) The success with which the candidate presents a unified, cumulative argument in addressing the theme or problem, and

- (d) Whether the research results constitute an original contribution to knowledge
Accordingly, the core competencies expected of a researcher must be evidenced at a more advanced level than that expected of a Master's candidate

(e) Whether the research study depict novelty/creativity and impact in the field and or society

4.4.2 Title

The title must be unambiguous, meaningful, demarcate the research topic and be aligned with the research problem and methodology

4.4.3 Research

- (a) The research objectives/aims/hypotheses must be appropriately delineated
- (b) The scope of the study should be clear
- (c) The focus of the study should be consistent with the aims and objectives of the research

4.4.4 Conceptual and theoretical aspects

- (a) The candidate demonstrates without doubt expertise and specialist knowledge in the discipline or field
- (b) The thesis reveals originality of approach and/or involves original research
- (c) Relevant, contemporary and authoritative scientific sources and theories were consulted
- (d) The candidate illustrates a thorough understanding of the principles and theories in the discipline or field and an ability to contribute, through the thesis, to scholarly debates at the cutting edge of an area of specialization nationally and internationally
- (e) The thesis contains clear evidence of an ability to apply knowledge, theory and research methods creatively to complex practical, theoretical and epistemological problems and an ability to draw sound theoretical conclusions
- (f) The thesis contributes new knowledge to the field or discipline in that it reveals substantial, independent study and advanced scholarship resulting in the (re) interpretation and expansion of knowledge

4.4.5 Research Design and Methodology

- (a) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the relevant research techniques and their application
- (b) The candidate illustrates and applies a critical understanding of the most advanced research methodologies, techniques and technologies in the field
- (c) The research design is a logical progression from the research objectives/aims/hypotheses
- (d) Where appropriate, the thesis illustrates an ability to identify, conceptualise, design and implement research that addresses complex problems at the cutting edge of the discipline/field, using evidence-based solutions and theorydriven arguments

- (e) Where appropriate, the candidate demonstrates an ability to select, apply and manage appropriate statistical software, instruments and techniques in the analyses of data or research samples
- (f) The thesis indicates that the candidate has used appropriate techniques in conducting the research and has mastered the methodological challenges sufficiently

4.4.6 Conclusions and Contributions

- (a) The extent to which the work reveals efficient and effective information retrieval and processing skills at an advanced level
- (b) The candidate has assumed responsibility for the work and demonstrates an ability to undertake independent research
- (c) Logical conclusions have been drawn and/or appropriate recommendations and/or proposals have been made based on the research results
- (d) The extent to which the work reveals an ability to engage critically with the current research and scholarly or professional literature in the discipline or field
- (e) The extent to which the work reveals specialist knowledge and advanced scholarship. The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive and in-depth knowledge of the research discipline or field
- (f) Demonstration of an ability to present and communicate research results and academic opinion to specialist audiences nationally and internationally
- (g) The extent to which the work is presented as a meaningful and integrated unit

4.4.7 Technical and ethical issues

- (a) Appropriate layout and technical requirements such as abstract, table of contents, declarations, chapters and bibliography
- (b) The inclusion of appropriate annexures and/or appendices, such as questionnaires, computer programmes, and other research documents
- (c) The consistent and professional application of a particular referencing style appropriate for the nature and level of research (17)
- (d) The overall linguistic and technical presentation of the thesis, for example, the use of tables and/or graphic illustrations
- (e) Compliance with ethical standards relevant to the type of research conducted
- (f) The citations for Doctoral candidates should follow the guidelines carefully. (16)
- (g) Language editing and proof reading must be done professionally (16)

5 LENGTH AND FORMAT

5.1 Length of manuscripts

The research work that is undertaken for research papers, dissertations and theses will normally be submitted in written form. Unless there are sound reasons for deviating from

the benchmarks, which require the approval of both Faculty and the Higher Degrees Committee, the length for dissertations and theses shall be:

5.1.1 Research papers

The minimum length of a research paper is normally 10 000 words (25 to 30 text pages (A4) of one-and-a-half (1.5) line-spaced typing), including footnotes or endnotes, but excluding introductory pages, bibliography, illustrative material and appendices. Research papers should not exceed 15 000 words (35 to 40 text pages, excluding the above-mentioned material).

5.1.2 Mini-dissertations

The minimum length of a mini-dissertation is normally 20 000 words (50 to 60 text pages (A4) of one-and-a-half (1.5) line-spaced typing), including footnotes or endnotes, but excluding introductory pages, bibliography, illustrative material and appendices. Mini dissertations should not exceed 25 000 words (approximately 70 text pages, excluding the above-mentioned material).

5.1.3 Dissertations

The minimum length of a dissertation is normally 40 000 words (approximately 120 text pages (A4) of one-and-a-half (1.5) line-spaced typing), including footnotes or endnotes, but excluding introductory pages, bibliography, illustrative material and appendices. Dissertations should not exceed 50 000 words (approximately 150 text pages, excluding the above-mentioned material). Flexibility of the length may be considered without compromising the quality of the dissertation.

5.1.4 Theses

The minimum length of a doctoral thesis is normally 70 000 words (approximately 200 text pages (A4) of one-and-a-half (1.5) line-spaced typing), including footnotes or endnotes, but excluding introductory pages, bibliography, illustrative material, and appendices. The thesis should not exceed 90 000 words (approximately 260 text pages, excluding the above-mentioned material). Flexibility of the length may be considered without compromising the quality of the thesis.

5.2 **Format**

Although the format of the manuscript will depend to a great extent on the discipline in which the study is undertaken and the research approach that was employed, all manuscripts should adhere to the following formal requirements:

5.2.1 Examination documents should be in A4-format with either one and-a-half (1.5) or one-point-one-five (1.15) line spacing. The documents for examination should be submitted in electronic form and a printed copy will be made on request by the examiner.

5.2.2 The manuscript shall contain at least the following:

(a) A title page with the following particulars:

(i) full title as approved by the Higher Degrees Committee

(ii) full name of the candidate (iii) the following formula:

“Submitted in fulfilment (or, in partial fulfilment) of the requirements for the degree of in the Faculty of at the University of Zululand.”

(iv) date of submission

(v) name of the supervisor (and co-supervisor, if applicable).

5.2.3 A description (abstract) in English of its contents not exceeding 500 words. This description must appear in the front of the manuscript following the table of content and must end with a list of not more than ten key words. Candidates may include a second description in a language of their choice, provided that, if the language is not one of the official UNIZULU languages, the translation must be a sworn translation furnished at the cost of the candidate.

5.2.4 A declaration by the candidate that the manuscript has not previously been submitted in fulfilment or partial fulfilment of the requirements of another degree, whether at UNIZULU or at any other university (Annexure A). Where a candidate has built upon material previously submitted towards fulfilling another degree, the candidate must submit the name of the previous work, together with a declaration regarding the nature of the additional work undertaken, the extent of the overlap, and the extent to which the manuscript being submitted constitutes an original work.

5.2.5 A declaration by the candidate that the manuscript is the work of the candidate, and that the candidate has complied with the provisions of the University's Plagiarism Policy (Annexure A).

5.2.6 A declaration by the candidate's supervisor and co-supervisor (where applicable) that the candidate has complied with the provisions of the University's Research Ethics Policy and the conditions, if any, specified by the University's Research Ethics Committee (Annexure B). The University's Ethical Clearance Certificate in respect of the research should be attached as an annexure to the manuscript.

5.2.7 Candidate to declare that the thesis has gone through professional editing and proof reading, including a certificate / letter to that effect, has been included in the submission to SENEX.

5.2.8 Candidate to declare that a plagiarism check was effected, with evidence of a Turnitin (or similar software) certificate always included in the submission;

5.2.9 In the case of 5.2.8 above, a Turnitin (or similar software) report should exclude a bibliography, with the similarity score of less than 15%. Additional report required for similarity score of 15% and above.

5.2.10 A declaration by the candidate and supervisor that proof of registration, ethical clearance and the appointment of supervisor/s and examiners is submitted

PROCEDURES

6 APPOINTMENTS OF EXAMINERS

6.1 General

6.1.1 All Examiners should be appointed as per the policy

6.1.2 Any deviation from the policies will be dealt with through the officially entrusted committee/s

6.1.3 Senate is the final authority in respect of the appointment of examiners but acts in this regard through the Higher Degrees Committee.

6.1.4 Only the Higher Degrees Committee, having considered the recommendations of the relevant faculty board, shall appoint examiners for all postgraduate programmes. Thereafter only the Examinations Office administers the appointment process, interacts with the examiners, and officially appoints them.

6.1.5 All interactions between the Higher Degrees Committee, the Examinations Office and/or the examiners on the one hand, and the candidate and/or the supervisor(s), on the other, shall be conducted via the relevant Dean and HoD.

6.1.6 Where the Dean or HoD act as supervisors, or are placed in a conflict of interest situation, the DVC shall determine the processes to be followed.

6.1.7 All discussions and decisions relating to the examination of postgraduate candidates are confidential and shall not be disclosed to candidates.

6.1.8 Special precautions shall be taken in instances where staff members are the candidates to be examined. In such instances the supervisor, HoD and Dean shall

maintain strictest confidentiality and the documentation shall not be presented to the Faculty for approval. Instead the Dean shall present the documentation to the Chairperson of the Higher Degrees Committee, who shall then report verbally and confidentially to the Higher Degrees Committee.

- 6.1.9 The Higher Degrees Committee may at any of its meetings consider the appointment of examiners for all Honours and Master's coursework programmes, and for postgraduate manuscripts. However, last-minute appointments should be avoided and it is important that potential examiners are identified early.
- 6.1.10 Examiners must normally be appointed at least three months prior to the submission of the manuscripts for examination, and no later than November of the year preceding the intended graduation ceremony.
- 6.1.11 HoDs must ensure that the names of proposed examiners have been submitted either prior to or in time for the fourth Faculty Board meeting of the year (usually at the beginning of October) so that the Higher Degrees Committee is able to consider the names at its meeting in November.
- 6.1.12 In instances where it is necessary to fast-track an appointment, the Dean and the DVC may respectively act on behalf of the Faculty and the Higher Degrees Committee; provided that the Dean's recommendations are presented to Faculty for noting and the DVC's decisions are presented to and ratified by the Higher Degrees Committee.
- 6.1.13 Examiners for all postgraduate coursework modules, including examiners for Honours research papers and coursework Master's mini-dissertations, are normally appointed per module. Examiners of Master's dissertations and doctoral theses are appointed specifically for each dissertation or thesis, to ensure alignment between the research topic and the examiners' expertise in that field.

6.2 Criteria for the appointment of examiners

- 6.2.1 The quality and standing of examiners are paramount. All examiners must meet the following general criteria:
 - (a) Appropriate research qualification, namely a minimum of Master's degree in the case of the examination of a research paper, a doctoral degree for a mini-dissertation, dissertation, and the examination of a thesis.
 - (b) Experience in postgraduate supervision
 - (c) Research experience, with a publication record
 - (d) Competence in the area of the work submitted for examination

(e) An examiner may be considered for a professional disciplines with a motivation for a master's dissertation if they have an extensive: publication and supervision record in the relevant field but do not have a doctoral degree in the relevant discipline of study.

6.2.2 A supervisor and co-supervisor may act as an examiner for a research paper, followed by an external moderation for a research paper; but may not act as an examiner for a mini-dissertation, dissertation or thesis.

6.2.3 An employee or research fellow of the University may act as an examiner for a research paper or a mini-dissertation, but not for a dissertation or a thesis.

6.2.4 Former employees (other than those who are research fellows or who are similarly connected to the University) may be appointed as examiners provided that they have served a three-year cooling off period between the date of departure from the University and the date of appointment by the Higher Degrees Committee.

6.2.5 Should there not be a suitable internal examiner, an additional external examiner may be appointed instead.

6.2.6 Office bearers of the Institution and Professors Emeriti shall not serve as examiners.

6.2.7 Internal examiners and/or examiners who are not from academic institutions may be appointed where specific expertise is required, provided that they are in possession of an appropriate academic qualification and have demonstrated competence in the area of the work submitted for examination. (Supervision and research experience, and a publication record, will be preferable).

6.2.8 Best practice requires that examiners should be diverse in terms of academic institutional and social backgrounds, and that examiners be rotated regularly. Accordingly:

- (a) Diversity in terms of gender, institutions at which examiners are employed or have obtained their postgraduate qualifications, country and country of origin must be borne in mind when examiners are appointed
- (b) The use of examiners who hail from intimate personal and/or culturally or narrowly-defined networks should preferably be avoided, or at least restricted
- (c) A candidate should not be examined by persons from the same institution, department or faculty
- (d) The same coursework examiner and examiners of research papers and mini-dissertations should be used for no more than three consecutive years in a department and should again be used only after a break of two years; alternatively, an examiner should not serve for more than three years in a five-year cycle
- (e) Examiners should not examine more than two manuscripts in any one year

- (f) Examiners should not be used in same combination for more than one dissertation and/or thesis examination
- (g) Examiners should not be used for more than three consecutive years
- (h) Quality of examination reports is important to the integrity of the examination process. Reports must be viewed with a critical eye, and examiners who provide poor / unbalanced reports shall be removed from the pool of examiners

6.3 Honours and Coursework Master's

The Higher Degrees Committee of Senate, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board, appoints:

- 6.3.1 One internal examiner (who may or may not be the person who presented the module) and one external examiner/moderator for each module comprising the coursework component of the programme.
- 6.3.2 For the examination of a research paper or mini-dissertation of Honours, an internal examiner other than the supervisor and one external examiner/moderator and, preferably, one alternate external examiner/moderator
- 6.3.3 Three external examiners (two main examiners and one alternate examiner) from separate institutions shall be appointed for a masters' mini dissertation.

6.4 Research Master's

The Higher Degrees Committee of Senate, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board, appoints two external examiners and one alternate external examiner for the examination of a master's Full dissertation. The examiners should be nominated from separate institutions

- 6.4.1 Should unexpected circumstances arise to prevent an examiner from performing their examination of a Masters project as per appointment (within the allocated time), the alternate examiner will be utilized as a replacement.
- 6.4.2 Should extra-ordinary circumstances arise where not only an examiner but also the alternate examiner fail to submit the examination report within the given 6 weeks examination period (*and after the additional 2 weeks grace period*), the Faculty Higher Degrees Committee (FHDC) shall initiate a new process to appoint a replacement examiner. The process can be expedited.
- 6.4.3. The external examiner/s who have failed to submit the examination report should be informed that new examiner will mark the dissertation/thesis
- 6.4.4 The process in 6.4.2 shall only be for a replacement examiner (without interference with the unaffected incumbent examiner), in which case such an

appointment should be ratified by all relevant SENATE committee structures such as the HDC.

6.5 Doctoral Theses

- 6.5.1 The Higher Degrees Committee of Senate, on the recommendation of the Faculty Board, appoints three external examiners and one alternate external examiner for the examination of a thesis;
- 6.5.2 At least two of the examiners must be based at institutions outside of the borders of South Africa but not from the same country. This rule may be deviated from in exceptional circumstances, on (a) proof that there is no suitable international examiner in respect of the research topic and (b) showing what attempt has been made to find suitable international examiners, (c) if one of the examiners appointed is in South Africa, the alternate should be international.
- 6.5.3 Should unexpected circumstances arise to prevent an examiner from performing their examination of a Doctoral project as per appointment (within the allocated time), the alternate examiner will be utilized as a replacement; provided there should be no more than one South African examiners for a thesis.
- 6.5.4 Should extra-ordinary circumstances arise where the alternate examiner also fails to deliver examination report within the given examination period (*and after the additional 2 weeks grace period*), the Faculty Higher Degrees Committee (FHDC) shall appoint a replacement examiner via the institutional committee approved protocols.
- 6.5.5 The process in 6.5.4 shall only be for a replacement examiner, in which case such an appointment is to be ratified by all relevant SENATE committee structures such as the HDC.

6.6 The appointment process

- 6.6.1 In August of each year the Registrar's Division shall issue a notice to staff and all Master's and doctoral students who intend to graduate during the next graduation ceremony in May of the following year, informing them of the need to notify the University of their intention to submit their manuscript for examination.
- 6.6.2 The candidate shall at least three months prior to the intended submission of the manuscript for examination, and no later than 30 September of the year preceding the intended graduation ceremony, submit via the supervisor to the HoD a form indicating intention to submit the manuscript for examination (Annexure C), together with a description (abstract) in English of the manuscript's contents not

exceeding 500 words. The HoD shall in turn submit the form and abstract to the Dean.

- 6.6.3 In consultation with the HoD, the Coursework Programme Coordinator or the supervisor, as applicable, identifies suitable subject specialists who can act as examiner(s).
- 6.6.4 The supervisor thereafter obtains the prospective examiner's CV (which include: the supervision record, the expertise and research output (research output, publications, conferences etc.), external examination of dissertations and or theses) and contact information and preferably enquires informally from the person whether the prospective examiner would be prepared to serve as an examiner of the dissertation or thesis, if appointed.
- 6.6.5 The supervisor completes a concise statement of the proposed examiner's expertise and suitability (Annexure D), signs it, and submits it together with the manuscript abstract and relevant CVs to the HoD.
- 6.6.6 The HoD, if satisfied that the examiner is indeed suitable and that the request complies with the provisions of this policy, submits to Faculty the relevant documentation together with a recommendation that the person(s) be appointed. (Should the HoD not be satisfied, the matter must be resolved with the supervisor, failing which, with the supervisor and the relevant Dean.)
- 6.6.7 Faculty may either refer the matter back to the HoD, with comment regarding remedial action to be taken, or recommend the proposed examiners to the Higher Degrees Committee.
- 6.6.8 The Dean shall ensure that the Faculty recommendation (signed off by the Dean) together with the supporting documentation (including contact details) is submitted to the Research and Innovation Office.
- 6.6.9 The Research and Innovation Office shall:
- (a) Record receipt of the documents in a register
 - (b) Record the information in its postgraduate data base
 - (c) Submit the documentation to the relevant member of the Committee section in the Registrar's Office responsible for the secretariat services for the Higher Degrees Committee
- 6.6.10 The Higher Degrees Committee may confirm the Faculty recommendations, or refer the matter back to the Dean, with comment regarding remedial action to be taken.

- 6.6.11 The Committee Section shall inform the Manager, Assessment in the Registrar's Division of all duly appointed examiners.
- 6.6.12 The Assessment Section thereafter records the Higher Degrees Committee decision and formally invites the nominated person to be an examiner, requesting confirmation of the duties and responsibilities. The examiners should receive copies of the manuscript abstract and the *Guidelines for the Examination of Research Dissertations and Theses* together with the invitation.
- 6.6.13 Examiners are required to accept the appointment formally and also complete a non-disclosure agreement (Annexure E) and return the documentation to the Examinations Office. The examiners should be given two weeks to respond on their appointment or otherwise an alternate examiner will be sought.
- 6.6.14 On receipt of a reply from the proposed examiner, the Assessment Section shall inform the Dean, the HoD and the Research and Innovation Office.
- 6.6.15 In the event of a negative response, the process shall be repeated until all the examiners are appointed.

7 SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

7.1 General

- 7.1.1 Internally, the Examinations Office interacts only with the relevant Dean and HoD, via the Dean's Office. There shall be no direct communication between the Examinations Office and any other person, especially the candidate and his or her supervisor(s).
- 7.1.2 All discussions and decisions relating to the examination of postgraduate candidates are confidential and shall not be disclosed to candidates. Special precautions shall be taken in instances where staff members are the candidates to be examined.
- 7.1.3 A candidate has only two opportunities to have a manuscript assessed, and has only one opportunity for re-submission of a manuscript that was not accepted on first submission.

7.2 Submission date

- 7.2.1 The deadline for submission of manuscripts for assessment is 15 December.

7.2.2 Candidates who have given notice of intention to submit by 30 September (Annexure C) and who have submitted their final manuscripts for assessment on or before 15 December have a legitimate expectation that the assessment process will be completed in time for the degree to be awarded during the following graduation ceremonies, provided that the examiners do not require extensive revision of the submitted manuscript to be affected.

7.2.3 While the University will make every effort to expedite the assessment process, the manuscripts of candidates who have not met the deadlines for either notice of intention to submit or submission might not be assessed in time for the degree to be awarded at the following graduation ceremony.

7.2.4 Should the examination process not be completed in time for graduation, candidates will be required to register for another academic year. Candidates who submitted their dissertations or theses on or before 15 December will, however, be exempted from paying any additional registration or tuition fees for one year following the first submission, provided that the corrections have been effected and approved by 30 June.

7.3 Process

7.3.1 Upon completion of the final draft of the manuscript, (mini-dissertation, dissertation or thesis) the candidate shall request the supervisor and co-supervisor to provide written consent that the manuscript may be submitted (Annexure B). Such consent implies that the supervisor(s) believe(s) that the candidate has complied with institutional policies and that the manuscript meets the required standards and is ready for assessment, but it does not imply or guarantee that the examiners will hold a similar view.

7.3.2 A supervisor may decline to consent to the submission of the manuscript for examination in which event the HoD shall attempt to mediate the matter. Should the matter remain unresolved, the HoD shall continue with the administrative process without the supervisor's consent, having recorded (a) the supervisor's reasons for refusal and (b) the candidate's acknowledgement of the supervisor's reasons and insistence that the process should nonetheless proceed, for submission with the other documentation to the Dean.

7.3.3 The candidate must present to the supervisor an electronic version of the manuscript in PDF format, soft bound hard copies will be made on request of the external examiner.

7.4 Where manuscripts or parts thereof could contain intellectual property or sensitive personal or other information which must be treated as confidential or classified,

duplication and binding for examination purposes must be done under the strictest supervision.

7.4.1 Copies handed in for examination shall become the property of the University and shall not necessarily be returned to the candidate.

7.5. The supervisor shall retain the electronic version as a back-up, in case more copies are required at a later stage but shall submit the hard copies of the manuscript to the Examinations Office, together with the completed supervisor's consent form (Annexure B), endorsed by the HoD and Dean, and the names and addresses of the approved external examiners.

7.5.1 The Examinations Office shall thereafter interact directly with the Dean.

7.5.2 Where an HoD or Dean acts as a supervisor, or is placed in a conflict of interest situation, the DVC shall determine the processes to be followed.

7.5.3 The Examinations Office shall not process any manuscript without the HoD and Dean's endorsement, signifying that the procedures of this policy have been complied with (Annexure B).

7.6 After Submission

An oral presentation should take place within approximately two weeks of submission. Oral presentation is to be made to the Faculty Higher degrees Committee. The candidate may invite the supervisor, the supervisor must withdraw prior to deliberations. The official recommendations (and list of corrections/guidance notes if applicable) will be sent to the candidate and supervisor by the deputy dean for consideration.

8 ASSESSMENT OF POSTGRADUATE DEGREES

8.1 General

8.1.1 Only the Examinations Office may administer the examinations process and interact with examiners.

8.1.2 No candidate and no supervisor shall communicate with the examiner/s until after the finalisation of the assessment.

8.1.3 The assessment by a person who is not appointed in terms of this policy shall be invalid and of no effect, and such persons will not be remunerated or compensated in respect of any conduct or expense undertaken while purporting to be an examiner. The University may discipline persons who fail to adhere to the provisions of this policy.

8.2 Assessment outcomes: Honours and coursework Master's degrees

8.2.1 Coursework modules are assessed by means of written examination and marks are allocated as per standard procedures.

8.2.2 Coursework modules may be externally examined or externally moderated, depending upon faculty rules. In either instance, the external examiner or moderator has insight into the marks allocated by the internal examiner.

8.2.3 The average percentage mark of the two examiner assessments or the moderated mark determines the mark allocated to the manuscript.

8.2.4 Examiners of mini dissertations shall not have any insight into the marks allocated by other examiners prior to the allocation of their marks.

8.2.5 The mark allocated to the manuscript is combined with the other coursework results, as determined by the course-specific rules.

8.2.6 Examiners of mini-dissertations are expected to complete an assessment form and to indicate whether:

- (a) The mini-dissertation be accepted unconditionally
- (b) The mini-dissertation be accepted on condition that the candidate makes corrections of a limited extent to the satisfaction of the supervisor or any other specified person or body
- (c) The mini-dissertation be not accepted in its current form and that it must be referred back to the candidate for revision, comprehensive restructuring and/or expansion after which it should be resubmitted for examination

8.3 Assessment outcomes: Research Master's degrees

8.3.1 Examiners of dissertations shall not have any insight into the marks allocated by other examiners prior to the allocation of their marks.

8.3.2 Examiners of dissertations are expected to complete an assessment form and in addition submit a separate assessment report.

8.3.3 Examiners allocate a percentage mark to the dissertation.

8.3.4 Examiners are expected specifically to indicate whether:

- (a) The degree be *awarded with distinction*, or
- (b) The degree be awarded unconditionally (*without corrections*), or

- (c) The dissertation be *provisionally* accepted pending minor corrections of a technical nature (e.g. spelling, typing, numbering of pages/ sections, references) which will normally be required to be made to the satisfaction of the supervisor
- (d) The dissertation be *provisionally* accepted pending more substantial corrections, which will normally be required to be made to the satisfaction of the examiner, or a specified person or body other than the supervisor
- (e) The dissertation be *not accepted in its current form* and that it must be referred back to the candidate for revision, comprehensive restructuring and/or expansion after which it should be resubmitted for examination
- (f) The dissertation be *not accepted, and the degree be not awarded*

8.4 Assessment outcomes: Doctoral degrees

8.4.1 A doctoral thesis is not awarded a mark.

8.4.2 Examiners of theses shall not have any insight into the assessments of other examiners prior to completing and submitting their reports.

8.4.3 Thesis examiners are expected to complete an assessment form and in addition submit a separate assessment report.

8.4.4 Examiners are expected specifically to indicate whether:

- (a) The degree be awarded unconditionally (*without corrections*), or
- (b) The thesis be *provisionally* accepted pending minor corrections of a technical nature (e.g. spelling, typing, numbering of pages/ sections, references) which will normally be required to be made to the satisfaction of the supervisor
- (c) The thesis be *provisionally* accepted pending more substantial corrections, which will normally be required to be made to the satisfaction of the examiner, or a specified person or body other than the supervisor
- (d) The thesis be *not accepted in its current form* and that it must be referred back to the candidate for revision, comprehensive restructuring and/or expansion after which it should be resubmitted for examination
- (e) The thesis be *not accepted and the degree be not awarded*

8.5 Assessment procedure

8.5.1 The Examinations Office provides each examiner with an electronic version or where circumstances require a copy of the manuscript/dissertation/thesis the guidelines to examiners, the appropriate assessment form (Annexures F, G, H, I) and a claim form.

- 8.5.2 Examiners must conduct their assessment in accordance with the guidelines for the assessment of postgraduate manuscripts. Each examiner thereafter completes, preferably in electronic (PDF) format, the assessment form and returns it, together with a typed report, to the Examinations Office by the stipulated date.
- 8.5.3 Where examiners have indicated that the degree should be awarded with minor corrections or subject to minor changes, or that the manuscript should be revised and re-submitted, their reports should clearly indicate the nature of the corrections and revisions that are required, and they may wish to return an edited copy with the desired revisions clearly indicated.
- 8.5.4 Examiners should indicate whether all or part of their report may be made available to the candidate and whether their names may be divulged.
- 8.5.5 The Examinations Office shall send the examiner a reminder two weeks before the stipulated date and where examiners do not meet the deadline, the Examinations Office shall follow up on the reports immediately after the deadline and, unless a particular date has been agreed to, every week thereafter.
- 8.5.6 Where it appears that all the external examiners reports might not be received in time for the University to process the award of a degree, the Dean must take steps to resolve the matter, and if necessary, in extreme cases, request the DVC to appoint an alternative external examiner, subject to ratification by the Higher Degrees Committee. It should be noted, however, that no degree can be awarded without the receipt of all the requisite examiners' reports.

8.6 On receipt of the reports from examiners

- 8.6.1 Once all the examiners' reports have been received, the Examinations Office forwards reports to the relevant Dean. The Dean shall then request the supervisor via the HoD, to consolidate the examiners' views and compile a report (Annexures J, K, L) which must be submitted to the Dean.
- 8.6.2 The consolidated report should be a balanced version of the reviews / assessments of all the examiners
- 8.6.3 Under no circumstances should the content of the examiners' reports be revealed to the candidate without the Deans' authorisation.
- 8.6.4 The Faculty Exam committees must diligently assess the quality of the assessors' reports. Their intervention at this level should not be escalated to SENEX to deal with matters that must be dealt with at Faculty Exam Committee level.
- 8.6.5 On receipt of the consolidated report, the Dean shall take one of the following steps:

- (a) Where all the examiners agree unconditionally that the manuscript has met the required standards the Dean refer the matter, with the required documentation, to the Senate Executive Committee (SENEX) for the award of the degree.
- (b) Where all the examiners agree that the manuscript has met the required standards pending minor corrections of a technical nature, the Dean shall authorise the supervisor, via the HoD, to communicate with the candidate to ensure that the necessary revisions are affected; and shall, on receipt of the candidate's revision report and the supervisor's certificate, cause the required documentation to be placed before SENEX for the award of the degree. The candidate shall present an electronic (PDF) copy and a hard copy of the revised manuscript to the supervisor.
- (c) Where
 - (i) the examiners do not agree, or
 - (ii) where one or more examiner requires substantial corrections to be made, or
 - (iii) where one or more examiners expresses reservation that the manuscript has not met the required standards, or
 - (iv) where the examiners agree that the required standards have been met, but hold materially diverse views as to the quality of the work (e.g. one examiner indicates mere pass while the other indicates a distinction),the Dean shall establish an assessment committee to consider the way forward.

8.6.6 The assessment committee shall comprise:

- (a) The Dean or a Deputy Dean (Chairperson)
- (b) The HoD
- (c) The supervisor(s)
- (d) Two members of faculty with extensive research and/or supervision experience

8.6.7 Having considered the examiners and the supervisor's reports, the assessment committee may

- (a) refer the manuscript to the candidate, via the supervisor, with specific instructions regarding additional work that might be required and/or the nature of the revisions that need to be effected
- (b) refer to the manuscript for arbitration
- (c) invite the candidate to an oral examination before an appropriately-approved panel of examiners
- (d) The examiners' reports, or parts thereof, may in the Dean's discretion be made available to the candidate.
- (e) The names of the examiners may not be revealed to the candidate until the entire process has been completed

8.6.8 Proper minutes and records of all assessments and examination related committee meetings shall always be kept for ease of later reference/s

8.7 The revision process

8.7.1 Having revised the manuscript, the candidate shall present an electronic (PDF) copy and hard copy of the revised manuscript to the supervisor, together with a report indicating the revisions that were made and how the examiners' comments were addressed.

8.7.2 Thereafter the supervisor shall

- (a) If the examiners required that the revisions be made to the satisfaction of the supervisor, sign a certificate to that effect and present the revised manuscript, the candidate's report, the supervisor's certificate, all the examiners' reports and any other relevant documentation to the Dean, via the HoD, for submission to an assessment committee, which may, but need not, comprise the same members as any previously-constituted assessment committee.
- (b) If the examiners required that the revisions be made to the satisfaction of any other person, obtain a certificate to that effect from such person, and follow the same process as set out in clause 8.7.2(a)
- (c) If one or more of the examiners required that the manuscript to be resubmitted to that examiner, an electronic copy or on request of the examiner a soft bound copy of the manuscript, and a candidate's revision report will be presented to the HoD for submission to the examiner(s), following the processes set out in this policy. On receipt of the examiner report(s), the Dean shall constitute an Assessment Committee to review the documents.
- (d) Upon completion of corrections, the faculty must produce proof of corrections signed by both the candidate and the supervisor before permission to submit a final print can be granted

9 PROCEDURE FOR AWARDING POSTGRADUATE DEGREES

9.1 Process

9.1.1 Upon receiving a revised manuscript the Faculty board Post Grad assessment committee may

- (a) Recommend to SENEX that the manuscript/dissertation/thesis be accepted, and that the degree be awarded
- (b) Refer the manuscript back to the candidate for further revision, in which event the procedures set out in this policy shall again be followed
- (c) Invite the candidate to an oral examination before an appropriately-approved panel of examiners

- (d) Recommend to SENEX that the manuscript be rejected and that the degree not be awarded, or
- (e) Decide on any other appropriate action.

9.1.2 SENEX may:

- (a) Confirm that the manuscript be accepted, and that the degree be awarded
- (b) Confirm that the manuscript be rejected, and that the degree be not awarded
- (c) Refer the manuscript back to the candidate for further revision, in which event the procedures set out in this policy shall again be followed
- (d) Refer the matter back to the faculty for the candidate to be invited to an oral examination before an appropriately-approved panel of examiners, or (e) Decide on any other appropriate action.

9.2 General

9.2.1 Only SENEX, having considered the recommendations of the relevant faculty board or an assessment committee, may confirm on behalf of Senate that a postgraduate degree may be awarded.

9.2.2 The Registrar's Division shall implement SENEX's decisions and notify the candidate, the Dean and the HoD accordingly.

9.2.3 All SENEX decisions regarding the award or non-award of a postgraduate degree must be tabled at Senate for endorsement.

9.2.4 Upon being notified by the Registrar that the manuscript has been accepted, the candidate shall then submit an electronic PDF version of the final manuscript and two leather-bound copies to the Examinations Office, who will then distribute them to the Library, and the student's supervisor. A candidate's degree certificate shall be withheld until such time as the Director, Library Services has confirmed that an electronic version of the thesis has been submitted to the Library.

10 ARBITRATION

10.1.1 An assessment committee or the Higher Degrees Committee may in appropriate circumstances, e.g., where examiners materially disagree on the quality of a manuscript, where:

- (i) there is a discrepancy margin of more than 15% or
- (ii) a mark differential does materially affect the outcome of the thesis/dissertation, (from a pass to fail, or ordinary to distinction) refer a matter for arbitration.

- 10.1.2 Subsequent to 10.1.1, where a need arises to appoint an Arbiter / Arbitrator, the original copy of the thesis / dissertation that was originally submitted for assessment, must be submitted to the arbiter / arbitrator
- 10.1.3 The Higher Degrees Committee shall approve the arbitrator, who must not only meet the minimum requirements stipulated for examiners but must in addition be an experienced academic in the field.
- 10.1.4 The arbitrator shall consider the original manuscript, all the examiners' reports, and any other relevant information or work relating to the research project, for example, compositions, designs or artefacts.
- 10.1.5 The arbiter may in addition make use of an oral examination as part of the process of reaching a decision on the awarding of the degree.
- 10.1.6 The decision of the arbiter as to whether the candidate should pass or fail is the final step in the assessment process, and is subject only to confirmation by SENEX (9) The mark given by the arbiter is the final mark of the examination.

ANNEXURE A: CANDIDATE'S ORIGINALITY DECLARATION (RESEARCH PAPERS, MINI-DISSERTATIONS, DISSERTATIONS AND THESES)

ORIGINALITY DECLARATION

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Full Names and Surname | |
| Student Number | |
| Title of dissertation/thesis | |

I acknowledge that I have read and understood the University's policies and rules applicable to postgraduate research, and I certify that I have, to the best of my knowledge and belief, complied with their requirements.

In particular, I confirm that I had obtained an ethical clearance certificate for my research (Certificate Number UZREC) and that I have complied with the conditions set out in that certificate.

I further certify that this research paper/ mini-dissertation/ dissertation/ thesis is original, and that the material has not been published elsewhere, or submitted, either in whole or in part, for a degree at this or any other university, except as follows:

(Where part of the work has been published elsewhere, or where the work is a continuation or progression of research that was submitted for another degree, e.g. an Honours project or a Master's dissertation this must be stated clearly, the name of the work must be provided, and an explanation must be given regarding the extent of the current work's originality.)

I declare that this research paper/mini dissertation/dissertation/ thesis (***delete that which is not applicable***) is, product from the supervisory guidance received, the product of my own work and effort. I have, to the best of my knowledge and belief, complied with the University's Plagiarism Policy and acknowledged all sources of information in line with normal academic conventions.

I have/have not subjected the document to the University's text-matching and/or similarity-checking procedures. *(One could indicate that this process applied only to some chapters or that it occurred during the course of the research and not in respect of the final product.)*

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Candidate's signature | |
|------------------------------|--|

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Date | |
|-------------|--|

ANNEXURE B: SUPERVISOR'S CONSENT, WITH HOD AND DEAN'S ENDORSEMENTS, TO SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT FOR EXAMINATION

CONSENT TO SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT FOR EXAMINATION

(To be completed separately by supervisors and co-supervisors)

I hereby confirm that the manuscript of the following candidate has been submitted for examination

- With my consent
- Without my consent, for the reasons indicated in the attached document
(Delete that which is not applicable, and attach document if the second option is selected)

My consent implies that I believe that

- The candidate has complied with institutional policies, in particular the Research Ethics Policy, and the conditions, if any, specified by the University's Research Ethics Committee ☐ The manuscript meets the required standards and is ready for assessment

My consent does not imply or guarantee that the examiners will hold a similar view and that the examination process will be successful.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Full Names and Surname | |
| Student Number | |
| Degree | |
| Name of Supervisor | |
| Supervisor e-mail address | |
| Name of Co-supervisor | |
| Co-supervisor e-mail address | |
| Title of dissertation/thesis | |
| Supervisor's signature | |
| Date | |

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT AND DEAN'S ENDORSEMENT

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| To the best of my knowledge, the University Rules and the procedures stipulated in the Postgraduate Assessment Guide have been adhered to in respect of the above-mentioned candidate. | | | |
| Name of HoD/Dean | Department/Faculty | Signature | Date |
| | | | |
| | | | |

ANNEXURE C: CANDIDATE'S NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A DISSERTATION OR THESIS FOR EXAMINATION

The Head of Department
 Department of
 Faculty of
 University of Zululand

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT FOR EXAMINATION

I hereby give notice that I aim to submit my dissertation/ thesis for examination. I undertake to inform the University immediately in the event of a delay in submitting the manuscript by the date stipulated above.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Full Names and Surname | |
| Student Number | |
| Intended date of submission | |
| Degree | |
| Name of Supervisor | |
| Supervisor e-mail address | |
| Name of Co-supervisor | |
| Co-supervisor e-mail address | |
| Title of dissertation/thesis | |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Candidate's signature | |
| Date | |

ANNEXURE D: REQUEST TO APPOINT EXAMINERS

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR/COURSE CO-ORDINATOR

These templates apply to requests for the appointment of examiners for candidates registered for doctoral studies, Master's by (full) dissertation, Master's by mini-dissertation and Honours papers.

Please note: Where the candidate is a staff member or a relative of a staff member, the information must be kept confidential and under no circumstances must the candidate be made aware of who the examiners are. Supervisors and Heads of Department must complete the templates and provide the information to the Faculty Dean who deals with the matter on behalf of the faculty committee and who then provides the information to the Research Office. The examiner information must not be placed on the agenda of any committee. (Only the first template with the candidate's particulars, but without the examiner information.) The Chairperson of the Higher Degrees Committee will make an oral presentation to the HDC regarding the examiners.

REQUEST TO APPOINT EXAMINERS

Department of

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| S Number | | | |
| Name of Student | | | |
| Student number | | | |
| Degree | e.g. D Phil, MA (Community Work) | Course Code | |
| Thesis/ Dissertation Title | | | |
| Department | | | |
| Faculty | | | |
| Supervisor | | | |
| Co-supervisor | | | |
| Examiner 1 | Prof xxx | | |
| Current position | e.g. Professor and Head of Department of Chemistry, University of Botswana, Botswana | | |
| Reason for choice | | | |
| Examiner 2 | Prof xxx | | |
| Current position | | | |
| Reason for choice | | | |
| Examiner 3 | Prof xxx | | |
| Current position | | | |
| Reason for choice | | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Examiner 4 (alt.) | Prof xxx | | |
| Current position | | | |
| Reason for choice | | | |
| | Name | Signature | Date |
| Principal Supervisor | | | |
| Head of Department | | | |
| Dean of Faculty | | | |

Examiner's abbreviated CV

Please note: The abbrev. CV in the form below must be compiled by the supervisor. The examiner's CV from which this information has been extracted must be sent to the Research Office.

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| Examiner's Name | Prof xxx | | | |
| Current position | Professor, Department of Sociology, Unisa | | | |
| Highest Qualification | D Ed | Year obtained | 2019 | |
| Academic Profile | 1990-1998 | Teacher | | |
| | 1999-2005 | Lecturer, Department of Sociology, NMMU | | |
| | 2006-2007 | Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology, UKZN | | |
| | 2008-2010 | Associate Professor of Sociology, UKZN | | |
| | 2010 to date | Professor and Head of Department of Sociology, Unisa | | |
| Field(s) of Expertise | Gender Studies | | | |
| | Rural Development | | | |
| Explanation of how the examiner's expertise is relevant to this study | | | | |
| Research output | Journal Articles | 34 | Books | 2 |
| | International Conference Papers | | Other Conference Papers | |
| | Research Projects | | Technical Reports | |
| | Other (specify) | | | |
| Relevant Research Experience (e.g. membership of professional bodies, editorial boards, etc) | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|---|----------|---|
| Supervision record: current | Master's | 7 | Doctoral | 2 |
| Supervision record: completed | Master's | | Doctoral | |
| Examining record | Master's | | Doctoral | |
| Any other relevant information | | | | |

ANNEXURE E: EXAMINERS' CONFIDENTIALITY/NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

I, the undersigned,

have agreed to assess a Master's dissertation/Doctoral thesis (delete which is not applicable), hereinafter referred to as "the manuscript", for the University of Zululand (UNIZULU) entitled

submitted by

I realise that I might in the course of my duties acquire knowledge of confidential information and intellectual property arising from or associated with the research towards the manuscript, and that the University would wish to protect such information and intellectual property.

I hereby agree:

1. That "confidential information" in terms of this undertaking shall mean any and all information, know-how and data, technical or non-technical, which relates to the

manuscript that I have acquired either in written form or orally in the course of executing my duties as an examiner/assessor of the manuscript.

2. Not to disclose, publish or in any other manner make known any such information to any third party without the express written approval of UNIZULU's Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Research and Innovation, or his or her authorised representative, unless such information falls within one of the following exceptions:
 - a. where such information can be proved to have been in my possession prior to my having received the manuscript for assessment
 - b. where such information can be proved to have been rightfully given to me from sources independent of UNIZULU
 - c. where it can be shown that such information has become part of the public domain.
3. Not to make use of such information for any reason or any purpose other than in the execution of my duties as an examiner/assessor.
4. Not to do or allow anything to be done which might compromise the interests of UNIZULU, its industry partner/s, or its student/s in respect of any intellectual property rights flowing from the confidential information.
5. That this Agreement shall be valid for a period of ten (10) years from the date of disclosure.
6. That the laws of South Africa will apply in governing, interpreting, and enforcing any rights and obligations arising from, or relating in any manner to, this Agreement.
7. That no amendment or modification to this Agreement shall be effective unless it is in writing and signed by both myself and UNIZULU's Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Research and Innovation, or his or her authorised representative.

SIGNED at _____ on this _____ day of

SIGNATURE

ANNEXURE G: ASSESSMENT SHEET – HONOURS PAPER



University of Zululand

ASSESSMENT SHEET: HONOURS PAPER

The following information must be completed by the Course Coordinator:

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Candidate: | Date of first registration: |
| Degree and nature of qualification: | Student number: |
| Title: | Nationality: |
| Supervisor: | Submission date to exam's office: |
| Co-supervisor: | Submission date to examiner: |
| Name: Examiner and Institution: | Contact e-mail of examiner: |

Examiners are requested to use the following key when assessing the various aspects of the study. NB: Scores are not intended to add to a 100%:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Poor (less than 40%) | Below average (40% to 49%) | Average (50% to 64%) | Good (65% to 74%) | Excellent (above 75%) |

Section A: Title and research focus / topic

1. Does the title cover the topic meaningfully?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

2. Does the title align with the central research problem / research questions / hypothesis?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

3. Does the title assist meaningfully in the demarcation of the research topic?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section A:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section B: Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study:

4. Does the paper demonstrate an adequate knowledge base in a discipline or field which demonstrates sufficient knowledge in the research conducted?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

5. Does the candidate provide evidence of an understanding of the principles and theories used in the study?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

6. Does the candidate demonstrate an ability to analyse and/or critique current research?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

7. Does the candidate show an ability to make sound theoretical judgments based on evidence?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Brief Comments on Section B:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section C: Methodological challenges and research process

8. Is the methodological orientation of the paper aligned to the theoretical conceptual orientation of the study? 9. Does the candidate illustrate an understanding of research methods, techniques and technologies to address the research problem in this paper?
10. Does the paper indicate that the candidate has dealt sufficiently with the methodological challenges? 11. Where relevant, does the candidate demonstrate an ability to select, apply and manage appropriate statistical software, instruments and experimental techniques in the analyses of quantitative data or research samples?
12. Does the paper reveal efficient and effective information retrieval and processing skills?

Comments on Section C:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section D: Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings

13. Does the paper reveal the identification, analysis, synthesis and evaluation of quantitative and / or qualitative data?
14. Does the paper demonstrate that the candidate has shown an ability to engage with current research in the discipline or field of research?
15. Does the paper demonstrate an ability to present and communicate academic / professional work appropriate to the context and level of the study and come to a conclusion?

Comments on Section D:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section E: Technical and ethical requirements

16. Does the paper comply with the technical, language and scholarly writing requirements / standards, e.g. referencing techniques as would normally be associated with this level of research and professionalism?
17. Does the paper demonstrate ethical sensitivity as well as evidence of how the research has been conducted in this context?
18. Do the sections within the paper form a meaningful and

integrated unit?

Comments on Section E:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section F: Concluding remarks:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section G: Recommendation

| | |
|--|-------------|
| | |
| The paper should be awarded the following percentage mark: | % |
| I confirm the content of the above assessment and that, in conducting the assessment, I was not at any stage placed in a conflict-of-interest situation. | |
| | |
| Signature | Date |

ANNEXURE H: ASSESSMENT SHEET – COURSEWORK MASTER’S MINIDISSERTATION



University of Zululand

ASSESSMENT SHEET: COURSE WORK MASTER’S MINI-DISSERTATION

The following information must be completed by the Course Coordinator:

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Name of Candidate: | Date of first registration: |
| Degree and nature of qualification: | Student number: |
| Title: | Nationality: |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| Supervisor: | Submission date to exam's office: |
| Co-supervisor: | Submission date to examiner: |
| Name: Examiner and Institution: | Contact e-mail of examiner: |

Examiners are requested to use the following key when assessing the various aspects of the study: NB: Scores are not intended to add to a 100%:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Poor (less than 40%) | Below average (40% to 49%) | Average (50% to 64%) | Good (65% to 74%) | Excellent (above 75%) |

Section A: Title and research focus / topic

- Does the title cover the topic meaningfully?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
- Does the title align with the central research problem / research questions / hypothesis?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
- Does the title assist meaningfully in the demarcation of the research topic?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section A:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section B: Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study:

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Does the mini-dissertation demonstrate an adequate knowledge base in a discipline or field which demonstrates sufficient knowledge in the research conducted? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Does the candidate provide evidence of an understanding of the principles and theories used in the study? 6. Does the candidate demonstrate an ability to analyse and critique current research and advance scholarship? 7. Does the candidate show an ability to make sound theoretical judgments based on evidence which lead to advanced thinking? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section B:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section C: Methodological challenges and research process

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | Is the methodological orientation of the minidissertation aligned to the theoretical conceptual orientation of the study? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Does the candidate illustrate an understanding of research methods, techniques and technologies to address the research problem in this mini-dissertation? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Does the mini-dissertation indicate that the candidate has mastered the application of the methodological challenges sufficiently? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Where appropriate, does the candidate demonstrate the ability to select, apply and manage appropriate statistical software, instruments and experimental techniques in the analyses of quantitative data or research samples? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Does the mini-dissertation reveal efficient and effective information retrieval and processing skills? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section C:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section D: Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13. | Does the mini-dissertation reveal the identification, analysis, synthesis and evaluation of quantitative and / or qualitative data? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Does the mini-dissertation demonstrate that the candidate has shown an ability to engage with current research in the discipline or field of research? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | Does the mini-dissertation demonstrate an ability to present and communicate academic / professional work appropriate to the context and level of the study and come to a conclusion? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section D:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section E: Technical and ethical requirements

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. | Does the mini-dissertation comply with the technical, language and scholarly writing requirements / standards, e.g. referencing techniques as would normally be associated with this level of research and professionalism? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Does the mini-dissertation demonstrate ethical sensitivity as well as evidence of how the research has been conducted in this context? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. | Do the chapters form a meaningful and integrated unit? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section E:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section F: Concluding remarks:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section G: Recommendations

Please select one of the following options:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | That the mini-dissertation be accepted unconditionally with a percentage mark of | % |
|---|--|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | That the mini-dissertation be provisionally accepted on condition that the candidate makes corrections of a limited extent to the satisfaction of the supervisor, with a percentage mark of | % |
| 3 | That the mini-dissertation be not accepted in its current form and that it must be referred back to the candidate for major revision after which it should be resubmitted for examination. The examiner should indicate if available to re examine | |

Section G: Consent and declaration

Do you agree to your name being divulged to a successful candidate?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you agree to a successful candidate being shown your examiner's report?

Yes ☐ No ☐

I confirm the content of the above assessment and that, in conducting the assessment, I was not at any stage placed in a conflict of interest situation.

| | |
|------------------|-------------|
| | |
| Signature | Date |

ANNEXURE I: ASSESSMENT SHEET – MASTER'S DISSERTATION

University of Zululand

ASSESSMENT SHEET: RESEARCH MASTER'S DISSERTATION

The following information must be completed by the Course Coordinator:

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Candidate: | Date of first registration: |
| Degree and nature of qualification: | Student number: |
| Title: | Nationality: |
| Supervisor: | Submission date to exam's office: |
| Co-supervisor: | Submission date to examiner: |
| Name: Examiner and Institution: | Contact e-mail of examiner: |

Examiners are requested to use the following key when assessing the various aspects of the study: NB: Scores are not intended to add to a 100%:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Poor (less than 40%) | Below average (40% to 49%) | Average (50% to 64%) | Good (65% to 74%) | Excellent (above 75%) |

Examiners are further requested to attach a report to this assessment form to supplement the comments made herein. (written in the institutional letter head)

Section A: Title and research focus / topic

1. Does the title cover the topic meaningfully?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

2. Does the title align with the central research problem / research questions / hypothesis?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

3. Does the title assist meaningfully in the demarcation of the research topic?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section A:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section B: Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study:

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Does the dissertation reveal originality of approach or involve original research? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Does the dissertation demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge base in a discipline or field which demonstrates a depth of knowledge in the research conducted? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Does the candidate provide evidence of an understanding of the principles and theories used in the study? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Does the candidate demonstrate the ability to analyse and critique current research and thus advance scholarship in the dissertation? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Does the candidate show an ability to make sound theoretical judgments based on evidence which lead to epistemologically thinking? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section B:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section C: Methodological challenges and research process

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. | Is the methodological orientation of the dissertation aligned to the theoretical conceptual orientation of the study? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Does the candidate illustrate an understanding of a range of research methods, techniques and technologies and an ability to select these appropriately for the research problem in this study? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Does the study indicate that the candidate has mastered the application of the methodological challenges? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | If appropriate does the candidate show an ability to identify, analyse and deal with complex and/or real world problems using evidence-based solutions and theory-driven arguments? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Does the candidate, where relevant, demonstrate the ability to select, apply and manage appropriate statistical software, instruments and techniques in the analyses of quantitative data or research samples? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | Does the study reveal efficient and effective information retrieval and processing skills? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section C:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section D: Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. | Does the dissertation reveal the identification, critical analysis, synthesis and independent evaluation of quantitative and / or qualitative data? | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | Does the dissertation demonstrate that the candidate has shown an ability to engage with current research and scholarly or professional literature in the discipline or field of research? | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. | Does the dissertation demonstrate an ability to present and communicate academic / professional work effectively appropriate to the context and level of the study and come to a cohesive conclusion? | | | | | |

Comments on Section D:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section E: Technical and ethical requirements

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. | Does the dissertation comply with the technical, language and scholarly writing requirements / standards, e.g. referencing techniques as would normally be associated with this level of research and professionalism? | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. | Does the dissertation demonstrate ethical sensitivity as well as evidence of how the research has been conducted in this context? | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. | Do the chapters form a meaningful and integrated unit? | | | | | |

Comments on Section E:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section F: Concluding remarks:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section G: Recommendations

Please select one of the following options:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | That the dissertation be accepted unconditionally with a percentage mark of | % |
| 2 | That the dissertation be provisionally accepted on condition that the candidate makes corrections of a limited extent to the satisfaction of the supervisor, with a percentage mark of | % |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 3 | That the thesis be provisionally accepted pending more substantial corrections, to be made to the satisfaction of the examiner, or a specified person or body other than the supervisor, after which a percentage mark will be allocated. <u>Specify person/body:</u> | % |
| 4 | That the dissertation be not accepted in its current form and that it must be referred to the candidate for comprehensive revision and / or expansion, as per my attached report, after which it should be resubmitted for examination | |
| 5 | That the dissertation should not be accepted and the degree be not awarded | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|----|--|
| The degree should be awarded with distinction | Yes | | No | |
|---|-----|--|----|--|

Section G: Consent and declaration

Should the other examiner so suggest, could you agree to the degree being awarded with distinction?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you agree to your name being divulged to a successful candidate?

Yes ☐ No ☐

| | |
|--|-------------|
| I confirm the content of the above assessment and that, in conducting the assessment, I was not at any stage placed in a conflict-of-interest situation | |
| | |
| Signature | Date |

ANNEXURE J: ASSESSMENT SHEET – DOCTORAL THESIS

University of Zululand

ASSESSMENT SHEET: DOCTORAL THESIS

The following information must be completed by the Course Coordinator:

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Candidate: | Date of first registration: |
| Degree and nature of qualification: | Student number: |
| Title: | Nationality: |
| Supervisor: | Submission date to exam's office: |
| Co-supervisor: | Submission date to examiner: |
| Name: Examiner and Institution: | Contact e-mail of examiner: |

Examiners are requested to use the following key when assessing the various aspects of the study: NB: Scores are not intended to add to a 100%:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Poor (less than 40%) | Below average (40% to 49%) | Average (50% to 64%) | Good (65% to 74%) | Excellent (above 75%) |

Examiners are further requested to attach a report (written in the institutional letter head) to this assessment form to supplement the comments made herein.

Section A: Title and research focus / topic

1. Does the title cover the topic meaningfully?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

2. Does the title align with the central research problem research questions / hypothesis?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

3. Does the title assist meaningfully in the demarcation of the topic?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section A:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section B: Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study:

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Does the candidate in the thesis demonstrate without doubt expertise and specialist knowledge in the discipline or field or body of knowledge? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Does the candidate further indicate that the thesis has been done at the forefront of the discipline, field or professional practice contributing to new knowledge in the field / discipline? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Does the candidate illustrate an ability to contribute through the thesis to scholarly debates at the cutting edge of an area of specialization nationally and internationally? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Does the thesis show clear evidence of an ability to apply knowledge, theory and research methods creatively to complex practical, theoretical and epistemological problems? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 9. Does the thesis reveal substantial, independent study and advanced scholarship resulting in the (re) interpretation and expansion of knowledge which is judged publishable by peers? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments on Section B:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Section C: Methodological challenges and research process

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Does the candidate illustrate and apply a critical understanding of the most advanced research methodologies, techniques and technologies in the research field? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Does the thesis illustrate an ability to identify, conceptualise, design and implement research that addresses complex problems at the cutting edge of a discipline / field? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Does the thesis indicate that the candidate has mastered the methodological challenges sufficiently? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

13. If appropriate, does the candidate show an ability to identify, analyse and deal with complex and/or real world problems and issues using evidence based solutions and theory-driven arguments?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
14. Does the candidate, where relevant, demonstrate the ability to select, apply and manage appropriate statistical software, instruments and techniques in the analyses of data or research samples?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
15. Does the thesis reveal efficient and effective information retrieval and processing skills?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section C:**Section D: Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings**

16. Does the thesis reveal the identification, critical analysis, synthesis and independent evaluation of quantitative and/or qualitative data?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
17. Does the thesis show that the candidate has shown an ability to engage critically with current research and scholarly or professional literature in the discipline or field of research?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
18. Does the thesis demonstrate an ability to present and communicate academic/professional work effectively appropriate to the context and level of the study?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
19. Does the candidate show an ability in the research of advanced information retrieval and processing skills and an ability to independently undertake a study and evaluation of the literature and current research?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
20. Does the thesis demonstrate the ability to effectively present and communicate the results of research and opinion to specialist audiences nationally and internationally using the full resources of an academic/professional discourse and come to a cohesive conclusion?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section D:**Section E: Technical and ethical requirements**

21. Does the thesis comply with the technical, language and scholarly writing requirements / standards, e.g. referencing techniques as would normally be associated with this level of research and professionalism?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
22. Does the thesis demonstrate ethical sensitivity as well as evidence of how the research has been conducted in this context?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

23. Do the chapters form a meaningful and integrated unit?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Comments on Section E:**Section F: Concluding remarks:****Section G: Recommendations**

Please select one of the following options:

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | That the thesis be accepted unconditionally | |
| 2 | That the thesis be provisionally accepted on condition that the candidate makes corrections of a limited extent to the satisfaction of the supervisor | |
| 3 | That the thesis be not accepted in its current form and that it must be referred back to the candidate for comprehensive revision and / or expansion, as per my attached report, after which it should be resubmitted for examination | |
| 3 | That the thesis be provisionally accepted pending more substantial corrections, to be made to the satisfaction of the examiner, or a specified person or body other than the supervisor, after which a percentage mark will be allocated. <u>Specify person/body:</u> | |
| 4 | That the thesis be not accepted in its current form and that it must be referred back to the candidate for comprehensive revision and / or expansion, as per my attached report, after which it should be resubmitted for examination | |
| 5 | That the thesis should not accepted and the degree be not awarded | |

Section G: Consent and declaration

Do you agree to your name being divulged to a successful candidate?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Would you like feedback on the examination outcome

Yes No.....

I confirm the content of the above assessment and that, in conducting the assessment, I was not at any stage placed in a conflict of interest situation.

| | |
|------------------|-------------|
| | |
| Signature | Date |

**ANNEXURE J: CONSOLIDATION
MINI-DISSERTATION**
COURSEWORK MASTER'S
FACULTY OF
**CONSOLIDATION OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS COURSEWORK MASTER'S MINI-
DISSERTATION**

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Surname of Candidate | | Initials | |
| Student number | | Degree | |
| Title of the mini dissertation | | | |
| Principal Supervisor | | | |
| Co-supervisor | | | |
| Internal examiner | | | |
| External examiner/moderator | | | |

RECOMMENDATION AND CONFIRMATION OF ALLOCATED MARK

| | |
|---|----------|
| I confirm that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the attached consolidated summary per section reflects the views of the examiners the candidate has made all the corrections that the examiners suggested, as per the candidate's revision report (attached) the University's rules and policies have been adhered to in examining the abovementioned mini-dissertation | |
| I recommend that the mark reflected in the attached consolidated summary be accepted as the final mark to be awarded to the above-mentioned mini-dissertation | |
| Principal supervisor's signature | |
| Date | |
| I support the supervisor's recommendation | |
| Signature of Head of Department | |
| Date | |
| I confirm that the Faculty Assessment Committee awarded the following final mark to the abovementioned mini-dissertation | |
| | % |

OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS –

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Signature of Dean | |
| Date | |

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY PER SECTION

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|
| <u>Section A:</u> Title and research focus / topic | | | | |
| <u>Section B:</u> Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study | | | | |
| <u>Section C:</u> Methodological challenges and research process | | | | |
| <u>Section D:</u> Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings | | | | |
| <u>Section E:</u> Technical and ethical requirements | | | | |
| General remarks | | | | |
| Marks awarded | Internal examiner | % | External examiner | % |
| Recommended final mark to be awarded to the mini-dissertation | | | | % |

Attachment: Candidate's revision report

ANNEXURE K: CONSOLIDATION

MASTER'S DISSERTATION

FACULTY OF

CONSOLIDATION OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS MASTER'S DISSERTATION

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Surname of Candidate | | Initials | |
| Student number | | Degree | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Title of the dissertation | |
| Principal Supervisor | |
| Co-supervisor | |
| Examiner (1) and affiliation | |
| Examiner (2) and affiliation | |

RECOMMENDATION AND CONFIRMATION OF ALLOCATED MARK

| | | | |
|--|--|------------|-----------|
| I confirm that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the attached consolidated summary per section reflects the views of the examiners the candidate has made all the corrections that the examiners suggested, as per the candidate's revision report (attached) the University's rules and policies have been adhered to in examining the abovementioned dissertation | | | |
| I recommend that the mark reflected in the attached consolidated summary be accepted as the final mark to be awarded to the above-mentioned dissertation | | | |
| Principal supervisor's signature | | | |
| Date | | | |
| I support the supervisor's recommendation | | | |
| Signature of Head of Department | | | |
| Date | | | |
| I confirm that the Faculty Assessment Committee awarded the following final mark to the abovementioned dissertation and has recommended that the degree be awarded | | | % |
| The Committee recommends a distinction | | Yes | No |
| Signature of Dean | | | |
| Date | | | |

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY PER SECTION

OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS –

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|
| Section A: Title and research focus / topic | | | | |
| Section B: Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study | | | | |
| Section C: Methodological challenges and research process | | | | |
| Section D: Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings | | | | |
| Section E: Technical and ethical requirements | | | | |
| General remarks | | | | |
| Marks awarded | Examiner (1) | % | Examiner (2) | % |
| Recommended final mark to be awarded to the dissertation | | | | % |
| Examiners' recommendation on whether the degree should be awarded with distinction | | | | |
| Examiner (1) | Yes | | No | |
| Examiner (2) | Yes | | No | |
| Recommend that the degree should be awarded with distinction | Yes | | No | |

Attachment: Candidate's revision report

ANNEXURE L: CONSOLIDATION

DOCTORAL THESIS

FACULTY OF
CONSOLIDATION OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS
DOCTORAL THESIS

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Surname of Candidate | | Initials | |
| Student number | | Degree | |
| Title of the thesis | | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Principal Supervisor | |
| Co-supervisor | |
| Examiner (1) and affiliation | |
| Examiner (2) and affiliation | |
| Examiner (3) and affiliation | |

RECOMMENDATION AND CONFIRMATION OF ALLOCATED MARK

| | |
|--|----------|
| I confirm that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the attached consolidated summary per section reflects the views of the examiners the candidate has made all the corrections that the examiners suggested, as per the candidate's revision report (attached) the University's rules and policies have been adhered to in examining the abovementioned thesis | |
| Principal supervisor's signature | |
| Date | |
| I recommend that the degree be awarded | |
| Signature of Head of Department | |
| Date | |
| I confirm that the Faculty Assessment Committee has recommended that the degree be awarded | |
| | % |
| Signature of Dean | |
| Date | |

CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY PER SECTION

| | |
|--|--|
| Section A: Title and research focus / topic | |
|--|--|

OF EXAMINERS' REPORTS –

| | | | | |
|---|------------|--|-----------|--|
| <u>Section B:</u> Conceptual and theoretical focus and quality of the literature study | | | | |
| <u>Section C:</u> Methodological challenges and research process | | | | |
| <u>Section D:</u> Conclusion, synthesis and the presentation of findings | | | | |
| <u>Section E:</u> Technical and ethical requirements | | | | |
| General remarks | | | | |
| Examiners' recommendations on whether the degree should be awarded | | | | |
| Examiner (1) | Yes | | No | |
| Examiner (2) | Yes | | No | |
| Examiner (3) | Yes | | No | |

Attachment: Candidate's revision report