

MUHIMBILI UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH AND ALLIED SCIENCES
DIRECTORATE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES



GUIDELINES FOR SCORING AND GRADING MASTER DISSERTATIONS

1.0 Preamble

The Senate at its meeting held on, approved the following guidelines for examiners of higher degrees theses. The guidelines require examiners to give comprehensive and critical review of the dissertation/thesis. In the course of doing this, the examiner should draw the attention of the Senate Higher Degrees Committee (SHDC) to such circumstances and factors as he/she feels the committee should be made aware of. The examiner's report should be compiled using the following general format: -

1.1. Abstract

Does the student provide a synopsis of the study? Is the abstract structured into Background, Aim/Broad objective, Materials & Methods (summarizing study type, population, data collected, method of collection and analysis plan), Results and Conclusion? **(Maximum score: 5)**

2.0 Introduction

2.1. Background (Maximum score: 5)

This section must assess the general overview given about the study topic.

2.2 Problem statement (Maximum score: 5)

Does the student clearly state the nature of the problem and its magnitude? How concise is it? Is there reference to the issues detected in the background? Does the problem have an analytical link with its associated factors? Does it clearly indicate the knowledge gap that the study has addressed? Does the problem magnitude focus on the target population? Is the problem statement articulated with the objectives?

2.3 Rationale (Maximum score: 2)

Does the student clearly indicate the possible utilization of the generated findings?

2.4 Research Questions & Objectives (Maximum score: 5) Questions

Are the research questions posed to address the knowledge gap to be filled by the study?

2.5. Objectives

Are the objectives SMART and set out to address knowledge gaps identified in the problem statement? Are the objectives in support of the study title? Do specific objectives capture all elements of the study and emanate from the broad objective

2.6 Literature Review (Maximum score: 15)

Is the review provided according to the objectives? Does it provide global, regional and Tanzania perspectives with regard to each objective? Does the review depict what is known and unknown with respect to each objective? Does the review tail- off with a knowledge gap? Are paragraphs mounted to describe concepts and sequenced in a logical flow? Is literature citation done according to the recommended style? Are all facts supported by authentic references that are well listed in the reference list? Check if there is any evidence of plagiarism in presenting the literature review.

3.0 Materials and Methods (Maximum score: 10)

Has the student indicated the study type, study sample and how it was drawn? Have assumptions for selecting the sample been clearly stated? Indicate whether the student has used an appropriate approach to investigate the subject and has not neglected other methods, which could have yielded better results. Assess for adequacy and relevance of data collected and the appropriateness of tools and instruments. Are threats to validity and reliability addressed? Is the data analysis plan provided in accordance with each specific objective?

4.0 Results (Maximum score: 15)

Evaluate for the adequacy of data analysis in providing answers to each objective; suitability of the way results is presented; accuracy, transparency and contributions from the study.

5.0 Discussions (Maximum score: 15)

Does the student discuss his/her own findings and relates them to other researched work? Does the writer show honesty and transparency in discussing limitations? Does the student apply scientific reasoning to relate study findings to the available theories/body of knowledge relevant to the field of study? Does the student discuss his/her findings in view of practical utility of the findings?

6.0 Conclusions (Maximum score: 5)

Does the conclusion emerge from student's own work? Does the conclusion provide answers to the research question? Does the study stimulate further inquiry or scholarship?

7.0 Recommendations (Maximum score: 3)

Does the student provide realistic recommendations which are articulated to his/her research findings?

8.0 Originality of Contribution (Maximum score: 5)

Please, state clearly whether the thesis makes an original contribution to the existing body of knowledge. For a PhD/doctoral degree the contribution must be significant, worthy of for example 4-5 papers. To qualify for a doctorate, there should be strong evidence that the subject displays scientific maturity and mastery of the subject

9.0 Literature Citation (Maximum score: 5)

Has the student made use of available, current and relevant literature? Does this adequately enrich the background, literature review and discussion? Has the student exercised due diligence in scholarly bibliographic write-up?

10.0 Overall presentation final (Maximum score: 5).

Indicate whether the student has presented the data in a logical flow and concise manner for example with cross-references to other sections, and with specific objectives following through appropriate methods leading to the results and discussion of each objective, thus ensuring that conclusions can be logically drawn from the information gathered. Is the abstract providing a Synopsis of the study? Does the presentation provide the flavour of scholarly and professional output?

11.0 Grading of Dissertation.

Record total score given for the written dissertation on MUHAS/PG.F7. Grading of the written dissertation shall follow the universal grading system of the University.

Letter grade	Marks range (%)	Grade point	Qualitative value
A	75-100	4.4-5.0	Excellent
B+	70-74	3.5-4.3	Very Good
B	60-69	2.7-3.4	Good
C	50-59	2.0-2.6	Marginal Fail
D	0-49	0-1.9	Fail

N.B: the score will be computed to contribute 50% of the final dissertation score as narrated under section 2.6 (iv).

12.0 Corrections or Revision

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

13.0 Final Evaluation

Using MUHAS/PG.F7, and in line with the quantitative score given, please state frankly and without ambiguity whether the dissertation:

- a) Passes and is worthy of the degree award in the present form;
- b) Passes and is worthy of the degree award after effecting minor corrections indicated in section 12.0 to the satisfaction of the Supervisor and Head of Department;
- c) Passes, subject to major revisions according to your suggestions in section 12.0 to the satisfaction of internal and external examiner/moderator.
- d) Is not accepted, but may be re-submitted for re-examination after major correction as outlined in section 12.0 to the satisfaction of internal and external examiner/moderator;
- e) Is not worthy of the award and is rejected outright