

Arbiter’s Decision on Pass/Failure of Masters Dissertation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty |  | | | |
| Department |  | | | |
| Degree |  | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Student Surname |  | | **Student No** |  |
| First Names |  | | **Title (Mr, Ms)** |  |
| **Title of Dissertation** |  | | | |
| 100% research dissrtation |  | **50% course-work dissertation** | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supervisor |  | Title |  |
| Co- Supervisor |  | Title |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Arbiter |  | Title |  |
| Position |  | Qualifications |  |
| **Affiliation of Arbiter** |  | | |

**SUMMARY OF EXAMINERS’ REPORTS*:* TO BE COMPLETED BY HOD/CHAIRPERSON OF FRC *BEFORE THE FORM IS SENT TO THE ARBITER***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EXAMINERS’ RECOMMENDATIONS (as on PG 8)** | | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| **Yes/No** | **Yes/No** | **Yes/No** |
| Did the Examiners state that the dissertation shows knowledge and understanding of the subject? | |  |  |  |
| Did the Examiners find the the presentation and the literary style adequate? | |  |  |  |
| Did the Examiners find the work adequate for the award of the qualification? | |  |  |  |
| **COMPLETE SECTIONS A, B AND/OR C (according to what each Examiner recommended):** | |  |  |  |
| A. | Did the Examiners unreservedly recommend the award of the Master’s Degree? |  |  |  |
| B. | Did the Examiners recommend the award subject to: |  |  |  |
| (i) Editorial corrections (style/format/grammar/spelling)? |  |  |  |
| (ii) Minor revision of reporting/claims/findings/ recommendations? |  |  |  |
| (iii) Minor expansion of arguments/analysis? |  |  |  |
| C. | Did the Examiners recommend outright rejection? |  |  |  |

**ARBITER’S RECOMMENDATION TO FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE/HIGHER DEGREES COMMITTEE**

**(Please tick)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I recommend that the student should: | **PASS** |  |
| **FAIL** |  |
| In the case of a pass, I recommend the award subject to:  undertaken to the satisfaction of the: | Editorial corrections |  |
| Minor revision of reporting/claims/findings/ recommendations |  |
| Minor expansion of arguments/analysis |  |
| Supervisor |  |
| HoD |  |
| Executive Dean |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rationale for recommending a failure (if applicable):** | | **Please tick** |
| A. | The dissertation fails to meet the University’s criteria for a pass as indicated by the Guidelines for Examiners (below). |  |
| and/or  B. | The dissertation fails to meet the standard generally expected of a masters. |  |
| and or/  C. | The examiners’ reports show compelling reasons for failure. |  |
| and/or  D.  (other) | [*Kindly provide* *a* ***brief*** *explanation: this can be expanded in the Arbiter’s written report*.] |  |

***Each Arbiter is required to attach a written report motivating the decision reached (i.e. pass/fail) based on the following evidence:***

* the DUT criteria for assessment (see p. 3 below)
* the examination copy of the dissertation
* the examiners’ reports

**Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

(Arbiter)

**Signed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

(Chairperson: Faculty Research Committee)

**DUT CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF THESIS/DISSERTATION**

**Requirements in respect of a Masters dissertation and a Doctoral thesis:**

The difference between a Masters dissertation and a Doctoral thesis is mainly in the size, scope, sophistication and originality of the research.

**GUIDELINES FOR EXAMINERS**

|  |
| --- |
| **Content:**   1. Title  * Clear, concise, contains all necessary key words.  1. Research problems and aims  * Clear, specific, relevant to the topic.  1. Literature review  * Comprehensiveness and relevance of the literature review.  1. Research methodology/design  * Appropriateness, explanation and application of the research design used to investigate the problem; correlation with the research question (or problem).  1. Analysis and interpretation  * Data analysis methods, arguments presented logically and relevant  1. Relevance of the research area and delimitation of the field investigated. 2. Conclusions that suggest satisfactory personal insights in the field.   **Technical aspects:**   * Layout (chapters) and flow of information. * Language (syntax, writing style) and presentation (language editing, layout, use of appendices). * Consistency of referencing style (in-text and bibliography). * Functionality of figures and tables. * Specific matters (if any) which, in your opinion require correction, revision or further development. Please furnish a list on an additional page/s or indicate in the examiner’s copy and return to the Supervisor/HoD.   ***Note to Arbiter:***  **Overall impression:** *A clear motivation should be supplied here, to support the Arbiter’s decision of* ***EITHER*** *a pass* ***OR*** *a failure. Please note that no other options are permissible.* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Routing** | **HoD** |  | **FRC** |  | **HDC** |  |

***KINDLY ATTACH THE ARBITER’S WRITTEN REPORT TO THIS FORM.***