

## ANNEX (PHD EVALUATION FORMATS)



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY  
የድክረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
School of Graduate Studies (SGS)



### PhD Proposal/Dissertation Supervisor Approval Form (SGS-PhD: Form 002)

#### Student Information

Student/candidate name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student/ candidate ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Expected Year of Graduation: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of PhD program: \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Title: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### Student Agreement

I declare that I have incorporated all the comments given by examining board/panel of experts and presented my final version of doctoral dissertation/proposal document to my supervisor for final defense.

Name of candidate \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### Supervisor

I certify that I have examined the final copy of the above candidate's doctoral research proposal/dissertation and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects, and that all revisions required by the student have been made. Accordingly, I approved his/her proposal/dissertation for oral defense and examination.

Name of supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



**የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ**  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
**የድካረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት**  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**Recommendation of Department Graduate Council**  
**(SGS-PhD: Form 007- 3A)**

College \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

***We member of the Department Graduate Council ascertain that in view of the following:***

1. Date of first registration in the Ph.D. programme: \_\_\_\_\_  
 If more than four years have been taken, please make sure evidence is provided for:
  - (i) Extension of time granted up to \_\_\_\_\_
  - (ii) Minutes No. & date on which the last extension was granted: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Have completed all course works with no pending issues: *qualified/ not qualified*
2. Publication status: *Published one and acceptance one*
3. Open seminar/conference carried as transferable skill development: *yes/no*
4. Two copies of the pre-submission draft for review by the members of the Department graduate council: *yes /no*
5. The draft pre-submission follows the format provided by the formatting manual: *yes/ no*
6. Exactly the same title (including case, capitalization etc.) should appear on the thesis as that of the Proposal defence as confirmation for candidature: *Yes / No*
7. Ensure that the copies are duly certified by the supervisor and are properly written following the guidelines for writing the thesis: *Yes/no*
8. Have been checked that the thesis is free of Plagiarism: *yes/no*

***The candidate is a fit /not fit to submit.***

**Members of the Graduate Council:**

- |          |                 |            |
|----------|-----------------|------------|
| 1. _____ | Signature _____ | Date _____ |
| 2. _____ | Signature _____ | Date _____ |
| 3. _____ | Signature _____ | Date _____ |
| 4. _____ | Signature _____ | Date _____ |
| 5. _____ | Signature _____ | Date _____ |

Name and signature of the head of the department \_\_\_\_\_

Name and signature of the Dean/Vice Dean of the College \_\_\_\_\_



**የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ**  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
**የድኩረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት**  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**Checklist for Pre-Viva Evaluation form**  
**(SGS-PhD: Form 007-3 B)**

College \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

Name of candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Title \_\_\_\_\_

Pre-viva date: \_\_\_\_\_ Name and Signature of examiner: \_\_\_\_\_

	Criteria	Yes	No	Evaluative Remark of the examining professor/panel
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>			
	Are the objectives based on in-depth literature review?			
	Does the thesis clearly mention focus, scope and limitation?			
<b>2</b>	<b>Literature</b>			
	Does the candidate show familiarity with, and understanding of, the relevant literature?			
	Is the literature survey up-to-date and exhaustive?			
	Does the review critically argue findings and or methods from previous work?			
	Are the research gaps clearly identified?			
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology</b>			
	Is the methodology adopted up-to-date?			
	Is the methodology adopted described exhaustively?			
	Is justification on use of the specific method or model convincingly provided?			
	Is the limitation of the method explained adequately?			
	Are the key aspects of the sampling adequately discussed? Is justification for sample size provided?			
	Are issues of reliability and validity well managed?			
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis, results and discussions</b>			
	Does the thesis demonstrate analytical rigor up to par with PhD dissertation?			
	Are the results adequately justified?			
	Is validation comparison with theory or previous work provided?			

<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>			
	Are the conclusions supported by the findings?			
	Are the conclusions clearly spelt out by way of answering the research questions or providing results of hypothesis testing?			
	Is the thesis placed in terms of the existing theory?			
	Is adequate justification for the use of the specific theoretical framework provided?			
	Does the candidate provide adequate explanation which previous studies closely match his/her? Where he/she does differ?			
<b>6</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>			
	Is policy implication of the findings or theoretical implication explicitly stated?			
	Are the findings generalizable?			
<b>7</b>	<b>References</b>			
	Is the citation of references done in the standard format?			
	Are the references relevant and adequate to the work?			
	Are all references cited in the list?			
<b>8</b>	<b>Documentation of thesis</b>			
	Is the flow of writing logical?			
	Is the line /thread/ of argumentation goes along the whole thesis?			
	Language use, grammar, syntax and mechanics are up to par with PhD dissertation?			
<b>9</b>	<b>Major contributions</b>			
	Does the study come out with original knowledge addition in this area of research?			
	Is the thesis on track to meet the academic standards that make it suitable for submission and examination?			
	In the view of the Panel, will the thesis be ready for submission within two months?			
	If not, what is the realistic timeframe until completion?			
<b>10</b>	<b>Way forward</b>			
	Is direction for future research provided as continuation of the dissertation findings?			

Name and signature of Examiner \_\_\_\_\_



Pre viva evaluation form (Continued)  
(SGS-PhD: Form 007-3C)

**SECTION A: To be filled by the candidate**

**Students Information**

Candidates name	
ID Number	
College	
Department	
Programme	
Supervisors' name (Main)	1.
Co-supervisors	2.
Dissertation Title	
Date of Pre-viva	

**SECTION B: Results of Evaluation**

(To be filled by the panel of examiners based on the evaluation results as shown in the attached evaluation form SGS-PhD: Form 007-3A)

Satisfactory evaluation result with minor corrections and recommended for final defense  
**Remark:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Satisfactory result with major corrections and recommended for final defense  
**Remark:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Satisfactory evaluation but with major modification and recommended for final defense  
**Remark:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Not satisfactory evaluation result and not recommended for final defense  
**Remark:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Name and signature of examiners**

S.No	Name	Sign	Date
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
 የድክረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**Pre-Viva List of correction form  
 (SGS-PhD: Form 007-3D) page 1-3**

College \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

**Section A: to be filled by the candidate and checked by examiners**

Name of candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Pre-viva date: \_\_\_\_\_

No.	List of corrections	Amendment in the thesis	Page/justification

No.	List of corrections	Amendments in the thesis	Page/justification

**Section B: Verification by main supervisor and co supervisor (if applicable)**

I am satisfied with the corrections made by the candidate as listed in the corrections form and therefore agree for the candidate to submit his/her draft thesis for oral examination (viva-voce).

**Approved by supervisor:**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Approved by co supervisor (if applicable)**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section C: Verification by examiners

I am satisfied with the corrections made by the candidate as listed in the corrections form and therefore agree for the candidate to submit his/her draft thesis for oral examination (viva-voce).

#### Approved by Examiner 1:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Approved by Examiner 2

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section D: Verification by Dean/Vice Dean

I am satisfied with the corrections made by the candidate as listed in the corrections form and therefore agree for the candidate to submit his/her draft thesis for oral examination (viva-voce).

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section E: Verification by Department

I hereby confirm the candidate has submitted:

	PhD ( __ copies of draft thesis)
	Correction form
	Draft thesis submission form
	Abstract of published and accepted articles
	Ethical clearance (if applicable)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Designation \_\_\_\_\_

(stamp)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_





**የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ**  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
**የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት**  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**REQUEST FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF EXAMINATION COMMITTEE**  
**(SGS-PhD: Form 003)**

We, hereby declare that the following external examiner and internal examiners have been approached and agreed to take part in the examination and oral defence of the dissertation here under stated. We kindly seek your approval.

Name of Candidate:		ID #:	Department:
Dissertation Title:			
Name of supervisor:			
Name of Co-supervisor:			
Suggested external and internal examiners		Cell Phone No.	E-Mail
Name of External Examiner1			
Name of External Examiner2			
Name of internal examiner			
Proposed Date of Oral Examination:			
Proposed Venue of Oral Examination:			
Attached here with please find the biographical data including academic achievements, publications and experience of the external examiners and also the abstract of the thesis.  <i>Name of Supervisor :</i> _____  <i>Date and signature:</i> _____			



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
 የድካረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**PhD Dissertation and Defense Evaluation Form (SGS-PhD: Form 007)**

*This page should be filled by the student or Committee Chairperson prior to the distribution to the Committee*

**Name of the Candidate:** .....

**Name of the Examiner** .....

**Name of the Advisor:**.....

**Date:**.....

**Dissertation Title:**.....

At the conclusion of the defense, **each examiner should fill up the response sheet**. For each aspect which an examiner feels that the candidate is somewhat weak or deficient, a short explanation should be provided (SGS-PhD: Form 007-Annex A). **Major Comment** section at the bottom of the form is provided for explanation of the reasoning behind the overall evaluation of the examinee’s performance. A summary of **written comments** of the examiner should be provided to the student by the **Academic Vice Dean**. Also, a verbal summary of the overall evaluation of the student’s performance by the examiner should be provided to the student. Completed forms are to be treated as **confidential** and should be sent only to **the Office of the College Academic Vice Dean** and the **School of Graduate Studies**.

All the examination documents (forms and written comments) must be completed regardless of the outcome of the exam / the Dissertation Defense. A copy of the completed forms (both forms and written comments) must be submitted to the Office of the College Academic Vice Dean, the Director of the School of Graduate Studies within 12 hours of the completion of the exam/ the dissertation defense.

**Form – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(To be completed by each examiner. Please check all the boxes of evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate for each aspect)*

**Part one: Dissertation Evaluation Form**

<b>Sl.No</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	Failed to convey the purpose of dissertation in the context of review of literature. No rationale. Purpose was not focused and unclear.	Vaguely conveyed the purpose of dissertation in the context of review of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.	The purpose of dissertation is moderately conveyed in context of review of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	The purpose of dissertation is conveyed in the context of review of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	The purpose of dissertation is clearly conveyed in the context of review of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Review of Literature</b>	Failed to review the literature relevant to the study. No review of theoretical and empirical studies. No research gaps were identified.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient identification of research gaps.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused identification of research gaps.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including /excluding various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies is apparent.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/ exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Methods / Approach</b>	Little or no description of research design, methods, samples, and proposed statistical analyses.	Inadequate description of research design, methods, samples, and proposed statistical analyses.	Moderate description of research design, methods, samples, and proposed statistical analyses.	Good description of research design, methods, samples, and proposed statistical analyses.	Excellent description of research design, methods, samples, and proposed statistical analyses.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Results / Outcomes</b>	Absence of the presentation of results in accordance with the research questions and stated hypotheses. Tables are either absent or poorly presented. . No analysis of data.	Inadequate presentation of results in accordance with the research questions and stated hypotheses. Tables are not properly presented. . Inadequate data analysis	Somewhat satisfactory presentation of results in accordance with the research questions and stated hypotheses. Tables are properly presented. Somewhat satisfactory data analysis	Good presentation of results in accordance with the research questions and stated hypotheses. Tables are comprehensively presented. Good analysis of data.	Excellent presentation of results in accordance with the research questions and stated hypotheses. Tables are comprehensively presented. Excellent data analysis.	

Name and signature of examiner: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>5</b>	<b><i>Discussion and Summary</i></b>	Little or no discussion of findings/outcomes. Poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by the findings/outcomes.	Inadequate discussion of findings/outcomes. Poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by the findings/outcomes.	Moderate discussion of findings/outcomes. Inadequate grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not adequately supported by the findings/outcomes.	Good discussion of findings/outcomes. Good grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary supported by the findings/outcomes.	Excellent discussion of findings/outcomes. Very good grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary well supported by the findings/outcomes	
<b>6</b>	<b><i>Writing Quality</i></b>	The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar and spelling reflect poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative is absent. Incorrect use of APA style	The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of the latest version APA style	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Inconsistent application of the latest version APA style	The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is good. Word choice, grammar and spelling are good. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of the latest version of AP style	The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is well framed. Word choice, grammar, punctuation and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of the latest version APA style.	
<b>Note:</b> Excellent >85 , Very Good 75< x < 85 , Good 60< x < 75 , Satisfactory 50< x < 60 , Fail <50 (ECSU Senate Legislation 2017)							

\_\_\_\_\_/30 = \_\_\_\_/70

Name and signature of examiner: \_\_\_\_\_

### Part two: Oral Defense Evaluation Form

<i>Sl.No</i>	<i>Content</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<i>Score</i>
<b>1</b>	<b>Organization</b>	Lacked sequence in presentation or missed information. Presented too little/much material for the allotted time.	Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information was not presented. Presentation not well timed.	Some information presented but out of sequence. Had some pacing and timing problems.	Information presented was nearly complete, relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing were appropriate.	Information presented was complete and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Originality</b>	Problem/purpose lacked creativity or not new. Duplication of previous work. Design/approach is inappropriate and/or ignored previous well- established work in the area.	Problem/purpose is limited in originality and creativity. Design/approach only marginally appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose moderately original or creative. Design/approach is moderately appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose fairly original or creative. Design/approach is appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose very creative or original with new and innovative ideas. Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes. Design/approach introduced	
<b>3</b>	<b>Significance/ Authenticity</b>	The dissertation has no significance/authenticity to the field and will make no contribution	The dissertation has little relevance or significance/ authenticity to field and will make little contribution	The dissertation has only moderate relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution.	The dissertation has fair relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a good contribution.	The dissertation is extremely relevant or has significant importance/authenticity to field and will make an important contribution.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Discussion and summary</b>	Little or no discussion of findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Few inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion is sufficient and with few errors. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included no recommendations	Discussion is superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	Presenter was unsettled, uninterested, and unenthused. Presentation was read. Inappropriate voice mannerism, body language, and poor communication skills. Poor quality of slides/presentation materials; did not enhance presentation/performance	Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerism, body language, and communication skills sometimes were inappropriate. Poor quality of slides/presentation material; poor enhancement of presentation/performance.	Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Read small parts of material. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerism, body language, and communication skills. Moderate quality of slides/presentation materials.	Relied little on notes. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Good quality of slides/presentation materials; enhanced presentation/performance.	Relied little on notes. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerism, body language, and communication skills. Exceptional slides/presentation quality materials; greatly enhanced	

**Note:** Excellent >85 , Very Good 75< x < 85 , Good 60< x < 75 , Satisfactory 50< x < 60 , Fail <50 (ECSU Senate Legislation 2017)       /25 =       /30

Name and signature of examiner: \_\_\_\_\_

## Examiner's summary

No.	Examining Board Member	Written dissertation (70%)	Oral examination (30%)	Overall assessment (100%)	Remark
1	External examiner				
2	Internal examiner				

**Note:** Excellent >85 , Very Good 75< x < 85 , Good 60< x < 75 , Satisfactory 50< x < 60 , Fail <50 (ECSU Senate Legislation 2017)

**I certify that I have examined the final copy of the above student's doctoral dissertation and have:**

- Accepted with minor correction:** *This requires accepting the thesis/dissertation with no any significant change/revision on editorial, language and content wise issues. The thesis/dissertation accepted with minor correction that can be corrected and submitted within few days of the examination*
- Accepted with major editorial correction:** *This decision of acceptance with major editorial corrections demands significant revisions or corrections related to formatting, editorial and language cases. The scientific approaches, research procedures, the quality and content of the thesis/dissertation may not have a serious problem.*
- Accepted with major modification:** *The decision of acceptance with major modification requires the student to conduct major re-work in some or major parts of the thesis/ dissertation that may include both major editorial problems and content revisions or changes.*
- Rejected:** *This option is decided under two major reasons. First, when the thesis/dissertation work does not meet the standards or quality requirements for the level of the study to award the required degree. Second, when there is justified evidence of plagiarism, falsification or fabrication of data or some or all parts of the research work.*

**Examiner:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Chair's Report Form (Annex 007 A)

No	Examining member	Overall assessment (100%)	Weight	Remark
1	(External examiner)		X 0.6=	
2	(External examiner)			
3	(Internal examiner)		X0.4=	
4	(Internal examiner)			
	Total/whole examining board			

**Note:** Excellent >85 , Very Good 75< x < 85 , Good 60< x < 75 , Satisfactory 50< x < 60 , Fail <50 (ECSU Senate Legislation 2017)

### Examining Board Members

External examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 External Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Internal Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Internal examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### **Summary of Major Comments by Board of Examiners ( Can also be an attachment)**

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

## Decision Summary

The Examining Board after a thorough discussion has/ unanimously/with only one dissent/ has passed the decision rating the dissertation as:

**Accepted with minor correction:** This requires accepting the thesis/dissertation with no any significant change/revision on editorial, language and content wise issues. The thesis/dissertation accepted with minor correction that can be corrected and submitted within few days of the examination

**Accepted with major editorial correction:** This decision of acceptance with major editorial corrections demands significant revisions or corrections related to formatting, editorial and language cases. The scientific approaches, research procedures, the quality and content of the thesis/dissertation may not have a serious problem.

**Accepted with major modification:** The decision of acceptance with major modification requires the student to conduct major re-work in some or major parts of the thesis/ dissertation that may include both major editorial problems and content revisions or changes.

**Rejected:** This option is decided under two major reasons. First, when the thesis/dissertation work does not meet the standards or quality requirements for the level of the study to award the required degree. Second, when there is justified evidence of plagiarism, falsification or fabrication of data or some or all parts of the research work.

External examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson \_\_\_\_\_ signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_






**4. Analysis Results / outcome**


**5. Discussion & summary**


**6. Writing skills**


Name of examiner \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



## Quick reference for Procedures in PhD dissertation defense

The Examination Board (EB) for doctoral dissertation defence shall have three and a maximum of five members composed of mainly two external examiners and one internal examiner. The rest members include the supervisor and an independent chairperson (CP).

An examiner evaluates a dissertation by filling a form (SGS-PhD: Form-007)

### VIVA VOCE

#### 1. Preliminary meeting of examiners

It is carried in adjoining room to the defence hall while guests wait in their seats and the candidate gets ready his/her presentation in the defense hall (*to be completed before 8:45 A.M.*). Its purpose is to agree on the structure and format for the viva including phasing, time budgeting and order of questioning among examiners. The CP first introduces the EB members to each other and makes sure all those present understand the procedures to be followed. The supervisor upon invitation of the CP will provide a profile of the candidate's background, course work, and publication record if any.

#### 2. Inside the viva hall

Members of the EB enter the viva hall led by the event organizer (8.50 A.M.). The CP subsequently welcomes guests, introduces members of the examining board and the PhD candidate and title of the dissertation. The CP gives briefing on the rule of the viva<sup>1</sup>. Then the CP invites the candidate to start his presentation (9:00 A.M.)

The candidate will be given 30 minutes of presentation followed by a maximum of 90 minutes of questions-and-answers session. Examiners will be allowed a 10 minute question period in turn, with the

opportunity to have a second round of questioning.

The role of CP is basically to ensure that the viva is conducted in a professional manner and that each examiner has the opportunity to ask questions.

The CP intervenes in the examining process only if there appears to be bias, misconduct, unfairness or if the examiners are diverting from the agreed format or if she/he believes is progressing in a manner which could compromise academic standards.

#### 3. Post-Viva discussion

EB members would take retreat (11:00 A.M.). The CP also chairs the post-viva discussion of the examiners and assisting them in the formulation of recommendation. She/he ensures that the examiners complete and sign the relevant forms at the end of the viva. The CP will return the completed form immediately after the event to the Office of the Academic Dean of the respective college and the School of Graduate Studies.

#### 4. Announcing the results

EB members come back to the Viva Hall (11:20 A.M.). Once the candidate and members of the public have taken their seats again, the members of the board will rise and the Chair will announce the qualification decided by the examiners, which may be: fail, satisfactory, good, very good or excellent. If the PhD is awarded with an overall classification of 'excellent', the dissertation may be considered for *cum laude* distinction.

The CP ensures that the recommendation of the examiners is conveyed to the student and make sure the student is clear as to what may be required of her/him. The Chair will then draw the proceedings to a close. The event organizer invites the whole party to the refreshment hosted by the University.

<sup>1</sup>To turn off their mobile phones and any other audiovisual device, only examiners are allowed to use laptops. Questioning by guests is prohibited only PhD members of the public can be allowed by the CP.

**Door will be closed for the public after 8:50 A.M.**

**Ethiopian Civil Service University**  
**School of Graduate Studies**  
**Contract Agreement for Internal PhD Dissertation Examiner**

This contract is concluded between the Ethiopian Civil Service University, here in after called the employer and \_\_\_\_\_ herein after called the \_\_\_\_\_ PhD Dissertation Examiner, on the following terms where necessary subject to rules and policies of the Ethiopian Civil Service University.

**Section 1**

**Obligations of Dissertation Examiner**

1. He/She shall examine the PhD dissertation of \_\_\_\_\_ candidates.
2. In the course of the examination the examiner shall make a thorough review of the dissertation and prepare all necessary comments and feedback to the Office of Academic vice dean of the respective college and the SGS.
3. He/she shall ensure that the examinee has produced satisfactory work, i.e. the dissertation qualifies as a partial fulfillment of the requirement for Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

**Section 2**

**Obligations of The employer**

4. The employer shall provide all facilities including desktop and printing facilities.
5. The employer shall verify the schedule ahead of time information on all possible changed in due time.

**Section 3**

**Payment**

6. The payment shall be an honorarium of Birr \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_\_) Birr per PhD dissertation examined which makes the total of \_\_\_\_\_ Birr for the entire service.
7. The payment shall be made only for PhD dissertation actually examined.

**Section 4**

**Penalty**

Where the examiner, save a force majeure, is in breach of the obligation under section (1) and Sub. (2) of this contract and fails to complete the examination of the assigned PhD dissertation, the candidate(s) he/she shall not be entitled to the payment prescribed under section (3).

**Section 5**

**Termination**

The employer shall have a unilateral right of termination of the contact upon 5 working days notice. This contact shall be effective as of \_\_\_\_\_.

**Ethiopian Civil Service University (Employer)**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Employee**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

CC. \_\_\_\_\_

**College/School of Graduate Studies**

\_\_\_\_\_  
•Procurement, Finance and Property  
Directorate



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
 የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**Title / Concept Note Approval (SGS-PhD: Form-005)**

This form is to be accompanied by a two-page typewritten description of the proposed research, including, topic/title, problem statement and purpose of the study.

To the student: Submit a signed copy of this form to academic unit/department before you begin work on your proposal. The academic unit will not accept this form until they have read and approved by your advisor. The academic unit forwards with its comment to the respective Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee gives decision on the approval, modification or rejection decision.

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **ID#** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title/Topic:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Supervisor**

I have examined the attached research title, problem statement and purpose of the study (concept note) with respect to both content. In my judgment, the presented topic is researchable, manageable attainable, and worthy to do it. I hereby certify that it is a good topic to be researched.

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>Advisor Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
_____		

<b>Head Academic Unit (name)</b>	<b>signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
_____	-----	-----



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY  
የድካሚ ምረቃ ጥምህርት ቤት  
School of Graduate Studies (SGS)



**Supervisor's Approval Form for Masters Proposal/Thesis  
(SGS-MT: Form 001)**

**Student Information**

Student/candidate name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student/ candidate ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Expected Year of Graduation: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of the program enrolled: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Student Agreement**

I declare that I have incorporated all the comments given by my advisor/examining board/panel of experts and presented my final version of the proposal/thesis document to my supervisor for final defense.

Name of candidate \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Supervisor**

I certify that I have examined the final copy of the above candidate's proposal/thesis and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects, and that all revisions required by the student have been made. Accordingly, I have approved his/her proposal/thesis for data collection/oral defense and examination.

Name of supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY  
የድካሚ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
School of Graduate Studies (SGS)



**Master Thesis Evaluation Form  
(SGS-MT: Form-004)**

Name of the Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_ ID No: \_\_\_\_\_

College: \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_

Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis Title: \_\_\_\_\_

No.	Criteria	Weight	marks
<b>1.</b>	<b>Part 1. Content</b>	<b>75%</b>	
1.1	Title clear, concise and fully reflects the content thereof	5	
1.2	Introduction: motivation, focus and purpose (rationale), sufficient description of context (background)	5	
1.3	Clarity and alignment of problem statement, research questions/hypotheses	5	
1.4	Alignment of research approach, methods, strategy, instrumentation with problem statement	5	
1.5	Knowledge of the relevant literature, familiarity with the main concepts and theories	10	
1.6	Operationalization: clear identification of research variables, data type and data sources, research population, sampling	10	
1.7	Data presentation, application of statistical methods, valid and reliable data analysis techniques and connectivity to findings	10	
1.8	Quality of argumentation, interpretation and discussion of results	10	
1.9	Conclusion by way of answering research questions/results of hypotheses testing	10	
1.10	Prioritized practical recommendations & way forward	5	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Part 2. Form</b>	<b>10%</b>	
2.1	Cover title, names, dates, adherence to format (font, spacing, margins etc.)	2	
2.2	Clarity and quality of text language: spelling, punctuation, grammar	4	
2.3	Use of table, figures and illustrations	2	
2.4	Citations, in-text referencing and appropriate referencing style	2	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Part 3: Presentation</b>	<b>15%</b>	
3.1	Structure of the presentation and use of visual means	2.5	
3.2	Verbal communication, content and argumentation	5	
3.3	Time management	2.5	
3.4	Response to questions	5	
	<b>Total (100%)</b>		

Name of examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature and date: \_\_\_\_\_



የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIV**  
 የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት  
**School of Graduate Studies**



**Master Thesis Evaluation Form  
 (SGS-MT-004)**

**Summary**

Component	External examiner	Internal examiner	chairperson	Total mark (100%)
Part 1+Part 2 + part 3 = (100%)	(*50%) =	(*35%) =	X	
Part 3 (100%)			(*15%) =	
<b>Total (100%)</b>				

**Rating**

	Rank	Score (%)*
1	Excellent	≥ 85
2	Very good	75 ≤ X < 85
3	Good	60 ≤ X < 75
4	Satisfactory	50 ≤ X < 60
5	Fail	< 50

**Comments and Suggestions of Board of Examiners**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Approval Signature**

External examiner's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Internal examiner's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_





**የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ**  
**ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY**  
**የድካሚ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት**  
**School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**



**Title / Concept Note Approval (SGS-PhD: Form-005)**

This form is to be accompanied by a two-page typewritten description of the proposed research, including, topic/title, problem statement and purpose of the study.

To the student: Submit a signed copy of this form to academic unit/department before you begin work on your proposal. The academic unit will not accept this form until they have read and approved by your advisor. The academic unit forwards with its comment to the respective Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee gives decision on the approval, modification or rejection decision.

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **ID#** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title/Topic:**  
 : \_\_\_\_\_

**Supervisor**

I have examined the attached research title, problem statement and purpose of the study (concept note) with respect to both content. In my judgment, the presented topic is researchable, manageable attainable, and worthy to do it. I hereby certify that it is a good topic to be researched.

<b>Advisor Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

<b>Head Academic Unit (name)</b>	<b>signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Graduate committee decision:**

---

---

---

---

---

**Committee Member (name)**

Signature

Date

---

**Committee Member (name)**

Signature

Date

---

**Chairperson Graduate  
Committee (name)**

Signature

Date

## Annex: Progress tracking report format

1. Name of the Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Department/Field of Specialization: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Title Approved (include the date approved):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### 4. Names of Supervisors Assigned (include date assigned)

**Major supervisor:**

**Co-supervisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Date assigned: \_\_\_\_\_

Date assigned: \_\_\_\_\_

### 5. Seminars/Training participated during the planning period

S. no.	Topic of seminar or raining	Date	Place	Organizer
1.				
2.				
3.				
Practical skills/knowledge gained from the seminars/training (helpful for your research)				

**6. Colloquium presentation (Colloquium 1)**

- Date of colloquium presentation: \_\_\_\_\_ Place: \_\_\_\_\_
- Topic of discussion: \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of participants: \_\_\_\_\_

**6.1. Major comments given during colloquium presentation**

---

---

---

---

6.2. If you did not participate in any seminar/training, please provide adequate and satisfactory reasons:

---

---

---

---

7. Based on your plan, provide the main research activities/tasks conducted using table below.

**7.1. Name of the milestone:** \_\_\_\_\_

**7.2. Milestone activities performed**

S. No	Activity planned	Activity executed	Remark (date performed)

7.3. The main comments (feedbacks) given by experts during a milestone session (if applicable)

---

---

---

8. State the major problems/challenges you have faced when executing the milestone (activity plan).

---

---

---

**9. For only the supervisor/s**

9.1. How do you rate the performance of your advisee(student) against his/her plan?

---

9.2. How do you rate the quality of your student's research work? \_\_\_\_\_

9.3. Do you think that your student can complete his/her dissertation research during the regular time schedule (4 years). Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

9.4. If your answer is no, what do you think are the main reasons for this?

---

9.5. If your answer is no, how many extra weeks/months he/she may require to complete?

---

**10. Strengths and weakness of the student**

The main strengths: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Weaknesses \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

I certify that the information provided below is correct and genuine

<b>Student</b>	<b>Supervisor</b>
Name:	Name:
Signature:	Signature:
Date:	Date:

*Note: - This report must be carefully prepared by the student in two copies; one for SGS, one for the department graduate council for further evaluation*