Ethiopian Civil Service University
School of Graduate Studies
(SGS)

Graduate Research Policies and Procedures

Final Version

March 2023

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

By

1. Amsalu Bedemo (Ph.D., Associate Professor)

2. Admassu Tesso (Ph.D., Associate Professor)

3. Tesfa Nega (Ph.D., Assistant Professor

4. Kassa Moges (Ph.D., Assistant Professor)

5. Mrs. Selamawit W/Silasie (Assistant Professor)

6. Melkamu Moshago (Ph.D., Assistant Professor)

7. Belete Ejigu (Ph.D., Assistant Professor)

March 2023

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Table of Contents

1. SECTION ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

1.1.1. Established in 1995, the Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) plays a pivotal role in advancing the transformation efforts of the country's Civil Service in alignment with the nation's development policies and strategies. The ECSU's primary objective is to enhance the capacity of the civil service, operating at both the federal and regional levels which will be achieved through the provision of specialized and professionally oriented education, training, as well as research and consultancy services.

1.1.2. The ECSU aspires to emerge as a foremost center of excellence in public service capacity building across Africa. This vision is pursued through the delivery of tailored and specialized education and training programs for public servants, coupled with extensive research initiatives, consultancy services, and community engagement. The overarching goal is to cultivate an efficient, transparent, and accountable public service that actively contributes to the country's development and transformation agenda.

1.1.3. ECSU has attained the distinction of being categorized among the nine research universities in the country. This designation signifies a concentrated emphasis on delivering graduate programs and extensive research endeavors. Furthermore, it underscores the commitment to producing high-caliber graduates capable of contributing significantly to the university's research initiatives through their thesis and dissertation research works.

1.1.4. Recognizing that the caliber of graduates hinges on the excellence of their thesis/dissertation submissions, crucial for their respective degree program completion, maintaining the university's desired quality necessitates dedicated efforts. It is imperative to focus intensively on initiatives that enhance the quality of graduate research works, ensuring they align with the requisite standards for research quality.

1.1.5. In alignment with these objectives, ECSU has formulated a comprehensive graduate research policy and procedure. This strategic initiative is geared towards enhancing the quality of students' thesis/dissertation writing. The policy document encompasses four pivotal areas: graduate research supervision, progress monitoring, graduate research examination policy, and the management of conflicts of interest associated with graduate research activities within the university. This document elucidates the core policy elements and outlines detailed procedures governing the implementation of graduate research supervision, progress tracking, examination processes, and conflict of interest management.

1.2. Purpose

The primary purposes of this graduate research policy are:

i) Cultivate clarity, consistency, and integrity among graduate students, their supervisors, and examiners throughout the graduate research writing process.

ii) Facilitate the production of high-quality graduate thesis/dissertations by students.

iii) Elevate the overall quality of graduates, aligning with the University's overarching goal of maintaining excellence as a research university.

iv) Integrate our graduate research initiatives with international research standards, fostering internationalization in the university's graduate research practices.

1.3. Scope

1.3.1. This policy document diligently tackles all issues and concerns related to graduate research activities such as supervision, progress tracking, thesis/dissertation examination, and conflict of interest management at ECSU.

1.3.2. This policy holds relevance across all academic graduate programs, encompassing both Masters and PhD levels, and involves graduate students, academic staff members, supervisors, and thesis/dissertation examiners. Its application extends to all colleges and academic units, including departments, schools, and institutes. Furthermore, it pertains to external stakeholders, organizations, and individuals actively engaged in the graduate research writing process of students.

2. SECTION TWO: POLICY ON GRADUATE RESEARCH SUPERVISION

2.1. Background and Purpose

This section of the policy document delineates the qualifications, responsibilities, and requirements for graduate research supervisors. By doing so, it establishes a framework for accountability in graduate research supervision at ECSU, aiming to guarantee candidates receive high-quality guidance.

2.2. Scope

This policy holds relevance for:

2.2.1. All supervisors engaged in graduate research across various modalities and programs.

2.2.2. All candidates undertaking graduate research across diverse modalities and programs.

2.2.3. All colleges, schools, institutes, and departments within ECSU.

2.3. Definition

2.3.1. In this context, "student" refers to individuals enrolled in the University's master's and Ph.D. programs who have not completed their research proposal. Upon successful completion of the proposal and progression to the subsequent research stage, these individuals are officially recognized as "candidates." For the sake of simplicity, the term "candidate" will be consistently used throughout this document.

2.3.2. In the context of this document

- '*Dissertation*' denotes the research work undertaken by PhD students as part of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

- *'Thesis'* denotes the research work conducted by Masters' students as part of the requirements for the Masters' degree.

2.4. Policy Statement

2.4.1. Engaging in graduate research is an essential element of ECSU's overall research initiative and graduate research supervision is a vital undertaking that blends teaching and research expertise. The role of graduate research supervisors is fundamentally pedagogical, focusing on the development of research skills and the generation of research output. The efficacy of this process hinges on the provision of suitable and high-quality supervision to graduate researchers.

2.4.2. Graduate research supervisors are exclusively assigned to candidates who fulfill the academic status prerequisites as stipulated in ECSU Senate Legislation (2017), specifically outlined in article 139.

2.4.3. For all Ph.D. candidates, a mandatory condition is the assignment of at least two supervisors, with one designated as the Principal Supervisor. The Principal Supervisor holds the responsibility for ensuring that the candidate fulfills both administrative and academic requisites for their course. Additionally, every Ph.D. candidate must have a minimum of one co-supervisor.

2.4.4. All master's candidates are mandated to have one supervisor. This supervisor bears the responsibility of ensuring that the candidate satisfies the administrative and academic prerequisites for their course. In exceptional cases, contingent on the nature and complexity of the research, a co-supervisor may be appointed.

2.4.5. Prior to an assignment as a supervisor, all Principal Supervisors are mandated to be officially registered on the Supervisor's Registry System.

2.4.6. Graduate research supervisors are expected to possess the requisite qualifications and experience, coupled with discipline-specific knowledge. This expertise enables them to guide the graduate research candidate's work and impart training in research planning and

execution. It is obligatory upon supervisors to guarantee that candidates receive sufficient and timely support and feedback throughout the duration of their candidature.

2.4.7. Graduate research supervision is a multifaceted task, entailing numerous competing priorities and demands. Each candidature signifies the top of academic education and training, presenting distinct circumstances. Recognizing the complexity of this role, supervisors require continual training and development in supervision and research training. Active engagement with the research community within the pertinent discipline is imperative for delivering high-quality supervision to graduate researchers. Accordingly, ECSU is anticipated to arrange supervision and research training for its faculty. This training, delivered by qualified and experienced professors from research institutions or universities, is crucial for maintaining high standards.

2.4.8. Supervisors, across all levels, are responsible for ensuring that the candidate's research aligns with the ECSU Senate Legislation 2017 and its associated procedures. In the case of Ph.D. candidates, supervisors must additionally guarantee that each candidate publishes at least one article and the second manuscript accepted for publication before the submission of their Ph.D. dissertation. It's noteworthy that while publication is obligatory for Ph.D. candidates, it is not mandatory for master's candidates during thesis submission and graduation.

2.4.9. Candidates are required to obtain prior approval from their supervisors before submitting their manuscript for publication. It is imperative that, unless mutually agreed upon, candidates refrain from seeking sole publication or co-authorship with individuals outside the supervisory team. The order of names on the manuscript, unless otherwise agreed upon, must adhere to the following sequence: candidate's name, principal supervisor's name, and co-supervisor's name.

2.4.10. In accordance with the Graduate Research Progress Tracking Policy, supervisors and candidates are required to convene regularly to oversee and facilitate the progress of graduate research work. Supervisors bear the responsibility of aiding candidates in achieving satisfactory academic progress, providing solutions to challenges, and ensuring timely feedback. Additionally, supervisors must collaborate with candidates to devise a progress support plan.

2.4.11. The DGC/SGC/IGC and the respective heads bear the responsibility of ensuring the uninterrupted continuity of Ph.D. supervision for candidates within their departments. This proactive measure is designed to minimize disruptions to candidate progress in unforeseen changes to supervisory arrangements. Conversely, for master's programs, the responsibility for ensuring supervision continuity and mitigating disruptions to candidate progress in unplanned changes to supervisory arrangements lies with program

coordinators and department heads.

2.4.12. The delineation of responsibilities for both graduate research candidates and supervisors is explicitly outlined in the ECSU Senate legislation and the Graduate Research Progress Tracking Policy.

2.5. Procedures

2.5.1. **Duties and Responsibilities of the Supervisory Team**

2.5.1.1. All supervisors are mandated to provide guidance and direction to candidates. Additionally, they are required to deliver induction training in research planning and execution.

2.5.1.2. Supervisors are required to support candidates in achieving satisfactory research progress and provide solutions to challenges they face in their research endeavors.

2.5.1.3. Supervisors shall be available for scheduled meetings with candidates. On average, communication, whether through email, phone, social media, in-person discussions, or other means, should occur at least once every two weeks.

2.5.1.4. Supervisors should motivate candidates to engage in various professional development opportunities, including workshops, seminars, and faculty research reviews within ECSU and other universities. They are also encouraged to explore industry engagement options such as placements or internships. Additionally, supervisors should promote involvement in intellectual climate activities such as reading groups and regular departmental seminars. Furthermore, supervisors play a crucial role in advising candidates on how and where to seek funding for these activities.

2.5.1.5. The Principal Supervisor role is open to individuals with ECSU employment, adjunct academic staff status, or anyone possessing the required academic rank and experience within universities or research institutions, whether in Ethiopia or abroad. These individuals may be specifically contracted for graduate research supervision through individual agreements or agreements with affiliated organizations.

2.5.1.6. The Principal Supervisor, in collaboration with academic unit heads, takes the lead in guiding the candidate on the comprehensive management of their candidature. They ensure that candidates fulfill all administrative and academic requirements of their course. Additionally, the Principal Supervisor serves as the primary administrative point of contact for the candidate's supervisory team.

2.5.1.7. The Principal Supervisor bears the responsibility of leading the supervisory team and offering disciplinary context for the research project.

2.5.1.8. Upon recommendation by DGC/SGC/IGC, the College dean is responsible for officially recognizing the assignment of supervisors (principal and co-supervisor). This recognition is conveyed through letters that include the name list of the assigned candidates and the anticipated timeline for the completion of the research.

2.5.1.9. Nevertheless, in cases where there is a compelling reason, a co-supervisor from another research institution or university may be appointed. To facilitate this, the head of the academic unit should submit the resume of potential co-supervisors to DGC/SGC/IGC, along with an official request letter justifying the necessity for an external co-supervisor. The DGC/SGC/IGC will evaluate such requests on a case-by-case basis before making a decision to accept.

2.5.1.10. Both internal staff members and those from external higher education, research institutions, or industries, serving as supervisors for both PhD dissertations and Master's theses, must enter into a formal agreement to ensure successful student supervision. The supervision fee for internal staff should be integrated into the semester load. Conversely, for external staff, payment must be carried out according to the completed roadmap.

2.5.2. **Qualifications and Experience of Supervisors**

2.5.2.1. For Ph.D. supervision, all supervisors must hold a doctoral degree and demonstrate extensive research experience, substantiated by numerous publications. Concerning academic rank, the Principal Supervisor is required to be at least an associate professor and should have published an article in a reputable journal within the preceding two years before being appointed as the principal supervisor. Co-supervisors, generally, are also expected to hold an academic rank of associate professor or higher. However, under exceptional circumstances, the DGC/SGC/IGC may propose a co-supervisor with the rank of assistant professor, subject to approval by the College Dean.

2.5.2.2. In the case of master's program candidates, staff/individuals holding an academic rank of assistant professor or higher are qualified to serve as supervisors.

2.5.2.3. Every supervisor must actively participate in research disciplines or fields closely related to the candidate they are supervising. This involvement encompasses ongoing scholarly pursuits, research activities, advancements in practice, continuous engagement in field-relevant practices, and the creation of original contributions that contribute to the understanding of contemporary developments in their respective field or discipline.

2.5.2.4. To qualify for the appointment as a Principal Supervisor for a Ph.D. program, a supervisor must have previously co-supervised at least one or more Ph.D. research candidates to successful completion of their degrees.

2.5.3. Ph.D. candidates at ECSU are restricted from supervising other Ph.D. candidates. However, master's degree candidates have the opportunity to be supervised by ECSU staff members who are doctoral candidates. This is contingent upon the doctoral candidate possessing extensive research and academic experience that meets the criteria outlined for supervising candidates' research, as described earlier.

2.5.4. **Supervisor Registration**

2.5.4.1. Program coordinators are responsible for maintaining records of the Supervisor Register and sharing them with the School of Graduate Studies (SGS). Subsequently, the SGS director will disseminate the same list to the Vice Presidents for Academic as well as Research and Partnership, who oversees the tracking of all Ph.D. research supervisors at ECSU. It is important to note that only individuals listed on the Supervisor Register are authorized to supervise candidates in graduate research.

2.5.4.2. The academic unit heads, program coordinators, and members of DGC/SGC/IGC have the authority to nominate potential supervisors for registration. During this process, the nominee's level of supervision (doctorate and master by research) and their specific roles (Principal Supervisor or Co-supervisor) must be clearly outlined. Additionally, the nominee's relevant experience should be justified in alignment with the criteria described above. Prior to registration on the Supervisor Register Records, program coordinators are required to secure approval from DGC/SGC/IGC for the nominated supervisor.

2.5.4.3. The decision to nominate an individual as a supervisor should be based on careful consideration of the person's research activity or ongoing field-specific practices. This evaluation should encompass their understanding of contemporary developments in the discipline, curriculum vitae, research publications, or other completed research works, research experience, and any other pertinent expertise. Additionally, factors such as experience in research training, evidence of familiarity with research quality, ethics, and safety should be taken into account.

2.5.4.4. At the commencement of each academic year, SGS is mandated to conduct a minimum of one full-day induction workshop for registered Graduate Research Supervisors. During this workshop, a guest expert is anticipated to offer refresher training to the supervisors. The Director for SGS is responsible for delineating the duties and responsibilities of the supervisors and furnishing them with relevant induction resources.

2.5.4.5. As a prerequisite for registration on the Supervisor Register, supervisors are required to have read and comprehended the induction resources provided by SGS that outline their responsibilities.

2.5.4.6. The DGC/SGC/IGC has the authority to remove supervisors from the Supervisor Register

under the following circumstances: if they are no longer actively involved in graduate research supervision at ECSU, if they are no longer actively participating in research-based college or department level assessments, or if instances of academic or general misconduct are identified.

2.5.5. Limits of Supervising

2.5.5.1. The graduate councils of respective academic units decide the suitable number of candidates for each supervisor, considering workload, experience, and capacity for effective supervision. In line with Senate legislation (2017), specifically article 156, a supervisor typically oversees a maximum of five Ph.D. candidates as the principal and an additional five as co-supervisors concurrently. Nevertheless, under no circumstances should a supervisor exceed ten Ph.D. candidates simultaneously. This restriction ensures optimal attention and quality supervision for each candidate.

2.5.5.2. The graduate council of an academic unit has the authority to establish limits on supervising master's program candidates, taking into consideration the number of candidates and the availability of supervisors. However, a key restriction is in place: no supervisor is permitted to oversee more than five candidates in the regular program and ten students from the CEP and summer program simultaneously. In practical terms, this implies a strict maximum of 15 candidates for any supervisor during a given semester, encompassing all programs.

2.5.5.3. The DGC/SGC/IGC may determine alternative supervision limits on a case-by-case taking into account the staff member's workload, experience, and responsibilities.

2.5.6. Professional Development of Supervisors

2.5.6.1. Supervisors are required to be well-versed in their responsibilities, as outlined in the Senate Legislation 2017 and relevant national higher education policies and guidelines.

2.5.6.2. At the commencement of every academic year, the SGS in collaboration with college level coordinators will give formal induction and orientation workshops for both existing and new supervisors.

2.5.6.3. The University anticipates supervisors to actively seek out development and training opportunities in the realm of supervising graduate researchers, aligning with their continuous professional growth within the University's broader performance development framework. The ECSU is required to allocate funds for supervisors' professional development, facilitating short-term training both domestically and abroad.

2.5.7. Appointment of Supervisory Teams

2.5.7.1. Each Ph.D. candidate must have a Principal Supervisor and a minimum of one co-supervisor assigned upon approval of their research title. No student is permitted to embark on their research candidature without having appropriate supervisory arrangements in place.

2.5.7.2. Ph.D. candidates must submit a concept note for their Ph.D. dissertation title to the Ph.D. program coordinator. Candidates are allowed to propose specific scholars for Principal Supervisor and Co-supervisor roles based on their Ph.D. concept note, provided these scholars are included in the current Supervisor Register records. In such instances, the candidate is required to furnish the DGC with written confirmation of the selected supervisors' willingness.

2.5.7.3. In cases where Ph.D. candidates encounter challenges in securing appropriate supervisors independently, the DGC will assign both a Principal Supervisor and a Co-supervisor based on the candidates' field of specialization. Following the review of concept notes, the assignment of the Principal Supervisor and Co-supervisor should be guided by the voluntary agreement of the selected supervisors.

2.5.7.4. For master's program candidates, the program coordinators, in collaboration with the respective department heads, have the authority to assign supervisors based on the supervisors' research and disciplinary backgrounds.

2.5.7.5. The DGC is responsible for initial approval of the appointment of supervisors in their department for all graduate research candidates. This approval considers factors such as the supervisors' experience in graduate research supervision, relevance to the candidate's planned work, and other expertise related to the candidate's research. Additionally, the assessment includes the supervisors' current research activity or ongoing practice in those fields. Following DGC approval, the department head is required to endorse the appointed supervisors to SGS within three working days.

2.5.7.6. In cases where members of the supervisory team belong to different departments, the department head in which the candidate was placed should consult the relevant department heads regarding workload and other considerations in the appointment of the supervisory team. This process requires approval at the DGC/DC level.

2.5.7.7. When an individual on a fixed-term or research-contingent contract is designated as a supervisor for a graduate research candidate, the department head is obligated to ensure that the candidate's overall supervisory team can maintain continuity if the ECSU appointment of one or more supervisors concludes during the candidature. Nevertheless, the candidate assumes responsibility if the research work extends beyond the anticipated completion time.

2.5.7.8. Supervisory tasks and responsibilities can be allocated in any proportion between the Principal Supervisor and co-supervisors as agreed upon by the supervisors. In cases of disagreement, the DGC may assume this responsibility.

2.5.7.9. Graduate research candidates have the option to request changes to their supervisory arrangements at any point, provided their supervisors and DGC endorse the application. The principal supervisor, acting on behalf of the supervisory team, can endorse the request and is accountable for consulting with other team members when necessary. Final approval for the change must be granted by the DGC.

2.5.8. **Conflict of Interest**

2.5.8.1. Supervisors and candidates are required to adhere to the University's Conflict of Interest Policy, as outlined below. In the event of any potential conflicts of interest arising during the supervision of a specific candidate, both supervisors and candidates must promptly inform the DGC. Upholding integrity, supervisors must consistently act in accordance with the University's Conflict of Interest Policy to prevent any doubts about the institution's management practices, thereby safeguarding community trust in research.

2.5.8.2. No individual should be appointed or retained as a supervisor, whether as a Principal or Co-supervisor, if the appointment or continuation is likely to result in a conflict of interest that could potentially compromise the candidate's progress or standing.

2.5.8.3. A supervisor is prohibited from engaging in close personal, intimate, or romantic relationships with candidates. Should such a relationship arise during a candidate's tenure, the supervisor is obligated to declare a conflict of interest, and an alternative supervisor must be appointed without delay.

2.5.9. **Continuity of Supervision**

2.5.9.1. If a supervisor takes leave during a candidate's period of candidature, proactive collaboration with the candidate and DGC is essential. This collaboration aims to establish suitable arrangements ensuring continuity of supervision. This may involve temporarily redistributing supervisory responsibilities among the candidate's other supervisors, considering their availability throughout the leave period.

2.5.9.2. If a candidate's supervisor is no longer able to provide supervision under this policy or is on leave for one month or more, including participation in an external studies program, it becomes the responsibility of the DGC to establish alternative supervisory arrangements in consultation with the graduate researcher. To prevent any lapses in supervision, these interim measures must be implemented promptly and should not exceed ten (10) working days. Such measures may involve appointing an acting supervisor, introducing additional

supervisors, or reallocating supervisory workload among the candidate's other supervisors while seeking a suitable permanent arrangement.

2.5.9.3. The department head is required to inform the SGS with a minimum of one week's notice about any modifications to a candidate's supervisory arrangements. This notification should include details about the alternative arrangements that will be implemented and whether any gap in supervision is anticipated.

2.5.10. **Resolving Supervisory Problems**

2.5.10.1. Given the distinctive nature of graduate research and research training, encountering challenges during a graduate research candidature is not uncommon. These challenges may arise due to communication issues or misalignment of expectations among the involved parties.

2.5.10.2. In instances where challenges arise, hindering productive collaboration between a candidate and a supervisor or within a supervisory team, all parties involved are encouraged to seek advice promptly to address these issues, ideally within ten working days.

2.5.10.3. To address supervision concerns, all the parties are encouraged to seek guidance and assistance from the relevant program coordinator, department head, or the candidate's advisory team as needed. If necessary, any party has the option to arrange independent mediation or seek advice at any time from the SGS.

2.5.10.4. Candidates, supervisors, or other staff members have the option to formally report concerns related to graduate research supervision to either the relevant program coordinator or the department head. Upon receiving such a report, the program coordinator or department head is expected to notify each other within five working days. Initially, they may attempt to address concerns related to graduate research supervision through consultation with the involved parties.

2.5.10.5. In addition to the steps outlined above, graduate research candidates may lodge a formal complaint at the department level at any time.

2.5.10.6. After investigating reported issues in graduate research supervision, the DGC may propose the following actions to the department head and SGS.

i) No further action is necessary.

ii) Resolve reported issues with easily manageable solutions; provide the supervisor support to enhance their supervisory practices.

iii) Impose restrictions or additional requirements on the supervisor, such as limiting the number of candidates they can supervise or temporarily prohibiting the allocation of new candidates.

iv) Implement an alternative supervisory arrangement for the involved candidate, as

required by the DGC and the department.

v) Remove the involved supervisor from the Supervisor Register.

vi) Refer the matter to the university disciplinary committee for a comprehensive review, following the conflict-of-interest policy and other relevant policies.

2.5.10.7. Supervisors can file a written appeal with the SGS within ten working days of receiving the determination. If facing deregistration, supervisors may submit a written appeal to the Director of SGS within the same timeframe. If dissatisfaction persists after the appeal, supervisors have the option to pursue a review through the University Ethics and Anti-Corruption Office.

2.5.10.8. In the event of a DGC convening, the Associate Dean will collaborate with affected graduate research candidates to offer support, aiming to minimize any impact on academic progress. Additionally, the Associate Dean will facilitate alternative supervisory arrangements as needed.

3. SECTION THREE: GRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRESS TRACKING POLICY

3.1. Background

3.1.1. The Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU) has established a mandatory policy for tracking the progress of graduate research work. This policy entails monitoring and recording students' advancements each semester, coupled with providing support to those facing challenges and falling behind in the roadmap.

3.1.2. The implementation of this policy is driven by the recognition that a structured system with mutually agreed-upon expectations and well-defined requirements can contribute to a reduction in students' completion time and mitigate misunderstandings between supervisors and supervisees. The graduate research journey involves various milestones, and tracking students' progress becomes essential to ensure timely completion of their study programs.

3.2. Purpose and Scope

3.2.1. The graduate research progress tracking policy delineates critical milestones in the research journey, establishes key measures for monitoring students' research progress, and provides guidance on support plans. Its primary objective is to monitor and assess students' advancement in their research work, offering support as they navigate through the various stages. This policy proves beneficial for reviewing students' progress in the preceding semester or year and planning for upcoming activities in their research journey.

3.2.2. In terms of scope, this policy applies to:

i) All graduate research students, including both Master's and Ph.D. candidates.

ii) All supervisors.

iii) All colleges, departments, institutes, and schools.

3.3. Policy Statement

3.3.1. Progress tracking serves as a mechanism to guarantee that the work completed at the conclusion of each milestone is substantial enough to affirm that the candidate can generate a high-quality research output within the designated study period.

3.3.2. The DGC/SGC/IGS serves as the designated body for tracking progress in graduate research work and is tasked with evaluating candidates' advancements during regular milestone meetings, conducted twice a semester.

3.3.3. The roadmap, encompassing milestones and detailed activities at each stage, must be communicated to students in advance through their academic units. Ideally, this information should be provided at the conclusion of their coursework.

3.3.4. At the commencement of the academic year, students are required to develop an activity plan with measurable targets aligned with the approved milestones for the two semesters. This plan must be submitted at the beginning of the academic year. Supervisors bear the responsibility of ensuring that the plan encompasses all activities essential for achieving specific milestones and subsequently obtaining approval. During progress tracking meetings, the evaluation of students' progress is based on this pre-approved activity plan or goal.

3.3.5. Aligned with the specified reporting schedule, all candidates are required to prepare a progress report according to their activity plan. To maintain consistency in the evaluation process, a well-structured reporting format will be established. Before the final submission of the progress report, students are obligated to formally meet with their supervisors, engage in discussions regarding the report's contents, and obtain their supervisors' approval. Subsequently, the approved report must be submitted to the PhD program coordinator of the academic unit.

3.3.6. In the progress evaluation meeting, the student's status will be categorized as either satisfactory, at risk, or unsatisfactory. In cases where a candidate does not meet the progress requirements, indicating unsatisfactory or at-risk progress, additional decisions or support plans may be recommended to ensure the student remains on track.

3.3.7. The outcomes of the progress evaluation must be meticulously documented, and these results should be promptly communicated to both students and their supervisors on either

the same day or the following day of the committee meeting.

3.4. Procedures

3.4.1. Milestones

3.4.1.1. The milestones, or the roadmap containing these milestones, will be developed by the School of Graduate Studies and subsequently distributed to each academic unit. These graduate research milestones serve as crucial steps for the successful completion of the program, outlining the key tasks students need to accomplish each semester to progress to the next stage. Designed to assist and enhance a student's journey towards completing their thesis or dissertation, these milestones offer a framework for receiving structured feedback on their progress. They serve as overarching tasks, guiding students in formulating detailed activity plans.

3.4.1.1. Milestones for the Master's thesis consists of;

i)   Proposal development

ii) Data collection

iii) Data analysis, write-up and thesis submission

3.4.1.2. Milestones for the PhD dissertation

i)   Proposal development

ii) Field data collection

iii) Data analysis

iv) Dissertation write-up

v)   Final write-up and pre-submission

vi) Final submission and open defense

3.4.2. Proposal development (for both PhD and Masters)

3.4.2.1. This milestone encompasses the following main activities:

i)   Selection and approval of the research topic, assignment of a supervisor, and agreement on the contract.

ii) Preparation of a concept note and its submission to supervisors to solicit feedback.

iii) Presentation of Colloquium one (applicable only for PhD programs).

iv) Writing the proposal and receiving feedback from supervisors, including the development of data collection instruments.

v)   Submission of the final proposal after incorporating comments from supervisors.

vi) Proposal defense.

vii) Incorporation of comments from experts during the defense and final submission.

viii) Participation in relevant academic seminars, training, and workshops, whether in the country or abroad.

3.4.2.2. The heads of the respective academic units are responsible for promptly informing students about the roadmap containing the activities to be accomplished, including deadlines for topic submission and approval, as well as colloquium presentation deadlines and issues related to supervisor assignment. This information is crucial for students to prepare their plans effectively.

3.4.2.3. The initiation of the proposal preparation process and communication with the supervisor begins with the development of the concept note. The concept note must encompass the title, a concise background of the study, objectives, and research questions. Additionally, it may provide insights into the nature and source of data, the approach to securing data, and a brief overview of the methods of analysis. The concept note should be limited to a maximum of five pages.

3.4.2.4. At the conclusion of this milestone, students are required to prepare and submit a progress report specific to the milestone. Additionally, they must create slides and present their progress before the graduate council of their respective academic units during the designated progress tracking meetings, which occur at the middle and end of the semester.

3.4.2.5. Following the assessment of students' progress, the department's graduate council may categorize it as satisfactory, at risk, or unsatisfactory. Depending on this evaluation status, the council will then recommend an appropriate course of action to move forward.

3.4.2.6. Students whose progress is assessed as at risk or unsatisfactory may be provided with a second opportunity to attempt the milestone. In conjunction with this, a progress support plan, complete with clearly defined timelines, will be established to assist these students in meeting the required standards.

3.4.2.7. To facilitate the release of the research fund, students need to obtain approval from their supervisors, confirming the successful completion of the proposal and data collection instruments, as well as their readiness for field data collection. Various formats for the facilitation and settlement of research funds will be provided by the School of Graduate Studies (SGS).

3.4.3. Data collection and reporting (for both PhD and Masters)

3.4.3.1. During the second milestone period (second semester, year II), all PhD students must devote their time on field data collection. Under normal circumstances, three months are allowed to stay on field for data collection purpose. Up on returning field data collection, students must prepare progress report on the accomplishment of the milestone. They should also settle their research fund before the end of the fiscal years and include this in

their progress report.

3.4.3.2. However, since the master's program students should work to complete their research during second years of the second semester, they are expected to accomplish data collection, analysis and the final thesis write-up during this milestone period. Therefore, they must prepare and send their progress reports (highlights of progresses on their data collection and analysis) at the middle of this second semester. They must report to their supervisors which will be forwarded to the DGC/DGS/DGI for tracking the progress.

3.4.3.3. The progress report must get an approval from the supervisor/s before submission and should be forwarded to the graduate council for progress evaluation. The graduate council meeting of the academic units shall be conducted immediately before the end of each semester.

3.4.3.4. If the milestone's evaluation result is *unsatisfactory* at any level, the council may recommend working on it again suggesting a support plan. However, if the student fails to be successful after second trial, the issue must be reported to the dean of the college for further discussion and decision.

3.4.4. Data analysis, write-up and thesis submission (Milestone 3 for Masters Students)

3.4.4.1. Based on the academic calendar and the roadmap, each masters student must provide a brief report on their status two weeks before the final thesis submission date (or immediately when they report back to the campus).

3.4.4.2. This brief report must include students' current status (whether or not they can complete and submit the final document for defense during the current academic calendar/year. This will help to identify students who may not be able to complete their thesis during the academic calendar.

3.4.4.3. The final thesis submission after incorporating comments from board of examiners requires signature by the supervisor and members of board of examiners.

3.4.5. Data analysis and Colloquium two (Milestone 3 for PhD Program)

3.4.5.1. This is the third milestone of the PhD graduate research work to be accomplished during the *first semester of the third year.*

3.4.5.2. Under this milestone students are expected to conduct many different activities, including data entry, clearing, encoding as well as data analysis and interpretation of results. Students may also start write-ups during this period, depending on their progress.

3.4.5.3. The data analysis must be conducted objective-wise, and the preliminary results of the investigation and interpretations are shared (communicated) with the supervisors before starting the final write-up. Students must also prepare and present colloquium two on the analysis and interpretation of the results after doing analysis of all of the objectives.

3.4.5.4. In the end, all students are expected to prepare a progress report on the milestone and

submit it to the PhD program coordinators two weeks before the end of the semester.

3.4.6. Dissertation write-up and presentation of colloquium three (for PhD Program)

3.4.6.1. This is the fourth milestone for the PhD research work, which must be conducted during second semester of the third year. At this stage of the research journey, candidates will start (continue) the dissertation write-up following the guideline of the university.

3.4.6.2. Since publication is a requirement for submission and final defense, students should include the preparation and submission of manuscripts in their plans at this stage and start to implement it in consultation with the supervisory team.

3.4.6.3. Students are expected to exhaustively complete the draft write-up stage and should share it with the supervisors for comments and feedback.

3.4.7. Final write-up and pre-submission seminar (Milestone 5 for PhD Program)

3.4.7.1. This milestone is carried out during first semester of 4th year. At this stage students should summarize their dissertation write-up by incorporating all the comments given by supervisors and also should present the pre-submission seminar.

3.4.7.2. As per the Senate Legislation, students must submit their dissertation for the pre-submission seminar two months before the seminar presentation date which is set six months before the final viva voce (open defense). Thus, to be consistent with this requirement, students must submit their draft dissertation for seminar during the first week of November and present it during the first week of January.

3.4.7.3. Students must submit three hard copies of their dissertation (which is ready for pre-submission seminar) to the respective department/schools/institutes to be distributed to panel of experts. A soft copy of the document to the department and School of Graduate Studies is also required.

3.4.7.4. Students must continue to work on manuscript preparation and publication. All these activities of the milestone must be carefully reflected in the student's plan at the beginning of the year.

3.4.7.5. Students who fail to meet these deadlines are considered as having unsatisfactory progress, but may be given a chance to attempt for the second time. Similarly, those who have presented the seminar but not recommended for the open defense by experts may be given a chance to present it again in the next pre-submission schedule depending on the decision of the evaluators (if evaluators recommend for seminar presentation again).

3.4.7.6. All students must prepare a comprehensive progress report and submit it to the academic unit level graduate council (through PhD program coordinator) for further evaluation by the department graduate council.

3.4.8. Submission and Final Dissertation Defense (Milestone 6 for PhD Program)

3.4.8.1. This is the last milestone and the final stage for completing graduate research and the

overall PhD program. Under normal situations, the final PhD defenses in our university must be concocted twice a year; the last week of May and the last week of November. However, if there are delay cases with strong justification, the department graduate council may recommend for such final defense owning to the upcoming Senate meeting of the university.

3.4.8.2. Before submitting for final defense, students and their supervisors must assure that all comments given by the evaluators during pre-submission seminar are successfully incorporated. The final document must be submitted to department graduate council (through the PhD program coordinator) for final viva voce six weeks before the final defense date. PhD students are required to submit three hardcopies and a soft copy in word and pdf format to their respective academic units and only softcopy to the School of Graduate Studies.

3.4.8.3. Master's students should submit their final thesis for open defense to their respective departments/ schools/institutes two weeks before the final defense date. They are required to submit two hardcopies and a soft copy both in Word and PDF format.

3.4.8.4. At least one published article and another accepted manuscript are mandatory for PhD students for final submission (defense) and thus all should seriously work towards to fulfilling publication requirements in consultation with their supervisors.

3.4.8.5. All candidates must prepare and submit progress report during the final document submission time so that the concerned department/school/institute will have adequate information about the students who may not complete it during this period.

3.4.8.6. Final submissions after open defense (after incorporating comments) must get approval from board of examiners and supervisors. PhD students are required to submit two hard copies to their academic units and one to the SGS after binding the document. They should also submit a soft copy in word and pdf format to the above units for documentation purposes.

3.4.8.7. Similarly, masters' students with thesis grade of very good and excellent should submit two hardcopies and a softcopy in both word and pdf format to their respective departments.

3.4.9. Due Dates and Milestone Meetings

3.4.9.1. Candidates and their supervisors will receive a reminder from the program coordinators or department heads about the progress reporting date and the requirements for the candidate's next milestone one month before the milestone meeting date.

3.4.9.2. Candidates and their supervisors are responsible for initiating a discussion with each other concerning the progress report and arrangements for the milestone meeting. The

supervisors shall assist the candidate in making arrangements for the meeting.

3.4.9.3. Before the meeting, candidates and supervisors will ensure that all materials for the milestone meeting are ready and distributed to all department graduate council members at least five working days ahead of the meeting.

3.4.9.4. Meetings of the council may take advantage of relevant communication technologies where it is not practicable for all members to be in person at the required time and place.

3.4.9.5. The principal supervisors must generally be in attendance during progress evaluation meeting. In exceptional circumstances where the principal supervisor is not able to present at the meeting, either physically or via an electronic link, the panel may proceed with the presence of co-supervisor, subject to the principal's input being included in the candidate's progress report before the meeting.

3.4.9.6. The chairperson must normally be in attendance during this meeting. However, in exceptional circumstances where he cannot be present at the meeting, either physically or via an electronic link, the program coordinator may substitute him/her and will chair the meeting.

3.4.10. Progress Report Submission and Presentation

3.4.10.1. Following a meeting with the candidate, the department graduate council will convene to discuss the candidate's submission and recommendation. The chairperson should ensure that the candidate has the opportunity to privately discuss matters as required with him before or during the meeting.

3.4.10.2. In case where a consensus cannot be reached on evaluation result, the final recommendation will rest on the chairperson, and any differences should be detailed in the progress report evaluation format.

3.4.11. Outcomes of the Milestone Meetings

3.4.11.1. A PhD candidate may make two attempts at any individual milestone within the maximum postponement period and the evaluation of candidate's progress can result in the following progress statuses at any milestone:

i) satisfactory progress

ii) at risk progress

iii) unsatisfactory progress

3.4.11.2. The progress of a candidate will be *satisfactory* if;

i) The status of the research project and other requirements are as anticipated for the designated period; and

ii) Majority of conditions or goals set at the beginning are completed by the expected work submission date.

3.4.11.3. Progress will be deemed '*at risk'* if the candidate:

  i) Experiences progress difficulties and requests a support plan at any point in their candidature;

  ii) Fails to meet agreed goals of the milestone or produce the work at the request of their supervisors during candidature period;

  iii) Fails to meet requirements at a first milestone attempt and fails to submit their thesis/dissertation by the expected work submission date.

  iv) If he/she is unlikely to meet the needs of the next milestone

3.4.11.4. Progress will be deemed as *unsatisfactory* if the candidate:

  i) Fails to meet the agreed goals in a progress support plan;

  ii) Fails for a second time to meet the requirements of any milestone;

  iii) Does not maintain regular contacts or communications with their supervisory team and thus he/she will be considered as absent without leave and formally reported to the academic unit.

3.4.11.5. On the candidate's first milestone meeting, the department graduate council may decide from the following status;

  i) **Satisfactory progress** – If the candidate's progress is satisfactory, the final progress report and comments of the evaluators must be properly documented on student's file and the academic unit will update the candidate's status on the student database and also forward the candidate with a final copy of the evaluation report.

  ii) **Risk progresses** – If the candidates' progress is at *a risk*;

  a) The council and the candidate must agree on a progress support plan and set a date for the second attempt on the milestone.

  b) The chairperson of the council will announce to the student the completed progress report evaluated by the council (including the date for the second attempt at the milestone) and the progress support plan to the academic unit.

  c) The academic unit or program coordinator will notify the new date, update the candidate's status on the student database, and send to the candidate and all members of the council a final copy of the evaluation report, including the support plan.

  iii) **Unsatisfactory progress**- Where a candidate is evaluated to show unsatisfactory progress,

  a) He has the right for the second chance to attempt on the milestone which must be completed in the next milestone period.

  b) The council is required to prepare or recommend a support plan to help the

candidate improve his/her progress;

c) The candidate, the supervisor, and the chairperson of the graduate council must discuss and decide on the time and the requirements (if any) of second attempt.

d) If the student is evaluated to have again unsatisfactory progress at the second attempt, his case must be reported to the college dean for the final decision.

3.4.12. Progress Report

3.4.12.1. The primary purposes of the progress report are to track the candidate's progress to date, to plan for the next semester or beyond, and to request enrolment for the next semester. The research process will be supported and monitored throughout the research journey by supervisors, departments/schools/institutes, and program coordinators. However, the progress of candidates will also be evaluated at designated points by the graduate council based on milestones and goals set by the student.

3.4.12.2. Candidates and their supervisors must report to the DGC on the research progress twice in a semester; one at the middle and the other at the end of the semester. The student should initiate the report.

3.4.12.3. Candidates are encouraged to make an appointment to meet with their supervisor/s to discuss on the report (the progress so far and the goals for the next semester) before submitting it the council. The report should get approved by principal supervisor before submission to the committee.

3.4.12.4. The program coordinators must take the responsibility for facilitating report submission and arrangement of the council meeting.

3.4.12.5. Anytime during the research journey, students are advised to discuss with their supervisors any problems or matters which will impede the research progress or affect the qualities of their research and thus include them in the progress report.

3.4.12.6. The evaluation of the progress report must be made against the specific requirements for each milestone as given on the approved plan of the candidate and the likelihood of candidates to submit their thesis/dissertation or the milestones during the planned submission date.

3.4.13. Request for progress reporting date postponement

3.4.13.1. If a progress report cannot be submitted within ten working days of the original due date, candidates or principal supervisors may request a postponement of the reporting date with justification. The chairperson of the graduate council of the academic unit will grant a postponement of a progress reporting date for only valid reasons. The principal supervisor will suggest the maximum postponement period and must be approved by the head of the academic unit.

3.4.13.2. In case of issues such as illness or other social problems or difficulties that threaten

progress, candidates should take the appropriate action, such as negotiating any relevant changes in supervision.

3.4.13.3. In cases where candidates failed the first attempt due to problems related to compulsory coursework that is a prerequisite to any milestone, the program coordinator will recommend the new timing in consultation with the candidate and the principal supervisor.

3.4.13.4. Program coordinators as a members and secretaries of the graduate councils are responsible for reminding the progress report submission dates, following up on any progress reports, and accepting reports.

3.4.14. Failure to Undertake a Milestone Attempt

3.4.14.1. Candidates who submit their thesis/dissertation early are encouraged to complete their milestones early; however, if the milestone due date is after the date of submission, completion is not compulsory.

3.4.14.2. If candidates fail to meet milestone requirements by the conclusion of two milestone attempts, they will be asked to withdraw from the program following the Senate Legislation of the University.

3.4.14.3. Where a candidate fails to attain the required grades in coursework, the council will evaluate his/her status and rated it as unsatisfactory progress and a recommendation will be made accordingly to clear the course work.

3.4.15. Progress Support Plan

3.4.15.1. If a candidate is placed '*at risk'* at any point of the milestone, the graduate council will discuss with the supervisor and recommend a *Progress Support Plan* to the candidate to bring him/her on track. The plan and time frame for another milestone attempt must be appropriately documented and communicated to the student and the principal supervisor.

3.4.15.2. The department graduate council, during meeting on the second milestone attempt, may make the following recommendations:

i) The candidate has made satisfactory progress, and the 'at-risk status' can be removed;

ii) The candidate remains to be 'at-risk', and the support plan is amended; or

iii) The candidate has made unsatisfactory progress and should be asked to withdraw or terminate from the program.

4. SECTION FOUR: GRADUATE RESEARCH EXAMINATION POLICY

4.1. Background and Purpose

4.1.1. The examination policy outlines the position of the university with regards to thesis and dissertation examination consistent with its Senate Legislation. It describes the steps to be taken by candidates, supervisors, board of examiners as well as different academic units of the university during the examination process.

4.1.2. The examination policy under its sub-section of procedures tries to address the qualification and appointment of examiners, the requirements for the open defense presentation, assessment and evaluation of the thesis/dissertation including decision making for the thesis/dissertation proposals, pre-submission seminar and final defense.

4.1.3. The Board of Examiners (or panel of experts) has the ultimate academic freedom to evaluate and decide on the quality of thesis/dissertation depending on the pre-determined criteria. The examination processes are administered by the respective colleges, academic units, and PhD coordinators. The School of Graduate Studies will play the role of coordinating the defense programs and proper implementation the procedures.

4.2. Scope

This policy applies to:

4.2.1. All Colleges, Departments, Schools and Institutes

4.2.2. All Master's and PhD degree programs and their candidates

4.2.3. All examiners or members of board of examiners

4.2.4. All graduate researches intermediate processes including proposals, pre-submissions seminars, thesis and dissertation defenses.

4.3. Policy statement

4.3.1. As a part of quality assurance, all masters and PhD students in Ethiopian Civil Service University should defend their research work in public and must pass the examination process at all levels/stages. All Ph.D. students are required to present their final proposal, pre-submission seminar on their dissertation work, and a final dissertation open defense in front of board of examiners to get feedback for further improvement of their research work. Similarly, the master's students must present their thesis proposal and also defend their final thesis. The pre-submission seminar presentation is not required for master's students.

4.3.2. The DGC/SGC/IGC will take the responsibility for the selection and assignment of a panel of experts or board of examiners as well as management of the whole examination process. The program coordinators, who are also members of DGC/SGC/IGC shall act as secretaries for the graduate council of the respective academic units and facilitate the process. The School of Graduate Studies will coordinate and provide support to the examination processes.

4.3.3. The members of the board of examiners or panel of experts must critically evaluate the

proposals and final thesis/dissertation documents and provide comments (feedback) in written form on or before the defense date. Other responsibilities of the board of examiners are provided in the procedure section of this document.

4.3.4. The final decision of the examination processes must be documented and properly communicated to the students and their supervisor stating the major areas for improvement or change. The program coordinators are required to report the final decisions to their respective departments/schools/institutes as well as to the School of Graduate Studies.

4.4. Procedures for Examination

4.4.1. Proposal defense examination

4.4.1.1. Composition and assignment of the panel of experts (examiners)

i) The panel of experts for the Ph.D. proposal evaluation should consist of three members; two faculty members with the academic rank of associate professor or above and a chairperson (may not be necessarily an associate professor). One of the experts should be staff of the department/school/institute and acts as an internal evaluator; whereas the second examiner (the external) must be from other colleges in the University with the required academic rank and field of specialization to be recommended by the respective graduate council of the academic unit.

ii) If there is a shortage of qualified staff members with the required academic rank of associate professor and above in the department, the DGC/SGC/IGC may select and nominate senior assistant professors with a Ph.D. holder as an examiner. However, there must be at least one associate professor or above in the team of the panel of experts. Similarly, if it is difficult to find an external evaluator from the other colleges, the DGC/SGC/IGC may assign a senior staff from other departments of its college keeping the specialization requirements.

iii) In the case where there is no university staff with special circumstances such as specific specialization requirements of the program, the DGC/SGC/IGC could look for potentially relevant examiners outside the University fulfilling the academic rank requirement but will be invited up on the approval and endorsement of the AVP of the University.

iv) Normally two staff members of the department/school/institute with the academic rank of assistant professor and above shall constitute the panel of experts and evaluate the master's proposal. However, one staff members of the department/school/institute with the academic rank of assistant professor and above can make such evaluation if there is staff shortage.

v) The supervisors of students cannot be a member of a panel of experts (they neither mark nor answer questions) but they can participate during the defense session. Besides, the program

coordinators, students, and all interested academic staff members of the academic unit may participate in the proposal presentation to students.

4.4.1.2.Responsibilities of a panel of experts (examiners)

i) The panel of examiners should get the proposal document at least two weeks before the defense date and are required to read the proposal ahead of the presentation date thereby providing critical written comments and feedback during presentation time.

ii) They should decide on the status of the student on his/her proposal work after completing the presentation and give a clear direction on how to revise or modify the proposal using the format prepared for this purpose.

iii) The chairperson is responsible for managing the whole proposal defense session including collecting evaluation formats from the department and distributing it to the panel of experts, managing time during the presentation session, and ensuring free, fair, and professional interactions during the presentation, ensuring that all evaluation formats are properly filled and signed by all members, summarizing the major comments, clearly stating the final decision of the panel and submitting the examination result to the academic unit. The panel members should fill out all the related proposal evaluation formats and submit them back to the chairperson after the announcement of the result.

4.4.1.3.Proposal Presentation and Evaluating

i) A proposal defense consists of presentation by the student and an oral examination by assigned experts. Before the defense, the proposal has to be well written following the thesis/dissertation writing guideline of the university, and students are advised to proofread their proposals before submission. Please refer to the thesis/dissertation writing guideline of the university.

ii) Assuming that examiners have read the proposal before the defense date, the presentation is limited to 20 minutes. This is followed by 40 minutes of comments as well as a question-and-answer session. In total one candidate's proposal defense session must not exceed one hour. The candidate has to keep the number of slides limited within the allocated time. Use the Proposal Defense Evaluation (*Form SGS-PhD: Form-007-1*) annexed.

iii) The presentation is followed by comments and challenging views by the examiners through questions and answers sessions. At this stage members of the panel are expected to provide comments and suggestions to improve the research proposal. At the end of the oral defense, panel members will discuss and decide on the status of the student based on the evaluation format and criteria. They should provide clear recommendations/directions for modification/revision. The chairperson summarizes the panel's decision, major comments, and suggested corrections/revisions.

4.4.2. Pre-submission Seminar and Examination for Ph.D. Candidates

4.4.2.1. Purpose of the Pre-submission Seminar

i) The Ethiopian Civil Service University in its Senate Legislation 2017 (Article 115.4.2) stipulated that a pre-submission seminar is a pre-condition to the final Ph.D. dissertation submission and examination. The main aim of this step is to ensure that there is no plagiarism involved and that the scholar is clear about his/her dissertation research. It may be carried out in public or behind closed doors.

ii) Pre-submission seminar/review requires oral presentation and examination which creates an opportunity for students to discuss/share their works with experts. The process involves lots of penetrating and probing questions and even conceptually complex debates and communication between students and examiners.

iii) The dissertation must be well written and properly edited following the graduate research writing guidelines and checked for plagiarism issues before submitting it for pre-viva.

iv) The pre-submission review will be examined by experts from the area of the study of the candidate to provide him/her with the opportunity to receive constructive comments from a broad range of academic staff in his/her area during the remaining preparation periods for timely submission of the Ph.D. dissertation. Such advice can be valuable for clarifying the final tasks to be completed, including any additional methodological scaffolding which can deflect objections from examiners antagonistic to the approach followed.

v) The pre-viva presentation and the subsequent examinations must be conducted in a supportive and engaging environment that enables the student to continue to enhance his/her communication and presentation skills within an academic context. The feedback he/she receives is designed to ensure that he/she is on track to a timely, and complete, that his/her research skills are developing appropriately, and that the supervisory arrangements are appropriate.

4.4.2.2. Preparation for the pre-submission review

i) The candidates and their supervisors will be notified by email five weeks before the due date for the Pre-Submission Review. If a candidate is ready for a pre-submission seminar, he will fill out the '*Application for Pre-Submission Seminar'(SGS-PhD form 007-2)* to be endorsed by the main supervisor. The application must be submitted to the concerned academic unit notifying that he/she is ready for the seminar and requesting the necessary arrangement to proceed. The application must be accompanied by three hard copies of the draft dissertation, a soft copy, and a synopsis of the dissertation (not more than 10 pages in hard copy).

ii) The principal supervisor will recommend academic and active researchers as a panel of experts consisting of a chairperson and two experts with appropriate qualifications as a member of a panel of examiners using the form *(SGS-PhD: Form 003)*. The form will be submitted to the graduate councils of the concerned academic units at least four weeks before the scheduled presentation date.

iii) The department and college level PhD coordinators must check if the submitted draft dissertation/thesis is free from plagiarism by using plagiarism checker software. For this, the ECSU must purchase reliable plagiarism checker software and readily available to the program coordinators.

iv) Reference lists, footnotes table and any other annexes are excluded from the plagiarism checker similarity determination.

v) A dissertation/thesis with plagiarism similarity level of 40 percent and above must be rejected on the ground of academic misconduct and must be immediately reported to the dean supported with the printed copy of the plagiarism level provided by the software.

vi) A candidate whose dissertation/thesis is found with plagiarism level of less than 40 percent but greater than or equal to 20 percent must be given one chance for improvement of the plagiarism level to below 20 percent.

vii) Only dissertations/theses with plagiarism level of below 20 percent is accepted for public presentation.

viii) Specific regulation for proper application of plagiarism checker shall be prepared and supplement this policy document.

ix) The graduate councils of the concerned academic units will formally recommend the pre-submission of a candidate using the **form SGS-PhD: Form 007-3A.** Finally, the above three forms (including the department graduate council recommendation for pre-submission) attached with DGC/SGC/IGC minute and will be sent to the college for review by the members of the College Graduate Council **three weeks** before the scheduled presentation date a copy of which will eventually be submitted to School of Graduate Studies (SGS).

x) The candidate has to kindly ensure that the copies are duly certified by the supervisor and are properly written following the guidelines for writing the dissertation/thesis. Upon the endorsement of the College Graduate Council, the draft copies of the dissertation and synopsis with the accompanying forms will be circulated to the panel through the program coordinators two weeks before the scheduled presentation date.

xi) Notice for the Ph.D. pre-submission presentation must be issued by the respective academic unit with the approval of the Dean of the college, after fixing the exact date in consultation with the concerned chairperson and supervisor, at least 7 working days in advance.

xii) If exceptional circumstances prevent the candidate from presenting on the scheduled date, an alternative date may be requested. Exceptional circumstances will be considered on case-by-case basis. The cases may include medical, personal, or family circumstances for which strong documentary evidence are required. The request would normally need to be made no less than **14 days** before the scheduled Pre-Submission presentation. The evidence and alternative date must be approved by the DGC/SGC/IGC.

4.4.2.3. Composition of the Review Panel

The principal supervisor will recommend members of the review team for pre-submission seminar which comprise of three members:

i) A staff member from the department/school/institute who will serve as a chairperson of the panel. He must be a senior staff member in academic status.

ii) Two senior staff members with the academic rank of associate professor or above; one from the department and one from another college with similar specialization.

iii) The supervisors should not be members of the panel of examiners but can appear on the presentation with no role in marking candidates' results or answering the questions posed to the candidates.

iv) Interested academic staff members and Ph.D. candidates can participate in the seminar.

4.4.2.4. The Roles of Panel of Examiners

i) Assess whether the PhD dissertation work satisfies the requirements of the university and academic standards required for the PhD level.

ii) Provide constructive criticism and feedback on students' dissertation/thesis.

iii) Recommend whether the student's dissertation can be ready for submission within the maximum time allocated for the degree.

4.4.2.5. Presentation and Review Session

i) The chairperson of the panel of examiners, after welcoming the candidate and the panel members, will briefly introduce the student and his/her title. The chairperson will then briefly explain the pre-viva process including the time management issues. Since the pre-submission seminar intends to give constructive comments in a supportive environment, the chairperson and members of the panel of examiners should act in a professional, constructive and disciplinary manner to enhance the candidate's research work.

ii) The pre-submission evaluation for one candidate should not take more than 60 minutes; the candidate will present his/her work in 20 minutes followed by 40 minutes of question and answers/discussion session including disclosing the result. The candidate will be asked a series of questions where he/she needs to be fully confident and ready to respond to all queries raised by examiners.

iii) Following the presentation and question-answer sessions, the panel will convene to evaluate the candidate's performance and may recommend for final submission (after participants left the seminar room). Overall progress to date will be made to determine the classification category. The panel members should fill out the Pre-Viva Evaluation form *(SGS-PhD: Form 007-3 B)* immediately after the presentation.

iv) After the discussions, the candidate will be verbally advised of the panel's recommendations and any other feedback and suggestions. The suggestions shall be discussed with the supervisor(s) and incorporated into the final dissertation. Formal written confirmation of the panel's deliberations will follow after the chairperson summarizes the decision of panel members using **SGS-PhD: Form 007-3C.**

4.4.2.6. Recommendation of the Panel

The panel can recommend one of the following outcomes;

i) Satisfactory evaluation result with minor corrections and recommendation for final viva voce.

ii) Satisfactory result with major corrections and recommendation for final defense. The corrections are subject to the recommendations of the panel being made within the timelines stipulated by the panel (normally within 2 months to make it ready for final defense).

iii) Satisfactory with major modification subject to the recommendations of the panel. Candidates with such status cannot finalize the corrections/comments within two months and thus cannot appear on the upcoming final defense. However, he/she is not required to present the seminar again but can get approval from the panel of examiners for incorporating all the comments.

iv) Not satisfactory (as will be detailed in the Panel's Evaluation form) where the candidate's work is not adequate in many aspects and he/she is required to re-work many issues in the dissertation and must present the pre-submission seminar following the roadmap for the next milestone.

v) If the panel of examiners is satisfied with the research work of the candidate, it will recommend to the college to allow the student to make the necessary correction and submit the final draft within less than two months from the date of seminar presentation. If a candidate fails to submit the corrected version in the stipulated period, then an extension in the submission period can be provided by the Dean of the College on the recommendation of DGC in consultation with the Academic Vice President.

vi) The chairperson will ensure that the panel's report and recommendation on the Pre-Submission review are forwarded to the concerned academic unit on the day of presentation or the next day. Upon receipt of the report, the academic will email all relevant documentation to the candidate/supervisor and confirm the panel's decision of the review and he will be informed to get prepared for the final viva voce before the panel of

examiners.

vii) Finally, the candidate, after making all necessary corrections recommended by the panel of examiners should get the approval of the panel members on the pre-viva correction form **(SGS-PhD: Form 007-3D)** and submit the dissertation to DGC/SGC/IGC for final defense. The department will submit a final report of the panel with all the papers to the office of the Dean of the College and copy it to the School of Graduate Studies for records.

4.4.2.7. Summary of Steps for Pre-submission

i) Candidates should apply for a pre-submission seminar presentation by filling out the application form **(SGS-PhD: Form 007-2)** and getting signature of supervisor. The candidate will submit this form to the principal supervisor no later than three weeks before the pre-submission review date. The supervisor will recommend the panel examiners using *(SGS-PhD: Form 003*) and submit it (along with student's application form) to the department council through the program coordinator.

ii) The Ph.D. coordinator (as a member and secretary of the council) will communicate with the chairperson of the DGC/SGC/IGC and arrange council meeting to decide on the application and approve the recommended examiners. During this meeting, the DGC/SGC/IGC will fill out the recommendation form for pre-submission (**SGS-PhD: Form 007-3A**) and support all of its decisions by formal DGC/SGC/IGC minute.

iii) The DGC/SGC/IGC, after approving all those applications, will send the documents to the dean of the College for final approval and the Dean will forward a copy of the decisions to the School of Graduate Studies.

iv) During the review panel meeting, the members of the panel will complete the pre-viva evaluation form (**SGS-PhD: Form 007-3B**) and also the chairperson of the panel will complete the summary evaluation form **(SGS-PhD: Form 007-3C).**

v) The chairperson must check that all forms are properly filled and then should collect back with clearly stated remarks and feedback signed by the panel of experts. The relevant forms are attached below.

Format code	Purpose	Remark
SGS-PhD: Form 003	Request for the constitution of the examination committee	Annexed
SGS-PhD: Form 007-2	Application for the pre-submission seminar	Annexed
SGS-PhD: Form 007-3A	Recommendation of department graduate council	Annexed
SGS-PhD: Form 007-3B	Checklist for pre-viva evaluation	Annexed
SGS-PhD: Form 007-3C	Pre-viva evaluation form	Annexed
SGS-PhD: Form 007-3D	List of correction form	Annexed

4.4.3. Final Defense Examination Process

4.4.3.1.Final submission and open defense schedule

i) For the final submission, the candidate must incorporate all the comments given by the evaluators during the pre-submission seminar, should get the pre-viva list of correction form (**SGS-PhD: Form 007-3D)** duly signed by examiners which serve as evidence for incorporating the comments. The candidates must submit this form and the final dissertation document for viva voce from six to eight weeks before the defense date. The candidates are required to submit three hardcopies and a soft copy in word and pdf format to their respective academic units and only final softcopy to the SGS.

ii) One article extracted from the dissertation and published and the other manuscript at least accepted for publication on reputable journals are mandatory for PhD candidates for final submission (defense) and thus all should seriously work towards to fulfilling publication requirements in consultation with their supervisors.

iii) Under the normal condition or based on the roadmap of the University, PhD open defense should be conducted twice a year; the last week of May for the first round and the first week of December.

iv) The master students are required to submit two hardcopies and a soft copy both in Word and PDF format. The masters' thesis defense will be carried out as indicated on the academic calendar of the University.

4.4.3.2. Composition and appointment of board of examiners

i) The final PhD dissertation must be evaluated by a board of examiners constituting three to five members. Two external examiners (external to the University), at least one internal examiner from the department (or may be from other colleges of ECSU with required academic rank and specialization) and a chairperson who is a senior staff from the respective academic unit. The supervisors cannot be members of board of examiners for their advisees. The chairperson should play the role of only managing the defense session (not expected to read the dissertation and thus should not mark the student's dissertation work). Former staff members can be invited to be external examiners unless the termination of their service was due to disciplinary cases.

ii) Anyone who participated as examining board member for PhD dissertation during pre-submission seminar should not be considered as an examining board member during the final viva defense for the same candidate. However, owning to shortage of qualified staff, the department graduate council may assign per-submission evaluator as the evaluator of the final dissertation in special cases.

iii) A PhD dissertation examiner should examine two PhD students and maximum of 5 master's students during a specific and formal defense time (schedule).

iv) The members of board of examiners for Masters' thesis should consist of three members; one external (external to the university), one internal (internal to the academic unit or may be to the University) and one chairperson who will manage the defense session.

v) The supervisor may recommend the potential members of board of examiners to DGC/SGC/IGC along with their justification and detail CV of the evaluators. The DGC/SGC/IGC after evaluating the CV of all proposed examiners (including the internal) will recommend them to the Dean of the College. Finally, the College dean (thorough CGC) will pass final approval decision on the board of examiners for master's thesis. For the PhD dissertation, the CGC will report its final decision to the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) for further scrutiny and final approval by the Council of Graduate Studies (CGS).

vi) Each examiner of the PhD dissertation and Master's thesis should not be invited to evaluate thesis/dissertation in consecutive periods; at least one defense session must be jumped.

vii) At college level, the members of board of examiners must get approval by the College Graduate Council (CGC). Therefore, based on the recommendation of the respective graduate councils of the academic units and the College Graduate Council (CGC) master's thesis will get final decision at this level and the Dean shall write the invitation (appointment) letter to the selected members. However, for PhD dissertation the members of board of examiners must get final approval by the Council of Graduate Studies (CGS) and the Dean of the College shall write the invitation letter to the selected members of board of examiners.

viii) The final approval of the board of examiners for PhD program should be made six to eight weeks before the final defense date and two weeks before scheduled master's thesis examination date for master's program so that examiners will have ample time to read and comment on the thesis/dissertation.

ix) When evaluating and approving the assignments of external examiners, the concerned academic units shall ascertain the following requirements:

   a) Academic rank or seniority (should be professor or associate professor) for PhD and assistance professor or above for Master's thesis examination.

   b) High expertise and active engagement in the research and publication.

   c) Exceptions shall be approved by the concerned council of graduate studies case by case basis and forwarded the dean of the College for final approval.

   d) External examiners from industry, research institutions, etc. may be selected when necessary for both Master's and PhD, considering the above requirements.

   e) One external examiner should be assigned for two dissertations at a time.

4.4.3.3.Duties and Responsibilities of Board of Examiners

i) Should evaluate the thesis/dissertation works of students purely on professional ethics and academic basis following the criteria set for this purpose.

ii) Must check that the thesis/dissertation is well-written to the standard or the quality requirement of the level and check that it should be free from plagiarism.

iii) Should decide on the fate of the thesis/dissertations based on the evaluation criteria after compiling the result of all examiners.

iv) Should recommend the award of Masters and PhD degrees to the concerned academic units.

4.4.3.4. Duties and Responsibilities of the Chairperson (CP)

i) The role of the chairperson (CP) is to manage the whole defense session in a professional and fair way. For this, it is highly recommended that an experienced academic member of the respective academic units shall serve as a chairperson.

ii) The chairperson, after formally opening the defense session, should introduce the whole process of examination and the members of board of examiners to the audience prior to the oral examination.

iii) Moderate the defense session, encourage the candidates feel at ease before and during the oral examination, manage and fairly allocate the time for each examiner, give the candidate a fair opportunity to defend the thesis/dissertation and clarify any matters raised by the examiners.

iv) Manage and settle conflicting issues or disagreements if any that may arise during the session through discussion and joint decision and ensure that the procedures and rules are adhered to during the examination process.

v) Ensure that all assessment formats are properly filled in and signed by examiners, consolidate all marks given by examiners, announce the grades of candidates, formally close the session and report to the concerned academic units and the School of Graduate Studies (SGS).

4.4.3.5. Duties and Responsibilities of Examiners

i) Read and provide critical comment on the thesis/dissertation in written form and submit the comments ahead of presentation date.

ii) Make all necessary preparations in advance of the defense, submit preliminary confidential reports one week before defense date (for PhD dissertation) and one day before defense for master's thesis, follow examination procedures in marking, forward feedback and comments as per code of ethics and in professional manner.

iii) Evaluate theses/dissertation on the basis of its content, structure, methodology, rigorousness, quality and scope by using the criteria set by the University.

iv) Fill out all the necessary evaluation formats, provide marks (grades) and comments after presentation and oral examination.

v) Disclose any conflict of interests (if any) with the supervisor/s, student, member of the board of examiner and others immediately when assigned as examiner.

vi) Report plagiarism cases (if any) and other concerns to the School of Graduate Studies, before two weeks (for PhD) and before two days (for Master's thesis) that may not allow students defend their research work.

vii) Examiners can be guided and informed about the desire to take account of certain factors in their assessment to address the safety issues, delays and disruptions as a result of the unintended disasters and pandemics.

4.4.3.6. Presentation and oral examination session

i) For PhD dissertation, first the candidate will be invited to present his work in a maximum of 30 minutes, followed by a maximum of 35 minutes for each external examiner and 25 minutes for internal examiner to forward their comments and questions (for oral examination). Then after, the student will be allowed to respond to the questions and give his/her reflects for maximum of 15 minutes and finally followed by 10 minutes for evaluating or grading the student's performance. The overall evaluation session of one PhD student must not be greater than two and half hours (or 150 minutes).

ii) Similarly, for master's thesis, a maximum of 15 minutes for presentation, 20 minutes for external examiner, 15 minutes for internal and 5 minutes for the student to respond to the questions. Final the board members must take 5 minutes to give the grade and finalize evaluation. The total time allotted for evaluation of one master's thesis must not exceed one hour. The chairperson must play a leading role in managing the time and putting ground rules on time management ahead of time.

iii) When oral examination is over, the candidate and participants will be asked to leave the auditorium for discussing on the status and grading of the students' performance. In case examiners cannot agree on the result, the chairperson should report to the DGC, who shall arrive at a decision after consulting a referee who should normally be within the department of the student.

iv) If a thesis/dissertation did not meet the criteria for the award of the degree, the examiners may recommend that it should be revised and resubmitted by a specified date (not later than one semester after notification of the result), or may be rejected in which case he/she is required to work again on another title. A candidate shall be permitted to revise and resubmit a thesis/dissertation for examination once only and if a resubmitted thesis/dissertation is finally accepted, the result shall be not more than 'Very Good'.

4.4.3.7. Grading (Marking)

i) A thesis/dissertation is evaluated based on its quality and rigorousness of the work, the relevance of professional arguments forwarded by the student, creative work of the candidate in his discipline of research, the quality of the data collected, the rigorousness of discussions and interpretations made.

ii) The thesis/dissertation, must demonstrate the candidate's ability to master theoretically sophisticated subject matter, identify and critically evaluate the findings and discussions on the basis of scholarly literature, analyze, argue and reach proper conclusions which are informed by independent enquiry. Moreover, they are expected to master the medium of production of the discipline.

iii) The weights of marks by the external and internal examiners are 60% and 40% respectively for PhD dissertation, but 50% for external, 35% for internal and 15% for chairperson in the case of master thesis evaluation. According to the Senate Legislation of the ECSU, the overall cut off marks and grading scale for thesis/dissertation is as follows:

S/N	Rank	Overall, Mark (in %)
1	Excellent	≥ 85
2	Very Good	$75 \leq X < 85$
3	Good	$60 \leq X < 75$
4	Satisfactory	$50 \leq X < 60$
5	Fail	<50

a) **Excellent (85-100):** An excellent thesis/dissertation should demonstrate the candidate's ability to independently collate, analyze and interpret research data using scientific procedures and theoretical perspectives which are current in the research area. The thesis/dissertation should be exemplary in the selection of problems, methods of securing data and analysis of the results so as to draw conclusions. There is considerable breadth and depth in theoretical and/or methodical reflection. The candidate has independently provided herself/himself for the data and literature and examined them in a sound interpretative ability and critical manner.

b) **Very Good (75 - 84):** The thesis/dissertation should show a very high familiarity with the literature in the area of study, and in-depth integration of research data and a student's personal contributions. The analysis and interpretation parts of the thesis should demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues and critical judgment. Moreover, the thesis/dissertation must be written or organized on the basis of proper formatting and with minimal language problems.

c) **Good (60 - 74):** Statement of the problem, research objectives and questions must be written and articulated clearly. The research has to be well delimited. The methods to answer the research questions have been adequately chosen and are well founded. The

35

student has shown that he/she can treat scientific data reasonably well, although his analyses are generally of basic quality.

d) **Satisfactory (50 - 59):** The problem statement of the research works many not clearly stated though research questions seem relevant. At least the research strategy and instrumentation are relevant to research topic. It may lack data triangulation, show weak review of the literature. It lacks strong argumentation. It ends up in weak /stereotyped recommendation. Whole write-up marked by fair with mistakes here and there.

e) **Fail or Rejection (<50):** Not clear about the research strategy and instrumentation alignment to analyze the research problem. It fails to identify the relevant literature for review or the review is based on a hotchpotch of irrelevant and not paraphrased paragraphs. Not based on empirical data. Research questions are not answered. The write up is done carelessly marked by grammatical errors, misuse of words, lot of mistakes in sentence construction, use of punctuation marks and capitalization. Academic misconducts such as plagiarism, falsification, fabrication etc. will all lead to rejection or fail of the thesis/dissertation.

iv) The actual evaluation criteria and marking for Master's thesis and PhD dissertation consists of three parts; the thesis/dissertation content, editorial and formatting and oral presentation with a weight of 75%, 10% and 15% respectively (see the annexed evaluation form). The final decision to be reached by board of examiners on the basis of these evaluation points may comprise of four options.

a) **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.

b) **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. The candidate may complete such comments within a maximum of one to two weeks.

c) **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. This decision may require two to three months of re-work or revision as suggested by the board of examiners.

d) **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. The decision whether the student should do the research again on another title or he/she should be dismissed totally will be decided on the basis of the Senate Legislation of the University. This decision of the board shall be reported to the academic vice president and dean of the college. The student will also be informed with official letter by the dean of the college.

v) However, if the reason for the rejection is plagiarism, falsification or fabrication of the research work, the student will be dismissed from the University for good. But if it is due to *not meeting standards or quality requirements* for the award of the required degree, the student may be given a chance to re-prepare the thesis/dissertation as per the recommendation given by the board of examiners. In this case the student must present his/her work to the board again at his/her expense. This decision of the board shall be reported to the academic vice president and dean of the college. The student will also be informed with official letter by the dean of the college.

4.4.3.8. Final decision and documentation

i) The examiner's comments and written reports should provide constructive feedbacks about the thesis/dissertation for the benefit of the candidate. The signature of the members of the board of examiners shall be required as evidence of their decision on the candidate's thesis/dissertation work.

ii) Where there is no significant difference in marks between examiners, the final mark for the thesis/dissertation is normally an average of the marks recommended by all examiners as shown in the annexed criteria.

iii) If there are significant differences in marks between examiners, the examiners are requested to consult, through the Chairperson, and arrive at a final agreeable mark. Differences are considered to be significant when the marks differ by more than 10%, or fall either side of an award grade/rank (excellent-to-fail).

iv) In the event of a disagreement on the appropriate outcome of the examination result among examiners, the matter should be resolved by the examiners and CP on the basis of detailed argument about the specific academic points arising from the examination, and a joint decision should be reached.

v) If, however, such differences in marks are not resolved by consultation, the Chairperson of the board should report the case to the academic unit. In these circumstances, an additional

referee examiner will be appointed and the thesis/dissertation and anonymized copies of the examiners' reports will be sent to the third person who will act as a referee.

vi) If the award of the degree has been approved or accepted, candidates must submit an electronic copy of their finalized thesis/dissertation to the University Library, the School of Graduate Studies and the academic unit via the CD soft copy either in PDF or word format. At the time of submission, candidates must select the level of access to the thesis/dissertation. Normally "full text available for download" would be chosen so that the thesis/dissertation is available to the public. Besides, the candidate must also prepare and submit the hard copy of the thesis/dissertation one for each of the units indicated.

4.4.3.9. Exceptional cases

i) Under normal situations, an online thesis/dissertation defense process is not allowed. However, if there are verified serious cases and reliable reasons (to be justified by the respective councils of graduate studies) a chance may be given for the candidate to present it online or to appear and present in person few days after the initial presentation date. The problem may include political unrests or conflicts, pandemic cases etc.

ii) The exceptional case must be supported by the official certificate of evidence by the candidate from the concerned bodies. For PhD dissertation, such evidences must be scrutinized and approved by the College Graduate Council (CGC). The Dean of the college must write an official letter stating the date and time of the open defense examination for the student and board of examiners. For master's thesis, the DGC/SGC/IGC will evaluate the reasons of exceptional cases and forward its approval to the head of the respective academic unit. The head of the academic unit will notify the defense date to the student and examiners.

iii) The university will not accept any complain about grade or thesis evaluation issues as exceptional case.

5. SECTION FIVE: GRADUATE RESEARCH CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

5.1. Background and Purpose

5.1.1. Following the principles of transparency, accountability, and the highest standards of professional conduct expected of the Ethiopian Civil Service University (ECSU), a policy governing Conflicts of Interest (CoI) in research is essential for academic staff and graduate students engaged in graduate research work. The legislation of ECSU has shown an interest in ensuring that various types of COI do not compromise research.

5.1.2. This policy document outlines the principles related to actual, potential, or perceived CoI, means for disclosing them and how to manage such conflicts of interest. The ECSU is committed to fostering a culture where a staff is free from influences, interests, or relationships that may lead to the potential or perceived conflicts in graduate research work.

5.1.3. This policy highlights principles related to conflict of interests in graduate research work and the procedures in its management including the nature and type of CoI, disclosure, and management of CoI.

5.2. Purpose

5.2.1. To protect the interest and reputation of the University by maintaining fairness, integrity, and other ethical standards in all of its graduate research endeavors;

5.2.2. To promote transparency, thereby increasing the culture of trust in the graduate research community and the public;

5.2.3. To create awareness among the participants of graduate research work and ensure the visibility and consistent application of measures to reduce the negative impact of COI; and;

5.2.4. To assist research participants in recognizing COI and establishing principles to ensure that COI is adequately disclosed and consistently assessed and managed.

5.3. Scope

5.3.1. This policy shall apply to:

- All academic staff members including academic administrators,
- All colleges, schools, institutes, departments
- All graduate programs and the graduate program students.
- Supervisors, examiners, visiting professors, and other academic staff involved directly or indirectly in graduate research work.

5.4. Policy Statement

5.4.1. In the process of graduate research work, all academic staff and candidates shall honor the principles of fairness and discharge their responsibilities with impartiality, integrity, loyalty, prudence, and diligence to facilitate the accomplishment of graduate research work without conflict of interest.

5.4.2. Conflicts of interests arise when situations place a person or the University in a real, perceived, or potential conflict between their duties related to research and their personal, university, or other interests. It may occur when the parties involved in graduate research work and actions concerning research are affected by personal, university, or other interests, including business or financial interests, whether of individuals, their family members, their friends, or their former, current or prospective professional associations – or of the University itself.

5.4.3. The academic staff shall perform their duties and responsibilities in a manner as to avoid any CoI. The interests of the University shall always prevail when the academic staff is in a situation of CoI or when the personal interest of a related party places the staff in such situation.

5.4.4. **Situations of Conflicts of Interest**

5.4.4.1. A conflict of interest may exist where the following may lead to an unfair advantage or disadvantage when making decisions on behalf of the University. These may include but not limited to the relationships and/or connections with former employers and former employees and/or; participation in external activities and/or; interests in another business a personal gain in making business or academic decisions

5.4.5. **Common Areas of Conflict of Interest**

Withstanding different articles in the legislation of ECSU in this way or another, such as in Prohibited Act, academic staff and graduate program students shall not engage in matters that raise CoI. The following are common areas where a CoI may arise or exist:

i) the personal relationship involving students

ii) the personal relationship involving staff

iii) financial and non-financial offers

iv) research

v) recruitment and selection of Members of the Examiners Board

5.4.6. **Types of Conflicts**

5.4.6.1. Actual conflict: involves a direct conflict between an academic staff member's duties and responsibilities to the University and a competing interest or obligation, whether personal or involving a third party. For example, an academic staff member appoints an external supervisor or examiner in which the academic staff member has a financial interest.

5.4.6.2. A potential conflict arises when an academic staff member has an interest or obligation,

whether personal or involving a third party, that could conflict with the academic staff member's duties/responsibilities to the University. For example, an academic staff member has a personal relationship with a student or academic staff member of the University within their school / Department.

5.4.6.3. Perceived conflict exists where it could reasonably be perceived, or give the appearance, that a competing interest could improperly influence an academic staff member's work-related decisions/activity. For example, an academic staff member is interested in a business that sponsors research conducted by their school/department at the University.

5.4.7. Expected Behavior

5.4.7.1. The University expects all academic staff to act ethically and with integrity and to maintain the highest professional standards at work under ECSU's Code of Practice.

5.4.7.2. All academic staff must do everything possible to avoid CoI. The following, without limitation, are examples of CoI in Research that the staff should avoid:

i) When financial, professional, or other personal considerations or commitments may compromise or have the appearance of compromising the staff's judgment in carrying out or reporting their research activities at the University;

ii) when the staff is in a position to influence, either directly or indirectly, research activities in ways that could advance the staff's interests, advance or hinder the personal interests of another staff or the personal interests of a Related Party; or

iii) when the staff makes use of university resources and personnel in carrying out research activities to the benefit of a Spin-Off Company or

a) when accepting any offer or receipt of gifts or other benefits that could affect either party's impartiality, influence a business decision or lead to the improper performance of their responsibilities or

b) be involved in activities and have a personal relationship which may provide an unfair advantage or disadvantage when making decisions on behalf of the University

5.4.7.3. Should an actual, potential or perceived conflict exist, staff should take action in accordance with the procedure, such as:

a) remove themselves from the conflict and/or

b) ensure appropriate controls are in place to manage the conflict and/or

c) where required, disclose the conflict or improper conduct

5.4.8. Breaches of Policy

5.4.8.1. The different levels of the University, such as the department, Colleges, School of Graduate Studies, and Council of Graduate Studies, will take steps to identify and manage actual, potential, and perceived CoI cases of CoI arise.

5.4.8.2. Pending an investigation/inquiry, staff may be subject to disciplinary action per University policies/procedures and the Collective Agreement. Refer to the Procedures below for further information.

5.5. Procedures

5.5.1. This procedure provides further information on the common areas where CoI occurs and the process of declaring an actual, potential, or perceived CoI.

5.5.1.1. Personal Relationships

The University expects all academic staff to act ethically and with integrity and to maintain the highest professional standards for graduate research work. Those representatives in personal relationships with another representative must:

i) Ensure that work-related considerations are the only ones used in graduate research activities.

ii) avoid impropriety

iii) work without bias

iv) not abuse authority

v) remove and mitigate any CoI

vi) act appropriately in the work environment

5.5.2. Staff/Staff

5.5.2.1. Where a relationship (such as husband and wife, family member, romantic relationship, business relationship, and other relationships that potentially cause CoI) that potentially leads to CoI does exist between two academic staff members and has formally been approved. The following work processes must not be engaged in concerning each other:

i) recruitment, selection, the appointment of supervisors

ii) recruitment, selection, the appointment of examiners

iii) recruitment, selection, the appointment of chairperson

iv) assessment, reviews, and performance management processes

5.5.2.2. The University should identify any behavior/relationship that it believes to be inappropriate/unacceptable, disruptive, or affect the work environment in a negative manner. The University reserves the right to review the work situation and take appropriate steps to avoid and/or resolve the situation.

5.5.2.3. In so doing, the academic staff member/s who/are the subject of the relationship may be required to undertake any reasonable steps and directions to resolve or avoid the issue to the extent necessary to protect the interests of the University and other staff.

5.5.2.4. The AVP and/ or delegate will ultimately determine and oversee any arrangement for the management of the academic staff members in personal relationships if not managed at the department, College, and school of graduate studies level.

5.5.3. Staff/Student

5.5.3.1. Where an academic staff member has a close personal relationship (such as husband and wife, family member, romantic relationship, business relationship, and other relationships that potentially cause CoI) with a student, that academic staff member should not participate in or contribute to that student:

    i) Selection for entry to the University and graduate programs offered by the University.

    ii) Selection of research topic/title.

    iii) Assessment of students' research progress

    iv) Research disciplinary proceeding

    v) Application for students' research fund

    vi) Assessment and evaluation of graduate research works

    vii) Evaluation of the same research work of students during the proposal, pre-submission, and viva voce/defense more than once.

5.5.3.2. If there is a close relationship, the academic staff should disclose and decline any supervisory and evaluative role and make alternative arrangements for the supervision and/or evaluation of the student's work.

5.5.3.3. The AVP and/ or delegate will ultimately determine and oversee any arrangement for the management of the academic staff members in personal relationships with students if not managed at the department, College, and school of graduate studies level.

5.5.4. Staff/Third Party

Where an academic staff member has a relationship with a third-party person/organization, that academic staff member should not participate in or contribute to decisions being made which may provide an unfair advantage or disadvantage for that third party. Third parties may include (but are not limited to) external supervisors, external examiners, and other parties.

5.5.5. Financial and Non-financial Interest

5.5.5.1. Academic staff members should decline offers of financial gifts, benefits and hospitality, and other non-financial offers from a student working on graduate research.

5.5.5.2. The department, the College, the School of Graduate Studies, or the University step by step does, however, recognize that situations may arise where it is not possible to decline the offer. In all cases, academic staff must ensure that the gift, benefit, or hospitality is an expression of goodwill and not an expectation of a return favour.

5.5.6. Research and Publication

5.5.6.1. The Code of Practice of the University requires that researchers make full disclosure in writing of any actual, potential, or perceived CoI in Research.

5.5.6.2. In respect of grants and other research funding, there is an obligation to disclose to the funding body any actual, potential, or perceived CoI which might affect the research or

investigations, influence publication, or otherwise affect the project. Likewise, concerning publications, CoI should be disclosed to publishers or editors and the readers of the published work.

5.5.6.3. Unless a special written agreement is made between supervisors and students, the publication of graduate research belongs to the candidate and supervisors. The manuscripts extracted from dissertation for publication purpose must list the candidate as corresponding (first) author, the principal supervisor as second author and then the co-supervisor's name at last.

5.5.7. Recruitment and Selection of Supervisors and Examiners

5.5.7.1. The University believes that the working relationships between people engaged in research in the University must be based on integrity and trust.

5.5.7.2. Academic staff engaged by the University involved in close personal relationships must avoid impropriety, bias, and abuse of authority and CoI.

5.5.7.3. Staff can recommend someone they have a close relationship with for a vacant position. However, they should not take any direct part in the selection process for any appointment for which this person is an applicant.

5.6. Disclosure and Management of Conflict of Interest

5.6.1. Disclosure Obligations

5.6.1.1. As soon as an academic staff member becomes aware that they have an actual, potential, or perceived CoI, they should either:

i) remove themselves from the conflict and/or

ii) ensure appropriate controls are in place to manage the conflict and/or

iii) where required, disclose the conflict or improper conduct

5.6.1.2. If an academic staff member doubts a conflict exists, they should seek advice from their Immediate Supervisor, such as the head of the school/department/institute.

5.6.2. Disclosure and Reporting Process

5.6.2.1. Academic staff members is required to disclose the nature and extent of a CoI before undertaking the activity or service or entering a situation that may constitute a CoI.

5.6.2.2. There are several methods of reporting a CoI depending on the nature of the CoI. When an academic staffs anticipate or are aware of a CoI, they shall immediately file a Disclosure Report using the format annexed (**see Disclosure Format in annex A**).

5.6.2.3. An academic staff who fails to disclose the circumstances of a CoI or who is otherwise not in compliance with this policy shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action by the relevant University policy or relevant collective agreement.

5.6.3. Management of Conflict of Interest

5.6.3.1. Once the department CoI management work fails, notifications of CoI will be reviewed by the college dean unless otherwise outlined in the appropriate policy or procedure. Under the

direction of the academic units like departments and Colleges, a management plan (Written plan and other documents and records related to CoI) will be established where required, which may include:

i) Nature of the academic staff member's interest

ii) Conflict in interest/s of the University against academic staff members

iii) Likelihood of the interests coming into conflict

iv) Actions that the academic staff member agrees to avoid doing and participating in and;

v) Decisions or actions which the academic staff member agree to take or do

5.6.3.2. The relevant academic unit or College must take into account several factors in the process of managing CoI, including:

i) the nature of the CoI

ii) the operating environment

iii) legal requirements and

iv) general practicality

5.6.3.3. Once a management plan is approved by the relevant academic unit or college it must be documented, recorded and signed by all parties in the Disclosure of CoI Register and reviewed on an as-needs basis.

5.6.3.4. All documents should be marked "confidential," and access strictly limited to responsible bodies who need access for official purposes.

5.6.3.5. In developing this plan, any party to the CoI may consult with the relevant body for guidance and assistance.

5.6.4. Determination of Conflict of Interest

5.6.4.1. Until there has been a determination that there is no Conflict of Interest or that there is a Conflict of Interest, but that it may be managed appropriately and therefore permitted, an academic staff member shall not enter into the activities, services, or situations that are the subject matter of the Disclosure Report.

5.6.4.2. Upon receipt of the Disclosure Report, the Reporting Officer shall immediately send a copy to the Vice-President, Research and Graduate Studies, who shall be available for any guidance that may be required. The Reporting Officer shall review the Disclosure Report and shall determine whether:

i) No CoI exists, where the academic staff member shall be free to pursue the activity, service, or situation that was the subject matter of the Disclosure Report;

ii) A CoI exists that is prohibited, where the academic staff member shall not pursue the activity, service, or situation that was the subject matter of the Disclosure Report; or

iii) a CoI exists, but it may be permitted if it is managed and monitored, where the academic staff member shall be free to pursue the activity, service, or situation that was the subject matter of

the Disclosure Report, but only when an appropriate method of managing and monitoring the CoI has been established, and the academic staff member has agreed, in writing, to comply with such management and monitoring process.

5.6.4.3. Before rendering a decision, the Reporting Officer may request additional information from the academic staff member regarding the anticipated CoI.

5.6.4.4. The Reporting Officer shall inform the academic staff member of their decision in writing within 5 working days following receipt of the Disclosure Report.

5.6.4.5. In case where the Reporting Officer anticipates having a CoI in the situation being assessed, the Reporting Officer shall refer the Disclosure Report to the next appropriate senior officer for review (see Appendix B).

5.6.4.6. A copy of the Reporting Officer's decision shall be sent to the AVP and, in a case involving a permanent academic staff member, to the Department Chair and Dean. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the academic staff member's personnel file.

5.6.5. Review of Reporting Officer's Decision Requested by the academic staff member

5.6.5.1. Within five working days from the issuance of the Reporting Officer's decision, an academic staff member may submit such decision for review to the next appropriate senior office as set out in Appendix B.

5.6.5.2. The Reviewing Officer shall review the decision and may uphold the decision in its entirety, uphold the decision in part, modify it, or overrule it in whole or in part.

5.6.5.3. Before rendering a decision, the Reviewing Officer may request additional information from the academic staff member or the Reporting Officer regarding the anticipated Conflict of Interest.

5.6.5.4. The Reviewing Officer shall inform the academic staff member of their decision in writing within 10 working days following receipt of the review request.

5.6.5.5. A copy of the Reviewing Officer's decision shall be sent to AVP, the Reporting Officer, and, in a case involving a permanent academic staff member, to the Head of School/Institute. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the academic staff member's personnel file.

5.6.5.6. In case where the Reviewing Officer anticipates having a Conflict of Interest in the matter being reviewed, he shall refer the review request to the next appropriate senior level for review, as seen in Appendix B.

5.6.5.7. Within ten working days from the receipt of the Reporting or Reviewing Officer's decision, the AVP may forward such decision for an independent review and recommendation by a three-person ad hoc Advisory Committee named by the AVP.

5.6.5.8. The AVP shall then render final decision within five days of receiving the recommendation.

5.6.6. Privacy

5.6.6.1. The University respects the privacy of academic staff members' personal information and

health information. Information collected will be used by the University's legislation and relevant policies.

APPENDIX 1: <u>**Conflict of Interest Disclosure Report Form**</u>

This form should be completed by any academic staff who anticipates a Conflict of Interest in graduate research. The staff who wants to disclose COI must carefully fill this following form and submit to concerned body.

Section 1: To be filled by the academic staff

Name: _____

Date of the Present Disclosure: _____

College: _____Department: _____
Email address: _____ telephone number: _____

Status/title of Academic Staff taking part in research (check one):

□ Master's Student   □ Doctoral Fellow   □ Supervisor

□ Examiner   □ Adjunct professor   □ Technical staff

□ Visiting professor   □ Heads of Academic Unit   □ Dean of Colleges

□ Other: _____

1. Describe below (or in a separate attached document) the research project in question[1] :

   _____

   _____.

2. Describe below (or in a separate attached document) the nature and extent of the CoI, including all activities, services, or situations that could place the academic staff in a CoI[2]

   _____

   _____

3. For situations of COI relating to the university (as defined in the policy), please provide the following information:

a. Describe the Member's or Related Party's interests or stake in the University.

   _____

b. Describe the Member's or Related Party's role or position in the University.

   _____

c. Describe the Member's intended time commitment to the activities mentioned.

   _____

d. State the planned involvement of any students, university faculty, and other University personnel in the activities, highlighting, in particular, any situations in which a member has academic or administrative supervision responsibilities for such individuals.

   _____

e. Describe the relationship between the research activities and the Member's University research activities, highlighting any real or perceived overlap in these activities.

   _____

   Signature of Member: _____

   SECTION 2: To be completed by the Reporting Officer

   Name and title of Reporting Officer: _____

   Date of receipt of the present Disclosure Report: _____

    Email address and telephone number: _____

   Copy of the present Disclosure Report sent to the Vice-President, Academics Affair?

      Yes □

      No □   Date sent: _____

The decision of the Reporting officer (check one):

   □ No COI exists; the Member is free to pursue the activity, service, or situation that was the subject matter of the present Disclosure Report.

---

[1] All information disclosed will be held in confidence per university policies and legislative, regulatory, and contractual requirements.

[2] Until activities, services, or situations with COI considerations are disclosed, assessed, and dealt with; members shall not engage in such activities, services, or situations.

□ A prohibited COI exists; the Member shall not pursue the activity, service, or situation that was the subject matter of the present Disclosure Report.

□ A COI exists but the Member may pursue the activity, service, or situation that was the subject matter of the present Disclosure Report only by the following conditions and/or instructions and/or method and monitoring (or see separate attached document)[3] :

Signature of the Member agreeing to the conditions mentioned above:
Signature: _____ Date: _____
Date of decision by Reporting Officer: _____
Signature of Reporting Office: _____

Appendix 2: PhD Dissertation Evaluation Forms

የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY
የድሕረ 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: _____

_____

---

[3] The Member shall agree in writing to the Reporting Officer's established method of managing and monitoring the COI

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

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

<u>*The candidate is a fit /not fit to submit.*</u>

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_____

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
1	**Introduction**			
	Are the objectives based on in-depth literature review?			
	Does the thesis clearly mention focus, scope and limitation**?**			
2	**Literature**			
	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?			
3	**Methodology**			
	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?			
4	**Analysis, results and discussions**			
	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?			

5	**Conclusion**			
	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?			
6	**Recommendation**			
	Is policy implication of the findings or theoretical implication explicitly stated?			
	Are the findings generalizable?			
7	**References**			
	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?			
8	**Documentation of thesis**			
	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?			
9	**Major contributions**			
	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?			
10	**Way forward**			
	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.			

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

Name _____   Name _____

Date and Signature _____   Date and Signature _____

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:   **Approved by Examiner 2**

Name _____   Name _____

Date and Signature _____   Date and Signature _____

Section D: Verification by Dean/Vice

Name _____

Date and Signature _____

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 and date: _____

Name:_____

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 _____

(stamp)

Date and Signature _____

ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY
የድሕረ 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. *Name of Supervisor:* _____ *Date and signature:* _____ Signature of Academic Vice Dean /Department head			

የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY
የድሕረ 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 **Dean of the College**. 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 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 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

Sl.No	Content	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1	*Introduction*	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.	
2	*Review of Literature*	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.	
3	*Methods / Approach*	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.	
4	*Results / Outcomes*	Absence of the presentation of results in accordance with the research questions and stated hypotheses. Tables are either absent are 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: _____

5	***Discussion and Summary***	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
6	***Writing Quality***	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.

Note: 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

Sl.No	Content	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1	Organization	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.	
2	Originality	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	
3	Significance/ Authenticity	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.	
4	Discussion and summary	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.	
5	Delivery	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: _____

12

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

PhD Dissertation examination and defense evaluation
(SGS-PhD: Form 007 Annex A)

This page is an attachment to the examination of the dissertation and provides an explanation for each aspect of the dissertation the examiner feels the candidate is somewhat weak or has deficiency. It is to be sent to the Dean/Vice Dean of the College and a copy to Director of School of Graduate Studies at least two weeks before the defense date via e-mail. The hard copy will also be attached to the examiner's evaluation result of the defense.

Name of the candidate: …………………………………………………………………………

Dissertation Title:…………………………………………………………………………………

1. Introduction

2. Review of literature

3. Methods/approach

| |
| |

4. Analysis Results / outcome

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

5. Discussion & summary

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

6. Writing skills

| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Name of examiner _____Signature_____Date_____

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.

_____   _____   _____

Advisor Name   Signature   Date
____

_____   ----------------   --------------
Head Academic Unit (name)   signature   Date

Appendix 3: Master's Thesis Examination Forms

የኢትዮጵያ ሲቪል ሰርቪስ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
ETHIOPIAN CIVIL SERVICE UNIVERSITY
የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት 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_____

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

Name of the Candidate: _____ID No:_____

College: _____ Department _____

Program: _____

Thesis Title: _____

_____

No.	Criteria	Weight	marks
1.	**Part 1. Content**	**75%**	
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	
2.	**Part 2. Form**	**10%**	
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	
3.	**Part 3: Presentation**	**15%**	
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	
	Total (100%)		

Name of examiner: _____Signature and date: _____

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%) =		
Part 3 (100%)			(*15%) =	
Total (100%)				

Rating

	Rank	`(%)*
1	Excellent	≥ 85
2	Very good	$75 \leq X < 85$
3	Good	$60 \leq X < 75$
4	Satisfactory	$50 \leq X < 60$
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
የድሕረ 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.

_____   _____   _____

Advisor Name   Signature   Date

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____   _____   _____

Head Academic Unit (name)   signature   Date

Graduate committee decision:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____   _____   _____
Committee Member (name)   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____
Committee Member (name)   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____
Chairperson Graduate   Signature   Date
Committee (name)

Appendix 4: The Roadmap and Progress Tracking Formats

Introduction: -This brief roadmap is prepared to facilitate the timely completion of dissertation research as well as to contribute towards improving the quality of graduate research work. Besides, it can be used as an instrument to follow up on the progress of students and to provide necessary support as required. It will help students focus on their studies. It is prepared based on the existing guidelines and the Senate Legislation.

Objectives – To track the progress of students and help facilitate the timely completion of the program by providing all necessary supports at different levels of the University.

Content: -   The roadmap consists of major milestones for completing the PhD program. The major activities to be accomplished during each year of the program are included. For both PhD and master's programs, the first year (two semesters) are devoted to course work. PhD students should start the research work (beginning with proposal development) during the first semester of year II and the remaining years are for dissertation research work. Similarly, master's program students after completing course work in the first year, will devote their first semester of the second year for completing remaining seminar courses and proposal development and must work on their master's thesis in the second semester of the year of semester. That is, under normal conditions they must complete their studies in two years. The main milestones are provided in the table below.

Milestones and their completion time for Ph.D. Students

A.Y	Semester	Major Expected Activities	Deadlines
Year 1	Semester I	*Coursework (1st Semester)*	Year 1, Sem 1, 1st week of the month – last week (Acad.Cal.)
	Semester II	*Coursework (2nd Semester)*	February 3rd week – June 4th week (Academic Cal.)
Year 2	**Semester I**	● ***Proposal Development***	**September 4th week – February 2nd week**
		- *Topic selection and approval*	September 4th week – October. 2nd week
		- *Colloquium presentation I*	September 4th week - October. 3rd week
		- *Proposal writing process*	October. 2nd week – January 2nd week
		- *Proposal submission and reading by experts*	January 2nd week – January 4th week
		- *Proposal defense and final submission*	February 1st week - February 2nd week
		- *Participate in seminars/ workshops/ training*	September 4th week – February 2nd week
	Semester II	● ***Data collection and Feedback Report***	**February 3rd week - *May 4th week***
		- *Fund request and processing*	February 3rd week – February 4th week
		- *Field data Collection*	March 1st week - May 4th week
		- *Report on data collection and submission of dataset including fund settlement*	May 4th week – June 2nd week
		- *Participate in seminars/ workshops/pieces of training etc.*	February 3rd week- May 4th week
Year 3	**Semester I**	● ***Data analysis***	*September 4th week - February 2nd week*
		- *Data clearing and entry*	September 4th week - October 4th week
		- *Data analysis*	October 4th week – December 2nd week
		- *Colloquium Presentation II*	October 1st week – February 2nd week
		- *Participate in seminars/ workshops/ training etc.*	September 4th week - February 2nd week
		- *Starting dissertation write-up*	December 2nd week -February 2nd week

	Semester II	• *Dissertation write-up -continued*	**February 3rd week - June 4th week**
		• *Colloquium presentation III*	February 3rd week - June 4th week
		• *Participate in seminars/workshops/training*	February 3rd week - June 4th week
Year 4	**Semester I**	• *Dissertation write-up -continued*	**September 4th week - December 3rd week**
		• *Request for pre-submission seminar*	December 3rd week – December 4th week
		• *Reading by experts*	January 1st week - January 3rd week
		• *Pre-submission seminar date*	January 3rd week – January 4th week
		• *Participate in seminars/workshops/training*	September 4th week – February 2nd week
	Semester II	• *Making the final copies ready for submission*	**February 1st week – February 4th week**
		• *Completing formalities for final defense*	March 1st week - March 2nd week
		• *Approval of the board of examiners by SGC*	March 2nd week - March 3rd week
		• *Dispatching copies to board of examiners*	March 3rd week – March 4th week
		• *Reading by the board of examiners*	April 1st week - May 4th week
		• **First round final PhD defense**	**May 4th week – June 1st week**
For students who planned to defend in the second round/ beginning of November		***For Second Round (November) Defense***	**November 4th week – December 1st week**
		• *Completion of final draft dissertation*	On/Before May 3rd week
		• *Per-submission request*	May 3rd week - May 4th week
		• *Reading by experts*	June 1st week - June 3rd week
		• *Pre-submission seminar date*	June 4th week - July 1st week
		• *Final submission and completing formalities*	September 3rd week - September 4th week
		• *Approval of the board of examiners*	October 1st week
		• *Reading by the board of examiners*	October 2nd week - November 3rd week
		• *Final defense*	November 4th week – December 1st week

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. **Indicate important dates**

    5.1. Date of final proposal approval _____

    5.2. Date research fund secured _____

    5.3. Data collection time _____ to _____

6. **Milestone and activity accomplishments**

    6.1. Milestone accomplished during first semester _____

    6.2. Milestone accomplished during second semester _____

    6.3. Main milestone activities performed during the two semesters

S. No	Milestone (semester I)		Milestone (semester II)	Remark
	Activities performed		Activities performed	

7. Write (in brief) the main comments (feedbacks) given by experts during a milestone evaluation session by progress tracking team or DGC (leave this if not performed)

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Problems/challenges encountered during executing the milestone activities

8.1. List out the major problems/challenges you have faced during execution of the milestone and detail activities under the milestone.

_____

_____

_____

_____

8.2. Did you report to the above challenges/problems you faced to your supervisors?

Yes _____ No _____

8.3. To what extent the problems you have indicated in number '8' are going to affect the overall progress of your dissertation work (indicate in months/days) _____.

9. **Seminars/Training participated or delivered**

9.1. Seminars/trainings participated or delivered during the two milestone periods (during the two semesters)

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)				

9.2. If you did not participate at any kind of seminar/training, please provide adequate reasons.

_____

10. Colloquium presentation conducted (if two colloquia are conducted, please state both)

10.1.   Have you conducted the required colloquium at your current level of progress? _____

10.2.   If your answer is no, give adequate reasons _____

10.3.   If you have conducted the required colloquia;

    a. Date of colloquium presentation: _____ Place: _____

    b. Topic of discussion: _____

    c. Number of participants: _____

    d. Major comments given during colloquium presentation

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10.4.   If you did not present the colloquia during the milestone periods, please provide adequate reasons:

    _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Form to be filled by the principal supervisor

    1. How do you rate the performance of your advisee(student) against his/her plan? (Tick on the space provided).

    High _____ Satisfactory_____poor performance _____

    2. How do you rate the quality of your student's milestone performance/work? (Tick on the space provided).

    Very high _____ high _____ good _____ satisfactory _____ poor _____

3. Do you think that your student can complete his/her dissertation research during the normal time schedule (May, 2024 next year)? Yes _____ No _____

4. If your answer is no, to Q3 above, what do you thinks are the main reasons for this?

   _____

   _____,

5. Did your student report to you any kind of challenge/problem he/she faced during his milestone execution that may retard his/her progress?

   Yes _____ No_____

6. If you answer is yes to question 5 above, how many extra weeks/months you think he/she may require to compensate for the delay due to justified problem/challenge he/she reported to you? _____

7. How many times did your student contact you for advice during this year? _____

8. What are the strengths and weakness of the student?

   8.1. Strengths

_____

_____

   8.2.Weaknesses

_____

_____

I certify that the information provided below is correct and genuine

Student	Supervisor
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 and documentation