

KABARAK UNIVERSITY

**INSTITUTE OF POST GRADUATE
STUDIES**

**HANDBOOK FOR POSTGRADUATE
STUDIES**

March 2024

VERSION: 02



KABARAK UNIVERSITY IS ISO 9001:2015 CERTIFIED

POLICY SIGN-OFF AND OWNERSHIP DETAILS


Document Name	Handbook for Postgraduate Studies
Version Number	1.0
Revision Number	2.0
Approved by:	University Governing Council
Effective From	28 th March 2024
Date of Review	28 th March 2029
Author	University Management
Owner (if different from above):	DVC (Academic and Research)
Document Location:	Office of the DVC (Administration and Finance)
Compliance Checks	Monitor the handbook for postgraduate studies implementation in all spheres of operation for compliance with the requirements in place on an annual basis.

Hand Book for Post Graduate Studies

This **Hand Book for Post Graduate Studies** is approved for implementation from this date

Prof. Henry K. Kiplangat, PhD, MBS, OGW

VICE CHANCELLOR


.....
SIGNATURE

3/4/2024
.....
DATE

Dr. John Kibosia

CHAIRMAN UNIVERSITY COUNCIL


.....
SIGNATURE

3/4/2024
.....
DATE

1.0 Preamble

1.1 About Kabarak University

Kabarak University was founded on **16th October, 2000** by **His Excellency President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi**, the Second President of the Republic of Kenya and the First Chancellor of the University. His Excellency President Moi wanted to set up a reputable Christian, Liberal Arts, Science and Technology university. The University operated under the Letter of Interim Authority granted by the Government of Kenya and presented to the University by the Commission for Higher Education on **16th October 2000**, therefore allowing the institution to award degrees. The University opened the door for admission of its first students in **September 2002**. On **16th May, 2008** the University was awarded Charter by His Excellency President Mwai Kibaki, the Third President of the Republic of Kenya.

Campuses

The University currently operates two (2) campuses and seven (7) schools. The Main Campus is located 20 kilometers north of Nakuru town, along the Nakuru Eldama Ravine highway. The campus stands on a 600-acre piece of land in a serene, spacious, and beautiful environment that makes it ideal for learning. The constituent campus, known as Nakuru City Campus, is located one kilometer from Nakuru CBD, off Nakuru – Kabarnet Road

1.2 Vision, Mission, Philosophy, Core Values, Objectives and Moral Code

University Vision

To become a Centre of Academic Excellence founded on Biblical Christian values.

University Mission

To provide holistic quality education based on research, practical skills and Biblical Christian values.

University Philosophy

To provide a holistic quality education based on research, practical skills and Biblical Christian worldview that transforms lives.

University Core Values

- (i) Integrity
- (ii) Professionalism
- (iii) Innovativeness
- (iv) Patriotism
- (v) Being Mindful of others

Moral Code

As members of Kabarak University family, we purpose at all times and in all places, to set apart in one's heart, Jesus as Lord (1 Peter 3:15).

1.3 University Objectives

These are the objectives in the University strategic plan.

1. To enhance the quality and quantity of teaching, learning and research;
2. To ensure rich experience while on campus that prepares students for a life of purpose;
3. To enhance quality assurance and institutionalize quality management
4. To maintain efficient and effective governance and management system
5. To enhance quality, adequacy and commitment of staff
6. To achieve financial self-sustenance and efficient and effective utilization of funds
7. To provide and maintain quality and adequate physical infrastructure and facilities
8. To provide and maintain quality and adequate ICT and library resources and services

Table of Contents

POLICY SIGN-OFF AND OWNERSHIP DETAILS.....	i
1.0 Preamble.....	ii
1.1 About Kabarak University.....	ii
1.2 Vision, Mission, Philosophy, Core Values, Objectives and Moral Code.....	iii
University Vision.....	iii
University Mission.....	iii
University Philosophy.....	iii
University Core Values.....	iii
Moral Code.....	iii
1.3 University Objectives.....	iii
1.0 Overview.....	1
2.0 Functions of the Institute of Postgraduate Studies.....	1
3.0 The Board of Postgraduate Studies (BPS).....	2
3.1 Reporting.....	2
3.2 Membership.....	2
3.3 Chairperson.....	2
3.4 Meetings of the Board.....	2
4.0 Postgraduate Faculty.....	3
5.0 Supervision and Examination of Thesis.....	3
5.1 Restrictions on Supervision and Examination of Thesis.....	3
5.2 Evaluation of Postgraduate Supervision.....	4
6.0 Development, Review, & Approval Process for Postgraduate Programs.....	4
7.0 Structure and Assessment of Postgraduate Programs.....	5
7.1 Postgraduate Certificate Program.....	5
7.2 Postgraduate Certificate Course shall be assessed through:.....	5
7.3 Postgraduate Diploma.....	5
7.4 Masters Degrees.....	6
7.5 Assessment of Masters Degrees.....	7
7.6 Graduation Requirements for Masters Degree.....	7
7.7 Doctor of Philosophy Degrees.....	8
7.8 Graduation Requirements for Doctor of Philosophy Degrees.....	8
8.0 Postgraduate Student Supervisors.....	8

8.1 Appointment of Supervisors 8

8.2 The Duties and Obligations of the Supervisor..... 10

9.0 Responsibilities of the Candidates 11

10.0 Course Work Examination..... 11

11.0 Concept Paper Examination 11

12.0 Proposal Examination..... 12

13.0 Examination of Master’s Projects 13

14.0 Examination of Thesis 14

15.0 Submission of the Final Thesis or Project Copies 20

16.0 Publication of Thesis 21

17.0 Conferral of Postgraduate Degrees 21

18.0 Academic Progression and Discontinuation 21

19.0 Withdrawal of Degrees and Other Awards 21

20.0 Postgraduate Student Welfare..... 22

21.0 Conflict Resolution 22

22.0 Evaluation of Postgraduate Supervision 25

APPENDIX I: SUPERVISION EVALUATION FORM..... 26

APPENDIX II: CORRECTION MATRIX FORM 28

APPENDIX III: THESIS CORRECTIONS SIGN OFF FORM..... 29

APPENDIX IV: MASTER’S/PHD THESIS SUBMISSION CHECKLIST 30

APPENDIX VI: SUBMISSION OF HARDBOUND THESIS..... 35

APPENDIX VII: NOTICE OF PROOFREADING OF THESIS..... 37

APPENDIX VIII: RESEARCH PUBLICATION SUBMISSION FORM 38

APPENDIX IX: SUPERVISION RECORD FORM 39

APPENDIX X: SUPERVISOR ALLOCATION FORM 41

APPENDIX XI: POSTGRADUATE ASSESSMENT TOOLS..... 43

APPENDIX V(B): PROPOSAL GRADING FORM 46

APPENDIX V(C): GUIDELINES ON AWARDING VERDICT FOR PROPOSAL DEFENSES 55

APPENDIX V(D): THESIS GRADING FORM 58



INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES (IPGS)

1.0 Overview

Since the establishment of Kabarak University in 2000, and the inception of postgraduate programs in 2009, the University's postgraduate enrollment and courses have expanded tremendously. This growth can be attributed to the development of responsive, market-driven programs which are periodically reviewed to reflect the changing needs of the society.

The Institute of Postgraduate Studies (IPGS) was established in 2009 to manage and coordinate the growing postgraduate student body and programs. The Institute is headed by the Director who also serves as Secretary of the Board of Postgraduate Studies (BPS)

2.0 Functions of the Institute of Postgraduate Studies

The functions of the IPGS are as follows:

- 2.1 Coordinate postgraduate academic programs domiciled in the various schools;
- 2.2 Ensure adherence to rules and regulations relating to postgraduate studies;
- 2.3 Formulate and review of relevant policies and guidelines for the conduct of postgraduate studies in the University;
- 2.4 Encourage the publication and dissemination of research findings;
- 2.5 Ensure that patents and other intellectual property rights are secured where appropriate.

3.0 The Board of Postgraduate Studies (BPS)

3.1 Reporting

The Board of Postgraduate Studies (BPS) shall be responsible to the University Senate for all matters pertaining to postgraduate studies in the University.

3.2 Membership

The members of the Board of Postgraduate Studies shall be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor as follows:

- 3.2.1 Director, Institute of Postgraduate Studies (Secretary);
- 3.2.2 One (1) representative from each School – get the list and correct names;
- 3.2.3 Director (Directorate of Excellence in Teaching and Learning);
- 3.2.4 University Librarian;
- 3.2.5 Director (Research, Innovation and Outreach);
- 3.2.6 Director (Quality Assurance and Institutional Planning);
- 3.2.7 One (1) postgraduate student representative (shall attend meetings only when matters pertaining to student welfare are on the agenda)

3.3 Chairperson

The chairperson shall be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and shall be of the rank of an Associate Professor or a Professor of Kabarak University.

3.4 Meetings of the Board

- 3.4.1 The regular Board meetings shall take place at least once in a month.
- 3.4.2 Notice of regular Board meetings and agenda shall be issued at least one week in advance.
- 3.4.3 The Director IPGS may call a special meeting of the Board and the agenda for such meeting shall be the only business of the meeting.
- 3.4.4 The quorum for the transaction of any business during all meetings

shall be one-third of the membership of the Board.

3.4.5 The Board may invite other resource persons to attend its meetings in an advisory capacity. Such persons shall be listed as “In Attendance” and shall not have power to vote.

3.4.6 Postgraduate Student representatives shall be invited to the meetings only when matters pertaining to student welfare are on the agenda.

4.0 Postgraduate Faculty

4.1 Postgraduate faculty in the University shall be as follows:

4.1.1 Professors

4.1.2 Associate Professors

4.1.3 Senior Lecturers

4.1.4 Lecturers with doctoral degrees and relevant teaching and / or research experience at postgraduate level as evidenced by publications in refereed journals or university level academic books, and waiting for promotion to senior lecturer level.

4.2 Terms of reference and functions of Postgraduate faculty:

4.2.1 Teaching postgraduate programs in their departments.

4.2.2 Supervision and examination of postgraduate students’ theses.

4.2.3 Coordinating and promoting postgraduate research activities within the University.

5.0 Supervision and Examination of Thesis

5.1 Restrictions on Supervision and Examination of Thesis

The following restrictions shall apply in respect of supervision and examination of thesis:

5.1.1 Postgraduate diploma candidates shall be supervised and examined by holders of relevant Masters Degree and above.

5.1.2 Masters candidates shall be supervised and examined by holders of relevant doctoral degrees.

5.1.3 Doctoral candidates shall be supervised and examined by holders of relevant doctoral degrees with research experience as evidenced by publications in refereed journals or university level academic books.

5.1.4 Staff appointed as supervisors or examiners shall be required to declare any conflict of interest.

5.1.5 Staff appointed as supervisors or examiners shall observe professional ethics and the University moral code in supervision of students.

5.2 Evaluation of Postgraduate Supervision

Supervision of postgraduate student is a critical component of postgraduate studies. In order to ensure that all internally and externally appointed supervisors and examiners for both Masters and PhD students deliver their supervisory and defense engagements in a consistent, transparent, timely and effective manner, it is necessary to evaluate the work of supervisors. Therefore, as a quality measure of supervision, all postgraduate students shall be required to fill and submit the Postgraduate Supervision Evaluation Form to the Director IPGS.

6.0 Development, Review, & Approval Process for Postgraduate Programs

All postgraduate programs shall be developed and reviewed by the respective departments which shall submit them to the School Board, Board of Postgraduate Studies, Deans and Research Committee, and the University Senate for consideration and approval, in that order.

7.0 Structure and Assessment of Postgraduate Programs

7.1 Postgraduate Certificate Program

The duration of postgraduate certificate programs shall be between three (3) to six (6) months, unless specified otherwise for specific programs.

7.2 Postgraduate Certificate Course shall be assessed through:

7.2.1 Written Examinations

7.2.2 Reports

7.2.3 Seminars

7.2.4 Any other appropriate mode of assessment approved by Senate.

7.3 Postgraduate Diploma

7.3.1 Postgraduate Diploma programs shall consist of a minimum of nine (9) units of course work, examination and project distributed over two (2) consecutive semesters, unless specified otherwise for specific programs.

7.3.2 Students shall choose courses in consultation with departmental postgraduate faculty. All candidates shall participate in the seminars arranged by their departments.

7.3.3 Students shall be required to undertake a project under supervision by academic staff appointed upon the recommendation of the School Board concerned to Board of Postgraduate Studies.

7.3.4 Each student shall choose a project topic in consultation with the academic staff from the departmental faculty within one (1) month of the first semester.

7.3.5 The candidate shall submit and present a project proposal for the Department Defense within one (1) month of the first semester.

7.4 Masters Degrees

7.4.1 Duration

The Masters Degree programs shall consist of coursework, examination and thesis/project extending over a period of two (2) academic years distributed over four (4) semesters of full time or part-time studies, provided that part-time studies shall not exceed a period of four (4) calendar years from the date of registration.

7.4.2 Masters Degree (Coursework and Thesis Option)

- i) The master's degree (thesis and course work option) shall consist of a minimum of fourteen (14) units, and a maximum of nineteen (19) units of coursework, examination and thesis distributed over four (4) semesters, unless specified otherwise for specific programs.
- ii) During the coursework semesters, students shall be advised to propose prospective supervisors to the Head of Department (HoD) from among the postgraduate faculty.
- iii) The candidate shall submit a thesis research proposal for Departmental defense within the next semester following completion of coursework.
- iv) Within two (2) days of receipt of proposal, the HoD shall appoint a date for the proposal presentation seminar. All postgraduate studies faculty shall be invited to the presentations.
- v) The period for processing of the successfully defended thesis research proposal from the Departmental Seminar to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies shall take a maximum of four (4) weeks.

7.4.3 Masters Degree (Coursework and Project Option)

- i) Masters degree (coursework and project option) programs shall consist of a minimum of fifteen (15) units and a maximum of twenty-two (22) units of course work, examination, and

project research distributed over four (4) semesters, unless specified otherwise for specific programs.

- ii) Students shall choose topics for their projects in consultation with their departmental postgraduate faculty supervisors.
- iii) The candidate shall submit a project research proposal to the Department within two (2) weeks of the next semester following completion of coursework.
- iv) The period for processing of the successfully defended project research proposal from the Departmental Seminar to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies shall take a maximum of four (4) weeks.

7.5 Assessment of Masters Degrees

7.5.1 Candidates shall be required to pass all the prescribed courses in a given program. The pass mark shall be 50%.

7.5.2 Assessment at the end of the course shall consist of:

- i) A written examination which shall constitute 60% of the total marks.
- ii) Continuous assessment based on essays, laboratory assignments and such other tests as may be prescribed by the department. This will constitute 40% of the total marks.

7.6 Graduation Requirements for Masters Degree

Masters degree shall be conferred on the candidates who have met the following requirements:

7.6.1 Successful completion of research thesis or project.

7.6.2 Successful completion of required coursework.

7.6.3 Publication of at least one research paper in a refereed journal.

7.6.4 Presentation of at least one research paper in the Kabarak University Annual International Research Conference, or any other international conference.

7.7 Doctor of Philosophy Degrees

7.7.1 Doctor of Philosophy degree programs shall consist of coursework, examination and thesis.

7.7.2 A candidate shall be registered as a full-time student for the doctoral degree for a minimum of three (3) years and a maximum of six (6) years. Continuance of registration will depend on evidence of satisfactory progress.

7.8 Graduation Requirements for Doctor of Philosophy Degrees

To qualify for graduation, students enrolled in the Doctor of Philosophy Program shall:

7.8.1 Pass all courses and complete a total of 54 credit factors divided as follows:

Five (5) core units	=	15 Credit Factors
Four (4) specialization units	=	12 Credit Factors
Thesis	=	27 Credit Factors
Total	=	54 Credit Factors

7.8.2 Publish at least two (2) papers from the thesis in peer reviewed journals.

8.0 Postgraduate Student Supervisors

8.1 Appointment of Supervisors

8.1.1 Every student admitted into postgraduate studies program shall be provided with two (2) supervisors appointed in that capacity by the Board of Postgraduate Studies through an appointment letter from the Registrar (Administration and Human Resource) on recommendation of the School Board concerned to the Board of Postgraduate Studies.

8.1.2 The graduate student supervisor must be a member of



Postgraduate Faculty of the program in which the student is pursuing the studies, except in special cases as approved by the Board of Postgraduate Studies.

- 8.1.3 The Dean of School shall convene a meeting of the Departmental Postgraduate Faculty within the semester students are completing coursework to recommend supervisors for the students to the Board of Postgraduate Studies. The recommendation shall be accompanied by the minutes of the of the Departmental Postgraduate Faculty meeting.
- 8.1.4 The Director IPGS shall present the names and curriculum vitas of recommended supervisors to the Board of Postgraduate Studies for vetting and approval.
- 8.1.5 The Director IPGS shall present the names and curriculum vitas of approved supervisors to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Research) for verification and forwarding to Registrar (Administration and Human Resource) for appointment letters.
- 8.1.6 In the Masters and PhD programs, two (2) supervisors shall be appointed for each candidate from among the postgraduate faculty of the School concerned for masters by coursework and thesis/project or doctoral students. However in rare cases, School Boards may recommend to the BPS appointment of additional supervisor(s). Such recommendations for additional supervisor(s) shall be accompanied with relevant justification.
- 8.1.7 In the postgraduate diploma program, only one (1) supervisor will be appointed for each candidate from among the postgraduate faculty of the department concerned.
- 8.1.8 At least one (1) of the supervisors must be a member of staff in the department where the masters by coursework and thesis/

project or doctoral candidate is registered.

8.1.9 Where applicable, one supervisor may counsel the student during the period of graduate course work and another may supervise the student's thesis or dissertation research; the latter shall have special competency in the area of student's concentration.

8.2 The Duties and Obligations of the Supervisor

8.2.1 Assisting the student in formulating a program of study and research that culminates in the timely completion of the degree.

8.2.2 Review and attach a recommendation to any petition the student may make with respect to graduate status or requesting a waiver of normal requirements affecting graduate studies, examinations, or research.

8.2.3 Direct the student's research or creative activity involved in the graduate thesis.

8.2.4 Provide the student with regular written evaluation of the student's academic progress.

8.2.5 Guide the student to publish papers in peer reviewed journals.

8.2.6 Guide the student to present papers in local and international conferences.

8.2.7 Maintain professional and ethical standards consistent with the University's Biblical values and moral code.

8.2.8 In the discharge of these functions, the supervisor is responsible to the Head of Department of the program and to the Board of Postgraduate Studies.

9.0 Responsibilities of the Candidates

Candidates shall be responsible for:

- 9.1 Maintaining regular consultation with their supervisors for at least once a month.
- 9.2 Submitting progress reports at the end of every semester through their supervisors to the Director IPGS.
- 9.3 Adhering to correct and acceptable format of presenting quotations, footnotes, references, bibliography, tables and other illustrative materials.
- 9.4 Writing proposal and thesis devoid of errors.
- 9.5 Presenting thesis and sitting oral examinations within the deadlines set in the Academic Calendar.
- 9.6 Ensuring that the required number of copies of thesis and the original are duly signed and *Correction Matrix and Certificate of Corrections* are submitted to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies within the deadlines.

10.0 Course Work Examination

- 10.1 The department in which a student is taught shall set and administer examinations, and process coursework examination results.
- 10.2 Unless otherwise stated, Examination Regulations as prescribed in the University Catalogue shall apply

11.0 Concept Paper Examination

- 11.1 The Head of Department (HoD), in consultation with the student, shall identify and appoint a potential supervisor to guide the student in identifying a research topic and formulating a concept paper.

- 11.2 A student shall work with the potential supervisor to prepare and submit the concept paper to the Head of Department using the prescribed IPGS format.
- 11.3 The concept paper shall be presented not later than end of year two semester one for master's student.
- 11.4 The Head of Department shall constitute a panel of at least three (3) suitably qualified examiners from the department to examine the concept paper. The concept paper examination panel shall consist of:
- 11.4.1 Head of Department
 - 11.4.2 Three (3) suitably qualified examiners from the Department
- 11.5 The duration for concept oral defense shall be as follows:
- 11.5.1 Fifteen (15) minutes for oral presentation
 - 11.5.2 Thirty (30) minutes of cross examination

12.0 Proposal Examination

- 12.1 Every postgraduate student shall prepare a proposal in line with the prescribed IPGS format.
- 12.2 The proposal examination shall be comprised of the following parts:
- 12.2.1 Document examination
 - 12.2.2 Oral examination
- 12.3 Composition of the panel for proposal examination shall be as follows:
- 12.3.1 Dean of School or Head of Department, who shall be the Chair
 - 12.3.2 Three (3) internal examiners
 - 12.3.3 At least one (1) of the supervisors
 - 12.3.4 One (1) Senate representative with relevant subject specialization
- 12.4 The Duration for Masters proposal oral defense shall be as follows:
- 12.4.1 Fifteen (15) minutes for oral presentation by the candidate.
 - 12.4.2 Fifteen (15) minutes for each of the three examiners.

- 12.4.3 Ten (10) minutes for the rest of the faculty present.
- 12.5 Duration for PhD proposal oral defense shall be as follows:
 - 12.5.1 Twenty (20) minutes for oral presentation by the candidate.
 - 12.5.2 Fifteen (15) minutes for each of the three examiners.
 - 12.5.3 Twenty (20) minutes for Dean, Senate Representative and faculty, to comment on the presentation.
- 12.6 The student must pass the proposal examination and obtain all the required approvals and permits to proceed to fieldwork.

13.0 Examination of Master's Projects

- 13.1 The candidate shall submit the project report for examination within the deadline provided in the University Academic Calendar.
- 13.2 For each candidate, the Dean of School shall recommend to the Board of Postgraduate Studies one (1) internal and one (1) external examiner and a panel of three (3) postgraduate faculty to examine the project report.
- 13.3 The candidate shall make an oral presentation based on the guidelines of master's thesis presentation as outlined in Clause 14.0
- 13.4 The project report shall be marked by the project panel and the internal and external examiners appointed by the Director IPGS upon approval by the Board of Postgraduate Studies. The marking shall conform to an approved guideline provided by the Board of Postgraduate Studies. The marks awarded shall constitute 60% of the grade.
- 13.5 The Dean of School shall forward project examinations results to the Director IPGS, within one (1) week of the oral examination for processing by the Board of Postgraduate Studies and submission to the Senate.
- 13.6 A candidate must pass both oral presentation and marked project and submit three (3) hard copies and a soft copy of the final project report to the Director IPGS.

14.0 Examination of Thesis

14.1 Document Examination

- 14.1.1 The thesis must make a distinct contribution to knowledge and show an understanding of the subject and display originality of thought as evidenced by at least two (2) publications emanating from it in a peer reviewed journal.
- 14.1.2 The thesis must conform to the Regulations for the Submission of Thesis of Kabarak University.
- 14.1.3 At least three (3) months before a thesis is submitted for oral defense, the candidate shall, with the consent of the supervisors, submit the Form of Notice of Intention to the Director IPGS indicating intention to submit the thesis for examination. The Director IPGS shall receive the notice and submit it to the Dean of concerned School to enable the Dean to identify suitably qualified examiners.
- 14.1.4 The thesis shall be submitted to the Director IPGS in four (4) copies in loose (not bound) hard copy format and shall be accompanied by a signed declaration by the candidate confirming that the thesis has not been previously submitted for a degree in any other university and that the thesis is the original work of the candidate.
- 14.1.5 The thesis shall bear the signature of the supervisors indicating approval to submit.
- 14.1.6 A soft copy of the thesis shall also be deposited with the Director IPGS together with the following:
- i) Antiplagiarism report with less than 15% similarity index for distribution to the examiners.
 - ii) A copy of research permit from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI)
 - iii) A copy of research clearance from Kabarak University Institutional Ethics Research Committee.
 - iv) Current fee payment statement from the Finance Office

- 14.1.7 Within four weeks after the Notice of Intent to Submit a thesis has been submitted, the Dean of School shall in consultation with supervisors and HoD recommend to the Board of Postgraduate Studies the following to undertake document examination:
- i) One (1) External Examiner
 - ii) Two (2) Internal Examiners
- 14.1.8 The Vice-Chancellor shall delegate to the Director, IPGS, the responsibility of inviting a panel to serve as internal and external examiners for project and thesis evaluation. Two (2) external examiners shall be appointed in the case of Kabarak University employee candidate(s) to minimize issues of conflict of interest.
- 14.1.9 The Board of examiners for the oral defense shall consist of:
- i) The Dean of School, who shall be the Chair
 - ii) Two (2) internal examiners
 - iii) One (1) external examiner
 - iv) Head of Department
 - v) Supervisors (at least one of them must be present)
 - vi) Director IPGS, who shall be the Secretary
 - vii) Senate Representative who shall prepare a report for the DVC (A&R) regarding the integrity of the examination process
- 14.1.10 The Institute of Postgraduate Studies shall be the secretariat for all oral defenses. The minutes of the oral defense shall be circulated to the candidate by the Director (IPGS) within two (2) weeks after the defense.
- 14.1.11 Each candidate shall submit seven (7) spiral bound copies of his/her thesis to the Director (IPGS), who shall then submit one (1) copy to the internal and external examiners.
- 14.1.12 The Internal and external examiners shall assess the thesis and submit detailed reports to the Director (IPGS) within Six (6) weeks from the date of dispatch of the thesis. In addition;

- i) Director IPGS shall send a reminder to the examiners two (2) weeks before the expiry of the required six (6) week period
- ii) The second and last reminder shall be sent to the examiner(s) yet to submit reports after the expiry of the one (1) week period of the extended deadline
- iii) The IPGS shall proceed to withdraw the project/thesis if there is no response from the concerned examiners after the second reminder.

14.1.13 Each Examiner shall indicate within the report:

- i) Whether or not the thesis is adequate in form and content.
- ii) Whether or not the thesis reflects adequate understanding of the subject or adds new knowledge in the subject area and in consequence.
- iii) Whether or not the thesis needs corrections; and
- iv) Whether the candidate should be awarded the degree or not.
- v) When an Examiner's report is delayed for more than two months, a new examiner shall be appointed.

14.1.14 A student who has been passed in the document examination by at least two thirds (2/3) of the examiners shall be allowed to proceed to the oral examination.

14.1.15 A student who has not been passed in the document examination by at least two thirds (2/3) of the examiners shall be required to address the issues raised by the examiners and re-submit the thesis for document examination.

14.1.16 A student who has not met the 2/3 threshold shall meet the cost of re-examination, as determined by the University, taking into consideration payments to the examiners and other costs.

- 14.1.17 An examiner shall not examine the document more than two (2) times. An alternate examiner shall be identified if a third examination is required.
- 14.1.18 A thesis that does not pass three (3) document examinations shall result in a fail and the student shall be required to start the entire process of research work from the concept paper.
- 14.1.19 Document assessment forms duly filled, and reports by examiners shall be submitted to the Director, IPGS who shall then forward to the Chair of the Oral Examination Panel.

14.2 The Oral Examination/Defense

- 14.2.1 As soon as all the examiners' reports are received, the Director (IPGS) shall schedule the date for the oral defense.
- 14.2.2 All the examiners shall be required to attend the oral defense.
- 14.2.3 The Internal and external examiners shall cross examine the candidate based on issues highlighted in their respective reports.
- 14.2.4 The public, if in attendance, will be allowed to ask questions for not more than ten (10) minutes but these questions shall normally not contribute to assessment of the candidate.
- 14.2.5 Duration for oral examination for Masters degree candidates shall not be more than one (1) hour and thirty (30) minutes, distributed as follows:
- i) Twenty (30) minutes for oral presentation by the candidate.
 - ii) Twenty (20) minutes for each of the three examiners.
- 14.2.6 Duration for oral examination for PhD defense shall not be more than three (3) hours, distributed as follows:
- i) Thirty (30) minutes for presentation by the candidate.
 - ii) Thirty (30) minutes for each of the three examiners

- iii) Twenty (20) minutes for the Dean, Senate representative., faculty, and members of the public to comment on the presentation

14.3 Recommendations

After the oral defense, the Board of Examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

- 14.3.1 Whether the candidate defended the thesis adequately and whether the candidate should be declared pass outright and recommending the award of the degree subject to the candidate fulfilling other University requirements in respect of the degree program. In this case, the candidate shall make any editorial correction required and submit the final thesis within **a minimum of two (2) weeks** after the defense date.
- 14.3.2 Whether the thesis is acceptable with **minor corrections**. In this case, the candidate shall submit the corrected thesis after a **minimum of thirty (30 days)** from the defense date. The candidate shall make corrections with the supervisors and submit the document and correction matrix to the Director IPGS for verification and conformity.
- 14.3.3 Whether the thesis is acceptable with **major corrections**. In this case, the candidate shall submit the corrected thesis after a **minimum of three (3) months** from the defense date. The work is considered redeemable, but must be resubmitted for confirmation of corrections by all the three examiners. Additionally;
 - i) The examiners shall be allowed **one (1) week period** from the date of resubmission of the thesis to confirm the corrections by the candidate
 - ii) IPGS shall proceed to withdraw the thesis if there is no response from the concerned examiner(s) after the reminder.

iii) To avoid unnecessary extended timelines IPGS shall proceed to process the documents based on available corrections sign-off form(s) already submitted by any **two of the three examiners**

iv) In the event that an examiner is dissatisfied with the candidates work, then he/she shall submit a summary of his/her reservations to the IPGS Director at the expiry of the **One (1) week period** for further correctios by the candidate.

14.3.4 Whether the thesis is acceptable with **substantial major corrections**. In this case, the candidate shall submit the corrected thesis after a **minimum of six (6) months**. The work is considered redeemable, but must be resubmitted for both document and oral examination.

In addition, the candidate(s) shall meet the cost of re-examination of the project/thesis as stated in the University Fee Structure.

14.3.5 Whether the thesis is not acceptable in its present form and not acceptable for the award of the degree. The work is considered not redeemable and the candidate shall be given an outright fail and shall be required to begin the process all over again, starting from the concept paper.

14.4 The examiners shall submit their scores in the Evaluation Form.

14.5 The scores for both the document and oral examination shall be used to determine the final score for the proposal or thesis examination. The final recommendation shall be arrived at as follows:

14.5.1 Scenario One: At least two thirds (2/3) of the examiners concur in their recommendation. The recommendation of the majority will hold, and the Director (IPGS) shall forward such recommendation to Senate.

14.5.2 Scenario Two: Should all recommendations differ significantly, the average of the two scores with the least variance shall be used to determine the final recommendation. The score with a

substantial variance of 20% shall be considered an outlier, and shall not be used to determine the final score.

- 14.5.3 Scenario Three: The scores of all three (3) examiners differ and the variance between the maximum, median and minimum scores is equal, the median score shall determine the recommendation.
- 14.6 An Examiner that awarded a pass grade for a thesis that is not successfully defended shall be replaced with another examiner before re-examination of the thesis.
- 14.7 A thesis shall not be defended more than twice.

15.0 Submission of the Final Thesis or Project Copies

- 15.1 The candidate shall revise the thesis according to the recommendations of the Board of Examiners.
- 15.2 The supervisors shall check the thesis and, if satisfied, sign the Correction Matrix certifying that all corrections and amendments required by the examiners have indeed been incorporated. The internal examiner shall also sign the Certificate of Correction.
- 15.3 After approval by Senate, the candidate shall be responsible for the binding of the thesis hard copies. Hard covered bound copies of the thesis shall be lettered in gold on the spine with the following information: Title of thesis, name of candidate with the year of final submission at the bottom.
- 15.4 Five (5) copies of the hardbound thesis shall be submitted to the Director (IPGS) together with Submission of Hardbound Thesis Form, Proof Reading Form and Publication Form. Each copy shall be distributed by the Director (IPGS) to the University Library, IPGS Library, Office of the Dean of School, and each of the supervisors.
- 15.5 If Plates are included in a thesis, original photographs and not photocopies shall be used in all the copies of thesis submitted.
- 15.6 The candidate shall also submit a softcopy of the final thesis or project report to the Director (IPGS).

16.0 Publication of Thesis

A thesis accepted by the University and subsequently published in whole in whatever form shall bear the inscription: “Work forming part of the requirements for the (Name of degree) of Kabarak University”.

17.0 Conferral of Postgraduate Degrees

- 17.1 The Director IPGS shall present to the Board of Postgraduate Studies the list of candidates who have submitted both electronic and the required number of hard copies of bound theses together with the minutes of the oral defense meetings.
- 17.2 The Board shall inspect and verify conformity to the quality standards of the bound theses and if satisfied, shall recommend the successful candidates to Senate for the conferral of the respective degrees, taking into consideration other requirements in respect of coursework, publications, and paper presentations in conferences, as required by the respective departments.
- 17.3 The Dean of School shall present the Senate approved candidates for conferral of degrees by the Chancellor during the Graduation Ceremony.

18.0 Academic Progression and Discontinuation

To remain as a bona fide student in the University, all postgraduate students must meet the academic progression and all the course requirements as specified for various programs and in the Kabarak University Catalogue: General Academic Regulations.

19.0 Withdrawal of Degrees and Other Awards

- 19.1 The University may rescind any Degree, Diploma or Certificate awarded to Graduates who, while registered in a particular

Programme, committed an academic offence, which if it had been detected before graduation would have resulted in Dismissal.

19.2 Notification of a rescinded Degree, Diploma or Certificate shall be communicated to all relevant parties.

20.0 Postgraduate Student Welfare

Postgraduate Students shall elect one representative to the Kabarak University Student Organization (KUSO) who will also be their representative at the Board of Postgraduate Studies.

21.0 Conflict Resolution

21.1 Introduction and Context

The relationship between Student and Supervisor is of vital importance to the success of the postgraduate student. It is imperative for the minimization of conflict and for good practice in supervision generally, that the roles and responsibilities of the supervisor and student are clearly understood as detailed in sections 4, 8 and 9 of this Handbook.

21.2 Objectives

The following are the objectives of this Conflict Resolution Policy:

- 21.2.1 To ensure the fair and equitable treatment of postgraduate students.
- 21.2.2 To ensure that the grievances of postgraduate students are dealt with fairly and expeditiously.
- 21.2.3 To ensure the fair and equitable treatment of members of staff against whom such grievances may be laid.
- 21.2.4 To articulate clearly those procedures which postgraduate students should follow in seeking to have a grievance addressed

21.3 Description of Malpractices in Graduate Student Supervision

The following are areas which can constitute malpractice:

- 21.3.1 Absent advisor or student.
- 21.3.2 Conflict of interest.
- 21.3.3 Unresponsiveness to supervision by the student.
- 21.3.4 Inaccessibility on various communication channels such as telephone calls, emails or face to face meetings.
- 21.3.5 Disrespectful and abusive language /personality defects.
- 21.3.6 Infringing on Intellectual Property Rights
- 21.3.7 Ethics and moral issues/sexual harassment
- 21.3.8 Intimidation
- 21.3.9 Mismanagement of research funds
- 21.3.10 Conflict between supervisors
- 21.3.11 Presentation of thesis without supervisors' permission
- 21.3.12 Disagreement with oral examination outcomes
- 21.3.13 Disagreement with de-registration outcomes

21.4 Disciplinary Procedures

In the event of such cases, it shall be necessary to take the following disciplinary procedures to resolve such conflicts:

- 21.4.1 The first step is to resolve the conflict informally. This is likely to succeed if the conflict is attended to as early as possible. The Supervisor, student, the Director IPGS and the Dean of the School should discuss the issue together. The outcome of these discussions should be documented.
- 21.4.2 In the event of non-resolution of conflict, the Director IPGS shall present the case to the Board of Postgraduate Studies which shall consider the case and make a decision.
- 21.4.3 If the attempts at reconciliation fail and it is determined that the student- supervisor relationship is beyond repair, the Board of Postgraduate Studies will terminate the supervision contract and make alternative arrangements of supervision.

21.4.4 If the staff member against whom a grievance has been lodged is a Dean/Director, the grievance should be referred to the Deputy Vice- Chancellor (Academic & Research).

21.5 Supervision Appeal Procedures

21.5.1 An appeal against the Board of Postgraduate Studies decision may be made by the dissatisfied candidate to the Vice-Chancellor through the DVC (Academics & Research).

21.5.2 The Vice-Chancellor shall consider the appeal taking into consideration all the available evidences. The Vice Chancellor's decision shall be final.

21.6 Thesis Examination Appeal Procedure

21.6.1 A student may appeal the decision of the examination panel by writing to the Vice-Chancellor (Chair of the University Senate).

21.6.2 The University Senate shall direct the IPGS Board to review the appeal and prepare an independent report for consideration on the matter.

21.6.3 The University Senate shall consider reports from:

21.6.3.1 The IPGS Board.

21.6.3.2 The Senate representative's report from the oral examination.

21.6.4 The University Senate shall use the reports to make one of the following determinations:

21.6.4.1 To allow the appeal

21.6.4.2 To reject the appeal

21.6.5 If an appeal is allowed the student shall be requested to do the following:

21.6.5.1 Submit eight (8) copies of the thesis to IPGS

21.6.5.2 Pay the applicable appeal processing fee

21.7 Thesis Examination Panel

- 21.7.1 A panel of five (5) suitably qualified independent examiners shall be appointed from a pre-approved list of IPGS external examiners to undertake a document and oral examination of the thesis.
- 21.7.2 The independent examiners shall submit their report to the IPGS Board.
- 21.7.3 The IPGS Board shall prepare a report and submit it to the Vice-Chancellor for consideration.
- 21.7.4 The decision of Senate shall be communicated by the Vice-Chancellor in writing to the student. No further appeal shall be possible.

22.0 Evaluation of Postgraduate Supervision

Supervision of postgraduate student is a critical component of postgraduate studies. In order to ensure that all internally and externally appointed supervisors and examiners for both Masters and PhD students deliver their supervisory and defense engagements in a consistent, transparent, **timely** and **effective** manner, it is necessary to evaluate the work of supervisors. The Evaluation Form shall be filled every semester by all graduate students. This is intended as a quality control measure of supervision.

APPENDIX I: SUPERVISION EVALUATION FORM**KABARAK UNIVERSITY****INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES****SUPERVISION EVALUATION FORM****Introduction**

You are kindly requested to provide feedback on the quality of the supervision you are receiving using the form below. To preserve your anonymity, please e mail your responses to the Director, Institute of Postgraduate Studies (directorpostgraduate@kabarak.ac.ke) who will use the information to further improve supervisory practice. Your honest and frank responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

This form should be completed once a semester.

PART 1

Name	
Student number	
School / Department	
Supervisor	
Year of study (1,2, etc.)	

PART 11

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Not sure 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Punctual in attendance of supervision					
Provides support (is encouraging, mentoring, understanding)					
Is available (regular meetings, contactable on email, phone or					

other media)					
Has good Communication skills					
Makes adequate preparation for supervision					
Provides direction and structure					
Is approachable					
Has interest and enthusiasm for the research project					
Provides written constructive feedback					
Knowledge and expertise in their fields					
Always punctual in providing comments					
Makes appropriate arrangements when unavailable					
Maintains clear and open lines of communication with student					
Collaborates with student in writing joint progress reports at the end of every semester					
Observes moral ethics in supervision					
Provides direction on publishing students work					

APPENDIX II: CORRECTION MATRIX FORM
KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
CORRECTION MATRIX FORM

STUDENT NAME: _____ Sign _____ Date _____

REG NO.: _____

PROGRAMME: _____

SUPERVISOR: I) _____ Sign _____ Date _____

II) _____ Sign _____ Date _____

INTERNAL EXAMINER APPOINTED TO OVERSEE CORRECTION (FOR THESIS CORRECTION)

I) _____ Sign _____ Date _____

ITEM	CORRECTION REQUIRED	AMMENDMENT MADE	OLD PAGE	NEW PAGE
1. Title				
2. Abstract				
3. Formatting				
4. Turn it in/Safe Assign				
5. Chapter 1 (List down your corrections in numbering format)				
6. Chapter 2 (List down your corrections in numbering format)				
7. Chapter 3 (List down your corrections in numbering format)				
8. Chapter 4 (List down your corrections in numbering format)				
9. Chapter 5 (List down your corrections in numbering format)				
10. Chapter 6 (optional)				

Note: Please submit your corrected proposals together with this form and copy of oral examination minutes.



APPENDIX III: THESIS CORRECTIONS SIGN OFF FORM
KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
THESIS CORRECTIONS SIGN OFF FORM
(CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTIONS)

Candidate: _____

Reg. No: _____

Thesis Title: _____

Degree: _____

School: _____

The above candidate has now completed all necessary corrections to his/her thesis and a may proceed to present hard bound thesis subject to further direction from Director, IPGS.

Name: _____

Signed: _____

(Examiner nominated to oversee corrections)

Date: _____

APPENDIX IV: MASTER'S/PHD THESIS SUBMISSION CHECKLIST**KABARAK UNIVERSITY****INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES****MASTER'S/PHD THESIS SUBMISSION CHECKLIST**

S/N	Item Required	Quantity	Tick
1	Hard Bound Thesis (Black)	8 copies	
2	DVD	1 copy	
3	Publications	2 copies (2 PhD) 1 copy (Master)	
4	Research Publication Submission Form	2 copies (2 PhD) 1 copy (Master)	
5	Thesis Submission Form	1 copy	
6	Proof Reading Form	1 copy	
7	Thesis Correction Sign-Off Form	1 copy	
8	Correction Matrix	1 copy	
9	Minutes of Thesis/Project Defense	1 copy	
10	Conference Participation	Evidence	
11	Minutes School Seminar		
12	Fee Statement	Zero Balance	
13	Plagiarism report and word count	15% and below 20,000 Masters/50,000 PhD	
14	Supervisor Evaluation Report, Student Progress Report, Supervision Record Form		
15	NACOSTI Letter and Permit		
16	Evidence of Completion of Coursework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transcripts • Letter from Dean of School 	

APPENDIX V: NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A

THESIS/DISSERTATION

KABARAK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF POST GRADUATE STUDIES

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO SUBMIT A THESIS/DISSERTATION &

EXAMINATION ARRANGEMENTS

SECTION A: TO BE FILLED IN BY CANDIDATE

(1) Name _____ in _____ full:
.....

(2) Telephone No.....

(3) Registration _____ Number:
.....

(4) Department.....

(5) Faculty:

(6) Degree registered for::.....

(7) Title _____ of
thesis/dissertation.....

(8) Name(s) of Supervisor(s):
(i)
(ii)

(9) I hereby declare that I have completed my thesis/dissertation research,
and intend to submit it within the coming three months.

Date: Signature of Candidate:

SECTION B: TO BE COMPLETED BY SUPERVISOR (S)

(10) I/We hereby confirm that the candidate is in the process of drafting
his/her thesis/dissertation and I am/we are of the opinion that
he/she should be in a position to submit the thesis/dissertation
within three months from now.



Date:..... Signature of Supervisor:

Date:..... Signature of Supervisor:

SECTION C: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DEAN OF SCHOOL

After consultation with the supervisor (s) of the candidate, I propose that the following be considered for appointment as examiners for the candidate’s thesis/dissertation:

(a) Potential External Examiner

(10) Name:

Affiliation.....

Postal Address.....

Telephone: Fax: Email.....

Curriculum Vitae: Attached Not attached

(b) Proposed Internal Examiners

(11) Name:

Affiliation.....

Postal Address.....

Telephone: Fax: Email.....

Curriculum Vitae: Attached Not attached

(12) Name:

Affiliation.....

Postal Address.....

Telephone: Fax: Email.....



Curriculum Vitae: Attached

Not attached

SECTION D: TO BE COMPLETED BY DEAN OF SCHOOL

- (a) The above proposed examiners have been recommended by the Board of the Faculty/Institute/Centre
- (b) After consultation with the Chairperson of Department and our Faculty’s Graduate Studies Chairperson, I recommend that the following be appointed to serve as VIVA VOCE panelists (for thesis examination only):

Panel Members	Designation
1.	Chairperson
2.	External Examiner
3.	1 st Internal Examiner
4.	2 nd Internal Examiner
5.	Dean/Director
6.	Chairman of Department
7.	Senate representative
8.	1 st Supervisor
9	2 nd Supervisor

- (c) In anticipation of the fact that the candidate will submit his/her thesis within three months from now, it is recommended that the viva voce be held in the month of..... of the year The exact date will be communicated later.

Date:..... Signature of Dean/Director:

SECTION E: TO BE FILLED IN BY THE DIRECTOR, IPGS

Please Tick:

	The examination arrangements are herewith recommended for approval.
	The examination arrangements are not complete for the reasons stated below, and are hereby referred back to the Faculty/School.

The following items are missing or are incomplete:

.....

.....

.....

Date: Signature of the Dean, IPGS:.....

*** To be filled in duplicate. A copy of this form MUST be returned to the Department/School**



APPENDIX VI: SUBMISSION OF HARDBOUND THESIS

KABARAK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

SUBMISSION OF HARDBOUND THESIS

TWO (3) Copies of your hardbound thesis are required to be submitted to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies to be distributed as follows:

- 1. Copy to library
- 2. Copy to Institute of Postgraduate Studies
- 3. Copy to school

Full Name:

.....

Student ID:

.....

Email address:

.....

School:

.....

Department:

.....

Supervisor 1:

.....

Supervisor 2:

.....

Degree for which the hardbound thesis is submitted:

.....

.....



I confirm that I have today submitted copy/ies of my hardbound thesis to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies.

Signature of Student:

Date:

Name of officer receiving the thesis:

.....

Signature of officer receiving the thesis:

.....

Date:

.....

Expected Graduation Date:



**APPENDIX VII: NOTICE OF PROOFREADING OF THESIS
KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POST GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**

Notice of Proofreading of thesis for grammar and spellings

All students who intend to submit a thesis for postgraduate degrees should complete this form, and hand in before the binding of thesis. Students are required to submit the **FINAL, CORRECTED THESIS** in hard bound copies according to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies regulations and in electronic format (pdf file on CD).

SECTION A: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE STUDENT

Names:

Student Number: School:

Department.....

Supervisors

Degree sought: Master’s / Ph D / Other

Title of Thesis
.....
.....

Reader Name: Phone

I certify that I have proofread the thesis for grammatical and spelling errors.

Reader Signature.....



APPENDIX VIII: RESEARCH PUBLICATION SUBMISSION FORM

KABARAK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF POST GRADUATE STUDIES

RESEARCH PUBLICATION SUBMISSION FORM

Part 1(To be filled by the student)

Name of the Researcher(s):

.....

Co-Publisher(s).....

Title of the Publication:

.....

.....

Journal Name:

Supervisor(s) name:

i)

ii).....

Student name: Reg No:

Part 2: University Librarian

Comments:

.....

.....

Sign..... Date.....

Part 3: Graduate School

Comments:.....

.....

.....

.....

Sign..... Date.....



APPENDIX IX: SUPERVISION RECORD FORM
KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
SUPERVISION RECORD FORM

This form, duly completed, must be presented to Postgraduate Studies by the Student at the end of every Semester

Student's Name:

Reg. No:

Department:

School:

Degree Programme:

Research Topic:

Month for which record is being submitted:

Name of Supervisor (s)
.....
.....

Date Scheduled for the meeting:

(If the meeting does not take place, explain why and what alternate

Arrangements have been put in place, then sign and submit the form to Postgraduate Studies:

.....
.....



Section/Chapter in discussion:

.....
.....

Date Submitted to Supervisor:

Supervisor’s response (s) (detail should be filed in students file):

.....
.....

Date of the next meeting:

Supervisor’s Signature:

Student’s Signature:

Date:



APPENDIX X: SUPERVISOR ALLOCATION FORM
KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
SUPERVISOR ALLOCATION FORM

Kindly complete this form and return in to the Director, Institute of Postgraduate Studies

NAME: ADM NO: LEVEL:

SCHOOL:

PROGRAMME:

SPECIALIZATION: DATE SIGN:

YEAR OF STUDY EMAIL: PHONE:

TITLE OF PROPOSAL

.....

.....

PROPOSED 1ST SUPERVISOR:

SPECIALIZATION: TELEPHONE:

PROPOSED 2ND SUPERVISOR:

SPECIALIZATION: TELEPHONE:

DEAN: SIGN: DATE:

DIRECTOR IPGS: SIGN: DATE:



Kabarak University Moral Code:

"As members of Kabarak University Family, we purpose at all times and in all places, to set apart in one's heart, Jesus as Lord" (1st Peter 3:15)



APPENDIX XI: POSTGRADUATE ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Appendix V(A): Concept Paper Grading Form



KABARAK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

CONCEPT PAPER GRADING FORM

NAME: **REGISTRATION NO:**

TITLE OF CONCEPT:

.....

Item	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
Feasibility and viability of research topic Time, resources and capability of the researcher are adequate and the topic has clear dependent and					

independent variables (it is viable and elicits clear research concerns)					
Justification of the problem The negative impacts if not solved are clear					
3. Significance of the problem The problem is of current interest to the field and industry					
4. Originality / novelty The problem has not been addressed before					
5. The objectives of the proposed study are clear					
6. In-text citations and references appropriately done and adhere to acceptable formats					
7. Presentation was clearly organized and easy to follow					
8. Candidate answered questions to satisfaction of examiners					

Total Score: _____ / 40 Points

Recommendation

- 0 – 14 Marks - Reconsider concept / idea and present again
- 15 – 24 Marks - Refine concept and present again
- 25 – 40 Marks - Proceed to develop the full proposal

Remarks

.....



.....
Name of Examiner: _____ Date: _____ Sign: _____



APPENDIX V(B): PROPOSAL GRADING FORM



**KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
PROPOSAL GRADING FORM**

NAME: REGISTRATION NO:

TITLE OF PROPOSAL:

.....

LEVEL: MASTERS PhD

SECTION A – DOCUMENT EXAMINATION

CONTENT – 90 points

	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
Preliminaries					

Title – The title is concise and reflects the content of the thesis					
Abstract – The abstract comprehensively covers the entire thesis					
Operational Definition of Terms – All terms are appropriately defined					
Introduction					
The background presented is relevant, contextualized and sufficient					
Problem is clearly stated					
Purpose of the study is clearly stated					
Objectives of the study are SMART					
Research questions / Hypothesis are clearly stated and align with objectives					
Justification of the study is convincing					
Literature Review					
Relevant literature for the study area and problem is reviewed					
References are comprehensive, current/up to date					
	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
The gap of knowledge for the study is clearly identified					
The theoretical framework or conceptual framework for the study is clearly discussed					
Methodology					
Relevance of methodology and research design across the research work					
Sampling procedures / calculation of sample size are					

appropriate/ The solution procedures/algorithms are clearly outlined					
The data analysis methods are clearly outlined / derivations of mathematical frameworks for each objective are provided					
Materials / tools / instruments / equipment for the study are clearly presented					
Validation and verification of materials / tools / instruments / equipment is clearly described / Theoretical validation of formulae / schemes is presented					

PROPOSAL CONSTRUCTION: 30 points

	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Language					
Concepts are defined and used consistently					
The language used is appropriate for a technical / subject matter audience					
The language used is sufficiently understandable for a non-technical audience					
Presentation					
The proposal is devoid of grammatical and spelling errors					
Citation and references are formatted as per the requirements of the discipline (specific requirements for each discipline to be provided by the institute of postgraduate studies)					
Appendices are complete and appropriately organized					

Raw Score: _____ / 120 Pts

Grading Based on Raw Score

KEY:

A	90 – 120	Excellent
B	78 – 89	Well Done
C	60 – 77	Done
D	59 And below	fail

WEIGHTED SCORE = (Raw Score x /120 X 70) %

NOTA BENE: If the candidates scores below 60 points (35%) which is 59 and below is considered failed and does not proceed to oral examination (presentation).

Name of Examiner: _____ Date: _____ Sign: _____

Received on: _____ Director IPGS: _____ Sign: _____

SECTION B – ORAL EXAMINATION FORM

Directions: Please circle or tick clearly on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 points

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA- Overall mark-=50 points

How would rate the audibility of the candidate

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Good (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Poorly projected voice, lack of clarity			Well projected voice, clarity in text that	

causing difficulty in communication		led to clear communication
-------------------------------------	--	----------------------------

2. How would you rate the confidence of the candidate

Not impressive (1)	Fairly evident (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
So timid, fidgeting, extremely nervous, avoids eye contact all the time			Clear summary of all chapters in a logical organized way	

3. Describe the candidate’s appearance and sense of professionalism

Poor (1)	Fairly presentable (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Poorly or indecently dressed, lacks good grooming, Influence or of evidence of use of hard drug			Impressively dressed, Good grooming, High level of self-discipline and self-respect, Pleasant personality/Character	

4. Describe the ability of the candidate to manage time

Poor (1)	Fairly Effective (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Very poor in time management, reported			Observed punctuality, worked within	

late, exceeded time limit, Covered less 25% of the content		time limit, effectively covered the entire content
--	--	--

5. Rate the candidate’s level of organization of the PowerPoint slides/formats

Poor (1)	Fairly Organized (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Poorly organized, crowded content with no clear flow of ideas. Confusing formats with a lot of inconsistency			Impressive, manageable and logically organized slides, Clear formats with key highlights and coherent flow of ideas	

6. Was the presentation clearly organized and easy to follow?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Poorly organized presentation, difficult to follow argument			Clear summary of all chapters in a logical organized way	

7. Did the candidate adequately demonstrate a significant problem for the proposed study?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Poor problem demonstration / poor			Demonstrates problem effectively /	

understanding of key concepts; relevance to the field or society not convincing		clear understanding of key concepts and potential contribution of the work to the field
---	--	---

8. Did the candidate articulate the methodology of the study clearly?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (3)	Excellent (4)
Poor understanding / elaboration of the methodology for the study			Good understanding / elaboration of the methodology for the study	

9. Did the candidate have appropriate attitudinal response to questions?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Unnecessarily and unreasonably defensive when responding to questions, does not listen well			Evidence of attentive listening / understanding of questions with conversational style when responding	

10. Did the candidate answer questions to satisfaction of examiners?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Unsatisfactory response to questions or continuous misinterpretation of questions			Consistently clarifies, restates and responds to questions with satisfaction to examiners	

Raw Score _____

Weighted Score = (Raw Score x/50 X 30)% _____ %

Document Examination Score: _____ /70% Oral Examination Score: _____ /30%

TOTAL SCORE: _____ /100%

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessment Guidelines	Total Score %	Recommendation (tick one)	Correction Time (Minimum)
Proposal Rejected (Unredeemable)	0 – 39		N/A
Acceptable with major corrections (Redeemable) (Resubmit for document and oral examination)	40 – 59		3 months
Acceptable with minor corrections Make corrections with the supervisors	60 – 79		30 days
Proposal Accepted Student can proceed to undertake fieldwork	80 - 100		N/A

EXAMINER.....

Sign.....

Date.....

Kabarak University Moral Code:

“As members of Kabarak University Family, we purpose at all times and in all places, to set apart in one’s heart, Jesus as Lord” (1st Peter 3:15)



APPENDIX V(C): GUIDELINES ON AWARDING VERDICT FOR PROPOSAL DEFENSES



**KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES**

GUIDELINES ON AWARDING OF VERDICT DURING PROPOSAL ORAL DEFENCES

VERDICT	DESCRIPTION	DURATION
Proposal Rejected	Academic breach of conduct Irredeemable work The candidate is required to start the proposal afresh	N/A
Pass with major corrections	Major flaws in conceptualization, execution or presentation not properly explained at the defense Substantial flaws in the analysis or write up Corrections include the addition of substantial new material, significant amount of rewriting in several parts of the proposal, extensive reevaluation, and discussion of the literature review The candidate’s oral examination performance reveals a fundamental lack of understanding of the rationale underpinning the work. Major flaws with research methodology. Incoherent flow of ideas and inadequate in	Minimum of 3 months

	<p>content and key components</p> <p>Absence of expected competencies that suggests that the candidate is not going to be able to undertake independent work as a professional in his/her area</p> <p>Corrections include adding some further material, rewriting several pages, some reanalysis or re- presentation of the data or corrections of a large number of typographical and grammatical errors</p> <p>Corrections should be made to satisfaction of examiners and return for 2nd oral defense</p>	
Pass with minor corrections	<p>Fairly readily correctable weaknesses</p> <p>Corrections should be made to satisfaction of the supervisor</p>	Minimum of 30 days
Proposal Accepted	No changes required to the document	N/A

Arriving at the final Recommendation

1. The scores for both the document and oral examination shall be used to compute the final score for the proposal / thesis examination.
2. The final recommendation shall be arrived at as follows.
 - i) Scenario One – At least two thirds (2/3) of the examiners concur in their recommendation. The recommendation of the majority will hold.
 - ii) Scenario Two – All recommendations differ. The average of the two scores with the least variance shall be used to determine the final recommendation.

- iii) Scenario Three – The scores of all three examiners differ and the variance between the maximum, median and minimum scores is equal, the median score shall determine the recommendation.

APPENDIX V(D): THESIS GRADING FORM



**KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
THESIS GRADING FORM**

NAME: **ADM NO:**

TITLE OF THESIS:

LEVEL: MASTERS PhD

SECTION A – DOCUMENT EXAMINATION

CONTENT – 120 points

	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
Preliminaries					
Title – The title is concise and reflects the content of the thesis					
Abstract – The abstract comprehensively covers the entire					

thesis					
Operational Definition of Terms – All terms are appropriately defined					
Introduction					
The background presented is relevant, contextualized and sufficient					
Problem is clearly stated					
Purpose of the study is clearly stated					
Objectives of the study are SMART					
Research questions / Hypothesis are clearly stated and align with objectives					
Justification of the study is convincing					
Literature Review					
Relevant literature for the study area and problem is reviewed					
References are comprehensive, current/up to date					
	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
The gap of knowledge for the study is clearly identified					
The theoretical framework or conceptual framework for the study is clearly discussed					

Methodology					
Relevant methodology/ hypotheses / assumptions for each objective is provided in detail					
Sampling procedures / calculation of sample size are appropriate/ The solution procedures/algorithms are clearly outlined					
The data analysis methods are clearly outlined / derivations of mathematical frameworks for each objective are provided					
Materials / tools / instruments / equipment for the study are clearly presented					
Validation and verification of materials / tools / instruments / equipment is clearly described / Theoretical validation of formulae / schemes is presented					
Results, Conclusion & Discussion					
Results for each objective are clearly presented (tables, figures, text)					
Results for each objective are clearly discussed					
The discussion relates the findings to other works in the field					
Conclusion of the study is clear and not overstated					
The recommendations for policy and future research are					

relevant and supported by the study findings					
Limitations of the study are comprehensive and mitigated (NB Limitations may appear in Ch 1)					

THESIS CONSTRUCTION: 30 Points

	Poorly Done	Attempted	Done	Well done	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
Language					
1. Concepts are defined and used consistently					
2. The language used is appropriate for a technical / subject matter audience					
3. The language used is sufficiently understandable for a non-technical audience					
Presentation					
4. The thesis is devoid of grammatical and spelling errors					
5. Citation and references are formatted as per the requirements of the discipline (specific requirements for each discipline to be provided by the institute of postgraduate studies)					
6. Appendices are complete and appropriately organized					

Raw Score / 150 Points

Grading Based on Raw Score

KEY:

A	120 – 150	–	Excellent
B	90 – 119	–	Fair
C	75 -89	–	Done
D	74 and below	–	Fail

Weighted Score = (Raw score x/150 X 70) % = _____/70%

Name of Examiner: _____ **Date:** _____ **Sign:** _____

Received on: _____ **Director IPGS:** _____ **Sign:** _____

SECTION B – ORAL EXAMINATION FORM

Directions: Please circle or tick clearly on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 points

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA - Overall mark- = 50 points

How would rate the audibility of the candidate

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Good (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Poorly projected voice, lack of clarity causing			Well projected voice, clarity in text	

difficulty in communication		that led to clear communication
-----------------------------	--	---------------------------------

2. How would you rate the confidence of the candidate

Not impressive (1)	Fairly evident (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
So timid, fidgeting, extremely nervous, avoids eye contact all the time			Clear summary of all chapters in a logical organized way	

3. Describe the candidate’s appearance and sense of professionalism

Poor (1)	Fairly presentable (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Poorly or indecently dressed, lacks good grooming, Influence or of evidence of use of hard drug			Impressively dressed, Good grooming, High level of self-discipline and self-respect, Pleasant personality/Character	

4. Describe the ability of the candidate to manage time

Poor (1)	Fairly Effective	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

	(2)				
Very poor in time management, reported late, exceeded time limit, Covered less 25% of the content			Observed punctuality, worked within time limit, effectively covered the entire content		

5. Rate the candidate’s level of organization of the PowerPoint slides/formats

Poor (1)	Fairly Organized (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	
Poorly organized, crowded content with no clear flow of ideas. Confusing formats with a lot of inconsistency			Impressive, manageable and logically organized slides, Clear formats with key highlights and coherent flow of ideas		

6. Was the presentation clearly organized and easy to follow?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)	
Poorly organized presentation, difficult to follow argument			Clear summary of all chapters in a logical organized way		

7. Did the candidate adequately demonstrate a significant problem for the proposed study?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
-----------------	---------------	----------	---------------	---------------

Poor problem demonstration / poor understanding of key concepts; relevance to the field or society not convincing		Demonstrates problem effectively / clear understanding of key concepts and potential contribution of the work to the field
---	--	--

8. Did the candidate articulate the methodology of the study clearly?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Poor understanding / elaboration of the methodology for the study			Good understanding / elaboration of the methodology for the study	

9. Did the candidate have appropriate attitudinal response to questions?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Defensive manner when responding to questions, does not listen well			Evidence of attentive listening / understanding of questions with conversational style when responding	

10. Did the candidate answer questions to satisfaction of examiners?

Poorly Done (1)	Attempted (2)	Done (3)	Well done (4)	Excellent (5)
Unsatisfactory response to questions or continuous misinterpretation of questions			Consistently clarifies, restates and responds to questions with satisfaction to examiners	

Raw Score _____ /50%

Weighted Score = (Raw Score x/50 X 30) % _____ %

Document Examination Score: _____ /70% **Oral Examination Score:** _____ /30%

TOTAL SCORE: _____ /100%

B. RECOMMENDATIONS – MASTERS/PHD THESIS

Assessment Guidelines	Total score	Recommendation (tick one)	Correction Time (Minimum)
Degree not awarded	0 – 39	F	N/A
Acceptable with substantial major corrections (Resubmit for document and oral examination)	40 - 54	D	6 months

Acceptable with major corrections (Resubmit for confirmation of corrections by the three examiners)	55 - 69	C	3 months
Acceptable with minor corrections (Make corrections with the supervisors)	70 - 84	B	30 days
Acceptable in its present form - Degree should be awarded	85 -100	A	15 days

EXAMINER.....

Sign.....

Date.....

B. RECOMMENDATIONS – MASTERS PROJECT

Assessment Guidelines	Total score	Recommendation (tick one)	Correction Time (Minimum)
Degree not awarded	0 – 39	F	N/A
Acceptable with major corrections (Resubmit for document and oral examination)	40 - 54	D	2 months
Acceptable with major corrections (Resubmit for confirmation of corrections by the three examiners)	55-69	C	1 months

Acceptable with minor corrections (Make corrections with the supervisors)	70 - 84	B	14 days
Acceptable in its form - Degree should be awarded	85 - 100	A	Within one week

EXAMINER.....

Sign.....

Date.....



APPENDIX V(E): GUIDELINES ON AWARDING VERDICT FOR THESIS DEFENSES



KABARAK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

GUIDELINES ON AWARDING OF VERDICT DURING THESIS ORAL DEFENCES

VERDICT	DESCRIPTION	DURATION
Degree not awarded	Academic breach of conduct Irredeemable work The candidate is required to start proposal writing all over again	N/A
Pass with major corrections	Major flaws in conceptualization, execution or presentation not properly explained at the defense Substantial flaws in the analysis or write up Corrections include the addition of substantial new material, significant amount of rewriting in several parts of the thesis, extensive re analysis of data which necessitates revising the discussion on the findings The candidate’s oral examination performance reveals a fundamental lack of understanding of the rationale underpinning the work Corrections include adding some further material, rewriting several pages, some reanalysis or re- presentation of the data or corrections of a large number of typographical and grammatical errors Absence of expected competencies that suggests that the candidate is not going to be able to undertake independent work as a professional in his/her area Corrections made to satisfaction of examiners and return for 2nd oral defense	Minimum of 6 months
Pass with minor	Fairly readily correctable weaknesses Corrections made to satisfaction of the supervisor	Minimum of



corrections		60 days
Degree should be awarded	No changes required to the document	Submit final document within two weeks

Arriving at the final Recommendation

1. The scores for both the document and oral examination shall be used to compute the final score for the proposal / thesis examination.
2. The final recommendation shall be arrived at as follows.
 - i) Scenario One – Two thirds (2/3) of the examiners concur in their recommendation. The recommendation of the majority will hold.
 - ii) Scenario Two – All recommendations differ. The average of the two scores with the least variance shall be used to determine the final recommendation. Score with substantial difference of 20% shall not be used to determine the final score
 - iii) Scenario Three – The scores of all three examiners differ and the variance between the maximum, median and minimum scores is equal, the median score shall determine the recommendation.

APPENDIX V(F): SENATE REPRESENTATIVE FORM



KABARAK UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

SENATE REPRESENTATIVE DEFENCE ASSESSMENT FORM

NAME: **REGISTRATION NO:**

TITLE OF PROPOSAL / THESIS:

LEVEL: MASTERS PhD

The presentation room was conducive and well organized.

Not at all	Attempted	Done	Well Done	Excellent
The room was poorly set up examination environment			The room was very well set up examination environment	

Remarks

.....

The student was prepared for the presentation.

Not at all	Attempted	Done	Well Done	Excellent
Evidenced total lack of preparedness			Evidenced a high level of preparedness.	

Remarks

The examiners conducted themselves professionally in the examination.

Not at all	Attempted	Done	Well Done	Excellent
Did not allow candidate to respond to queries, were very subjective, used unacceptable language			Allowed candidate to respond to queries, were very objective, used professional language	

Remarks

Time was managed well during the presentation.

Not at all	Attempted	Done	Well Done	Excellent
Poor time management. late arrival of participants and late start of the session			Excellent and effective management of time'. Every activity executed as per the schedule	

Remarks

IPGS provided clear guidance to the participants in the presentation.

Not at all	Attempted	Done	Well Done)	Excellent
Total lack of guidance, clarification and proper advice from IPGS, integrity of the process compromised			Excellent support from IPGS; meaningful guidance, timely clarification and advice, integrity of the process observed	

Remarks

.....

Are there any commendable practices that you observed in the presentation that should be encouraged and replicated in other presentations?

.....

Are there any glaring anomalies that you observed in the presentation that should be discouraged and not replicated in other presentations?

.....

Verdict delivered in the presentation

NB

- This assessment is confidential and should not be shared by any of the participant involved in the defense process
- Submit this assessment to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (A & R) within 24 hours from the adjournment time of the session.

Senate Representative: Sign_____ Date_____



APPENDIX XII: POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRESS REPORT



KABARAK UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRESS REPORT

Supervision report shall be completed by the student and University Supervisors and submitted to the Institute of Postgraduate Studies after recommendation by the HoD and the Dean. Students shall meet with supervisors at least once a month and the supervision report shall be submitted semesterly (after every four months)

PART I: STUDENT'S DETAILS			
Students Name _____	Reg. Number _____	Phone Number _____	
PhD/Masters _____	Full/Part Time _____	Email _____	
Department _____	School _____	Year/Semester _____	
PART II – PROGRESS ON PROPOSAL/THESIS/PROJECT/SEMINARS/CONFERENCES AND PUBLICATION(S)			
S/N	Activity	Additional Information	Remarks
1	1. Work Schedule (attach a copy of	Attach a copy of the works schedule and any relevant	

	Research Study Schedule)	documents	
2	Summary of Tasks Completed on _____ _____ _____	Indicate level - Proposal/Project/Thesis Indicate assignments submitted to supervisor(s), corrections etc Explain progress	
		(ii) Seminars/Conferences/Workshops Indicate the ones attended and or plan to attend and nature of engagement	
		(iii) Publications	
3.	Challenges and way forward	(i) Problems	
		(ii) Solutions/Suggestions	
4.	Tasks and Work schedule for the next month (or semester)	(i) Proposal/Project/Thesis	
		(ii) Publication(s)	
		(iii) Seminars/Conferences/Workshops	
Student's Signature _____		Date _____	
SECTION III - ASSESSMENT/COMMENTS/REMARKS BY SUPERVISORS			
1	Observation/Comments/Assignment (Attach Supervision Tracking Form)	(i) Proposal/Project/Thesis	
		(ii) Seminars/Conferences/Workshops	
		(iii) Publications	
2	2. Date of Last Three	1. _____	

	Sessions		
		2. _____	
		3. _____	
3.	Assessment of Students' Progress Accomplished According to submitted Work Schedule	(i) Rate and quantify in % tasks accomplishment	
		(ii) State whether the student is on track and keeping to schedule	
		(iii) Challenges/Suggestions	
SUPERVISOR I			
	Name _____ _____ _____	Signature _____	Date _____
SUPERVISOR II			
	Name _____ _____ _____	Signature _____	Date _____
SUPERVISOR III			
	Name _____ _____ _____	Signature _____	Date _____
4.	REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENTAL BOARD OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE		

	Names _____ _____	Signature and Date _____ _____	Remarks
5	REMARKS BY THE DEAN OF THE RELEVANT SCHOOL		
	Names _____ _____	Signature and Date _____ _____	Remarks
6	REMARKS BY DIRECTOR, IPGS		
	Names _____ _____	Signature and Date _____ _____	Remarks

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

1. The Commission for University Education standards require that PhD students publish at least two (2) papers before graduation in a peer-reviewed journal.
2. Phd and Master’s students should have at least one presentation in a peer-reviewed conference proceeding.
3. Master’s students should publish at least one (1) paper before graduation in a peer-reviewed journal
4. All postgraduate students shall share their findings in a departmental/School’s postgraduate seminar before submitting the draft of the thesis for examination.
5. Students working towards graduating end of year must defend their thesis by June of the same year. This will allow candidates to attend to major corrections in case of any.

APPENDIX XIII: PROPOSAL FORWARDING FORM



**KABARAK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
PROPOSAL FORWARDING FORM**

NAME OF STUDENT _____

REG. NO.: _____

PROGRAM: _____

SCHOOL: _____

e.g. Masters or PhD

Level of study _____

Names of Supervisors1): _____ 2) _____

Date proposal submitted to the Department	Date of the departmental defence	Nature of verdict eg pass/major corrections etc	Signature of HOD	Minutes availed (YES/No)	New title of the proposal (if any change was suggested)
Date the proposal submitted to the School/ Faculty	Date of the School/ Faculty defence	Nature of verdict eg pass/major corrections etc	Signature of the Dean	Minutes availed (YES/No)	New title of the proposal (if any change was suggested)
Date the proposal submitted to the Postgraduate Office	Received by (Name& Signature)	Sign of student	Correction matrix attached YES () No()	Minutes attached (YES/No)	Registered title of the proposal