**UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSAND, JOHANNESBURG**



**FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES**

**EXAMINATION PROCESS AND FORMAT OF RESEARCH REPORT FOR M.MED/M.DENT PROGRAMMES**

**General guidelines to describe changes in format of report and examination model of the M.Med/M.Dent degree for candidates, supervisors and examiners**

**Background**

In the Faculty of Health Sciences, the percentage weighting of the research report for the M Med programmes is up to 30%.

Registered candidates are required to submit a full research protocol under the direction of their nominated supervisor/s to the Department’s Research Assessor’s group. Human ethics clearance must be obtained prior to initiation of the research. The Departmentally approved protocol and the ethics approval letter must be submitted to the Health Sciences Postgraduate Office for approval by the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee. A student is not allowed to proceed with their research prior to approval from the FGSC and the Human Research Ethics Committee (Wits).

The protocol for the research should outline the scope of the research report and must include the following:

* Title of the research report
* Name/s of the supervisor/s

**Research requirements**

The subject of the research report must be the result of independent work by the candidate. The report should demonstrate that the candidate is able to undertake scientific research, to analyse and interpret results and to critically assess the relevant literature.

Please see document entitled “**Format for the M Med / M Dent RESEARCH REPORT” for further details of the type of research that can be undertaken and the nature of the format for the submission (also outlined below).**

1. **Format of Research Report**

Three options in the format of the research report are now possible:

1. **Publication Model\* –** this is the preferred option for the Faculty. An article published in an accredited journal **plus** the protocol (due to the extended literature review) may be submitted for examination. This would be examined by an internal examiner in the first instance. The article plus protocol and the internal examiner’s report will then be submitted as part of the bulk examination (see 1 above) to the external examiner for examination.
2. **“Submissible” format with protocol (extended literature review)\* –** if an article has not been accepted for publication/ or not yet submitted, the “submissible format” plus the protocol would be examined by the internal examiner, followed by examination by the external examiner (as in bulk review in 1 above).
3. **Monograph –** submission of a research report in the traditional format. An internal examiner will mark the report and an external examiner is appointed (as in bulk review in 1 above).

**\*Note bene:** If the candidate submits the final research report as a published article or in the format of a submissible article, the protocol which has an extended literature review MUST accompany the submission.

1. **Examination Model**

An **internal examiner** is responsible for marking the research report and will prepare a written report on the M.Med report. The marked M.Med research report together with the internal examiner’s report will be examined by an external examiner. The external examiner will review batches (2-8) of M.Med research reports. The report by the internal examiner will be ratified by the external examiner.

Batches of research reports will be examined by an external examiner each semester. Thus M Med candidates could submit for examination to one of three or four sessions in a year to reduce the volume. Should a department have an excess of reports for examination in one semester, the Department could appoint two external examiners for that semester.

* **Supervisor’s** will continue to nominate an **internal examiner** in consultation with their Head of Department
* The form for the nomination of the internal examiner will be submitted to the Postgraduate Office for approval in the normal way, two months prior to the submission of the research report. Internal examiners will be approved by the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee EXCO.
* Each **Head of Department** will submit the name and CV of the external examiner for the semester to the Postgraduate Office at the beginning of each semester or could nominate external examiners in advance for the entire year. These names and CVs will be approved by the Faculty Graduate Studies Committee EXCO. The Head of Department would approach the external examiner in the normal way to request acceptance of the task prior to submitting the name to the Postgraduate Office.

**Award of Degrees with distinction:**

Current Practice: Candidate must obtain 75% for coursework and both examiners must be in agreement that the research report is worthy of a distinction.
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