



## UGANDA NATIONAL EXAMINATIONS BOARD

OUR REFERENCE: CF/UNEB/50  
YOUR REFERENCE:

P. O. Box 7066, Kampala, Uganda  
Ntinda Tel. 0417-773100, 0414-286635/6/7, 0414-289397  
Kyambogo Tel: 0417-773256, 0414-286173  
E-mail: [uneb@uneb.ac.ug](mailto:uneb@uneb.ac.ug), Website: [www.uneb.ac.ug](http://www.uneb.ac.ug)

9 February, 2023

### **STATEMENT ON RELEASE OF 2022 UCE EXAMINATION RESULTS**

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Honourable Minister of Education and Sports, the examination was conducted under the Theme ***"Integrity and Security in the management of examinations, the Health and Safety of Learners is a joint responsibility"***. This theme was adopted to guide all the examination processes for the 2022 examinations.

#### **2.0 TOTAL CANDIDATURE**

Candidature increased by **16,063 (4.8%)** from **333,396** in 2020 to **349,459**, in 2022 reversing the decrease of **4,324 (-1.3%)** that had been witnessed in the previous examination. The candidates sat from 3,703 centres. Of these, **114,181 (32.7%)** were USE beneficiaries. The number of male candidates registered is **175,768 (50.3%)** and that of females is **173,691 (49.7%)**. The difference is 2,077 more males than females who registered for the examination. In 2019, the number of females had surpassed that of the males, for the first time, by **398**. The gap, in favour of males, appears to be resurfacing.

In 2022, **345,695** candidates (**173,761** males and **171,934** females) appeared for the examination compared to **330,592** candidates who appeared for the examination in 2020. This is an increase of **15,103 (4.6%)** candidates.

Statistics of the number of candidates who registered for, and those who sat the UCE examination for the last 5 years are given in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Registration over the Last Five Years**

Year	Candidates registered	Candidates who sat	Absentees	% Absent
2022	349,459	345,695	3,764	1.1
2020	333,396	330,592	2,804	0.8
2019	337,720	333,060	4,660	1.4
2018	326,212	320,119	6,093	1.9
2017	323,276	316,624	6,652	2.0

Absenteeism of candidates, which had continued to drop over the last four years, rose by 0.3%.

A total of **721** Special Needs Education (SNE) candidates (**389** males, **332** females) registered for the 2022 UCE examination compared to **519** in 2020. This was a large increase of 38.95% over last year. These consisted of the **blind (39)**, those with **low vision (115)**, the **deaf (87)**, the **dyslexics (88)** and **physically handicapped (94)**. There were **308 others** with other forms of disability that only needed to be given extra time. The Board made adequate arrangements for these candidates, which included modification of questions, provision of questions written in Braille form, providing support personnel for the handicapped and dyslexics, and sign language interpreters for the deaf. Candidates with low vision were given question papers with enlarged print to enable them read more easily. All SNE candidates were allowed extra 45 minutes in each paper.

### **3.0 COMPARISON OF GENERAL CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE FOR 2022 AND 2020 UCE EXAMINATIONS**

Performance of candidates who sat in 2022 and 2020 in terms of Division passes is compared in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: General Performance in 2022 compared to 2020**

Division	2022				2020			
	No. of Cands	% age	Cumm no. of Cands	Cumm %	No. Of Cands	% age	Cumm no. of Cands	Cumm %
1	46,667	13.5	46,667	13.5	39,968	12.1	39,968	12.1
2	76,745	22.2	123,412	35.7	69,782	21.2	109,750	33.3
3	88,690	25.7	212,102	61.4	81,428	24.7	191,178	58.0
4	117,837	34.0	329,939	95.4	120,055	36.4	311,233	94.4
9	15,756	4.6	345,695	4.6	18,415	5.6	329,648	5.6

Table 2 shows that there was better performance in the 2022 examination. The failure rate has also dropped by 1.0 percent.

Performance of candidates in 2022, in selected subjects, is compared to the 2020 performance of candidates in the same subjects in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Comparison of 2022 and 2020 Candidates' Performance in Selected Subjects**

Subject	2022				2020			
	No. of Cands.	Percentage at			No. of Cands.	Percentage at		
		2	6	8		2	6	8
English Lang.	345,444	0.7	46.8	84.82	329,447	1.3	42.8	78.2
Christ. Rel. Ed	224,644	8.6	57.2	85.2	224,695	12.6	64.2	87.9
Islam. Rel. Ed	41,092	22.8	73.3	91.2	35,550	18.1	66.6	87.4
History	344,304	9.0	54.1	72.2	328,550	7.0	53.3	73.4
Geography	345,301	3.3	66.8	85.7	329,380	1.9	55.8	80.4
Mathematics	345,471	5.2	36.9	64.2	329,453	3.9	37.9	67.2
Agriculture	198,035	8.6	73.2	89.2	184,102	7.2	60.4	85.9
Physics	345,259	1.7	21.0	57.8	329,303	1.2	19.1	53.2
Chemistry	345,205	2.5	19.3	58.7	329,292	1.4	13.0	45.3
Biology	345,275	0.2	26.9	63.7	332,524	0.7	28.2	64.3
Art (IPS)	102,097	2.7	87.7	99.9	95,588	1.7	76.1	99.7
Commerce	137,195	6.9	55.4	74.8	153,577	10.9	75.5	89.0

There is an improvement in performance in the large entry subjects except in Christian Religious Education, Biology and Commerce. Mathematics showed better performance at the Distinction level, but declined overall. English Language improved at credit and overall Pass levels but declined at the distinction level. Performance in Biology has continued to decline as seen in the last few years. Worth noting is that, performance in Physics and Chemistry has improved, although the overall pass levels are still low. Over 40% of the candidates have not passed the two subjects.

The Board examined Chinese Language for the first time in 2022. A total of 134 candidates sat and 124 (92.5%) of them passed. The language is in addition to other major languages; French, German, Arabic, Latin and Kiswahili already being examined.

#### 4.0 COMPARISON OF FEMALE AND MALE CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE

Table 4 compares performance of female and male candidates in selected subjects expressed in terms of cumulative percentages at the indicated levels.

**Table 4: Performance of Females and Males compared**

Subject	PERCENTAGE AT					
	GRADE 2 (Distinction level)		GRADE 6 (Credit level)		GRADE 8 (Pass level)	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
English Lang.	0.9	0.6	49.1	44.5	86.1	83.5
CRE	8.3	8.9	57.2	57.0	85.7	84.6
IRE	22.8	26.7	72.4	74.4	90.8	91.7
History	7.4	10.7	50.1	58.1	69.0	75.4
Geography	2.4	4.2	63.7	69.9	84.1	87.3
Mathematics	3.4	6.9	32.2	41.6	61.6	66.9
Agriculture	5.7	11.2	66.6	79.1	85.7	92.2
Physics	0.9	2.5	16.5	25.5	53.6	62.0
Chemistry	1.5	3.4	16.7	21.9	59.2	58.3
Biology	0.1	0.4	22.3	31.5	59.0	68.3
Art (IPS)	1.8	3.5	86.7	88.6	99.9	99.9
Commerce	4.8	8.9	48.2	62.2	68.8	84.4

Female candidates performed better than males in English Language. In Chemistry, the male candidates show better performance in the higher grades but, overall, a higher percentage of females obtained at least a pass. This trend in the disparity in the performance of male and female candidates has been observed over the years.

Percentage passes at the different Divisions are compared in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Comparison of Percentage Divisional Passes**

Gender	Division 1	Division 2	Division 3	Division 4	Division 9
Males	15.5	23.3	25.5	31.4	4.3
Females	11.5	21.0	25.8	37.0	4.7

Table 5 confirms that overall, male candidates performed better at all the higher grades than their female counterparts.

## 5.0 PERFORMANCE OF SPECIAL GROUPS

### 5.1 Inmates

UNEB maintains an examination centre at Luzira Prisons for the inmates to assist the Uganda Prison Service in their efforts at rehabilitation of offenders. The centre registered **51** candidates and all sat. **Eight** passed in Division 2, **16** got Division 3; 26 passed in Division 4 and **One** failed.

### 5.2 Special Needs candidates

Table 6 below shows the performance of Special Needs candidates by category

**Table 6: Performance of the SNE candidates by category**

Category	No sat	Div 1		Div 2		Div 3		Div 4		Div 9	
Blind	46	2	4.3%	13	28.3%	11	23.9%	16	34.8%	4	8.7%
Deaf	120	5	4.2%	10	8.3%	10	8.3%	74	61.6%	21	17.5%
Dyslexic	66	4	6.0%	6	9.0%	18	27.3%	30	45.5%	8	12.1%
Physically handicapped	179	22	12.3%	32	17.9%	41	22.9%	65	36.3%	19	10.6%
Low Vision	154	41	26.6%	38	24.7%	35	22.7%	39	25.3%	1	0.6%

Table 6 indicates the SNE candidates have performed quite well, especially those with Low Vision.

## 6.0 PERFORMANCE OF CANDIDATES

As we have stated in previous release statements, before, the UCE examination is designed to assess the degree of acquisition of the necessary knowledge, skills and competences in the various learning areas; and to lay a foundation for specialization at Higher education levels. Examination Papers have been carefully constructed and go through necessary quality assurance stages to ensure **validity** such that they test the candidates' knowledge, understanding, and ability to apply the knowledge acquired to solve problems in given novel situations and to show analytical skills.

In the Sciences, the papers test the candidates' ability to use the Science apparatus provided to perform experiments following instructions, and to apply the science process skills of making measurements and observations, recording observations and other data from the experiments carried out.

They are then expected to draw inferences or conclusions from observations that they have made, and interpret the data. They should also be able to apply basic scientific knowledge in problem solving situations, including problems in their environment.

The weaknesses outlined below are persistent, and have been reported in previous statements.

## **6.1 Language Deficiency**

We note that this year, examiners reported better quality work in English Language. However, in composition writing, where candidates are expected to exhibit creativity and originality, learners in some schools are still cramming passages from textbooks or what they call “model compositions” with unusual and difficult vocabulary. They then reproduce the crammed passages irrespective of what the composition topic is. This practice is, fortunately, declining, because candidates who do this are punished. IN the Comprehension passage, candidates found difficulty in extracting appropriate information to use to correctly answer the questions based on the passage. There are also weaknesses in using the correct grammar in sentence construction. The essential skill of extracting main ideas from a passage and writing out a coherent summary presents a major challenge to most candidates.

The challenge of language deficiency is reflected in performance in other subjects, where Chief Examiners continue to report failure by the candidates to interpret the demands of the tasks set, failure to follow instructions, misunderstanding key words used in the stem of a question, and generally poor language expression.

## **6.2 Performance in Science practicals**

In Sciences, the problems have remained the same as in recent years. Candidates showed weaknesses in the handling of apparatus during the practical tests. The weaknesses were also shown in making and recording observations and drawing conclusions from those observations; tabulation of experimental results and interpretation of the results to meet the demands of the question. They also showed poor Mathematical skills required in calculations, inability to write the correct symbols of elements, formulae of compounds and equations, among others. Many candidates take measurements and tabulate the readings and stop on that, being unable to do anything else with the tabulated data. There is a practice, probably encouraged by teachers, where a candidate takes the first reading, and then for the subsequent readings, the candidate merely adds a fixed value adds a fixed value, ending up merely forged figures of experimental results in the practical papers.

A lot of candidates showed lack of practical experience in handling the apparatus as many schools tend to handle practical aspects of the curriculum much later in the course. As a result, students do not develop the necessary skills. This could explain why most malpractice cases are in Science practical papers.

### **6.3 Performance in Higher Order Questions**

As reported in previous statements, candidates do better in questions which require mainly knowledge and understanding (Low Order questions). Higher Order questions which require candidates to apply knowledge in problem solving situations, draw inferences or make predictions from observations or a set of data are not done well. This has been persistent over the years.

## **7.0 EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE**

The measures put in resulted in a welcome reduction in the cases of malpractice. Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics have been most affected, with external assistance, collusion among candidates, impersonation and script substitution as the common cases. A total of 1,035 results will be withheld in accordance with Section 5 (2) (b) of the UNEB Act No 1 of 2021. The number of results to be withheld has been reducing steadily at this level.

Examination centres from which results are withheld will be notified through their portals.

## **8.0 APPRECIATION**

I wish to express my profound appreciation to you, Hon Minister, and the entire Ministry for your invaluable support. I thank the Parliamentary Committee on Education and Sports for their efforts in ensuring the UNEB obtains the budgetary allocation it needs to run the examination; and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development for availing the funds.

I wish to thank all those persons, the Police, UPDF and other security agencies who rendered invaluable services to UNEB during monitoring the field conduct of the examination. I sincerely thank the Area Supervisors, heads of examination centres and invigilators, who conducted the examination in accordance with the stipulated Board's regulations and adhered to the Ministry of Health guidelines on the control of COVID-19 and Ebola. Allow me, Mama, to introduce Col Sylvia Meeme from the UPDF (Military Police) and ACP Godfrey Maate from the Uganda Police Force who were assigned to work with us.

I thank the examiners whose hard work ensured that the marking ended on schedule. I am grateful to the heads of the schools that allowed UNEB to use their premises as marking centres.

Finally, in a very special way, I thank the staff of UNEB Secretariat for their utmost perseverance, selfless commitment to duty and the personal sacrifices they made to ensure the 2022 UCE Results are released. They are represented here by Director, Examinations - Mr Nangosya Mike Masikye; Manager Examinations Management - Mr James Turyatamba; Manager, Examinations Development -, rs Florence Agola Buyinza; Principal Examinations Officer (Test Development) - Mrs Joyce Awor Ebal; Principal Examinations Officer, Exam Management - Mr Jonas Sunday; the Principal Public Relations Officer - Mrs Jennifer Kalule Musamba and the Personal Assistant to the Executive Director - Ms Laetitia Naigaga.

## **9.0 ACCESS TO RESULTS AND COLLECTION OF RESULT SLIPS**

Heads of UCE examination Centres can download the results from their portals as soon as they are released. No hard copy result lists will be issued from UNEB offices until conditions are more favourable. Examination centres will be notified accordingly.

Candidates, their parents and any other person wishing to access results may do so through their mobile phones. Go to the 'Message' menu and type **UCE**, leave space, then type the correct index number of the candidate; e.g. **U0000/001**. Send to **6600** on the **MTN and AIRTEL** networks.

## **10. SUBMISSION OF QUERIES**

Heads of Examination Centres are advised to study the examination lists and submit any queries they may have to UNEB Secretariat via the Portal within 15 working days from today's date. Queries submitted after this date may not be attended to.

**Dan N. Odongo**  
**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**