



Report on Thesis Examination

Date...../...../.....

To Dean of the Graduate School,

The Thesis Examination Committee has conducted examination for the thesis of Mr./Mrs./Miss..... Student ID.....

Degree and Plan Doctoral Degree Plan 1.1 Plan 1.2 Plan 2.1 Plan 2.2 Master's Degree Plan A 1 Plan A 2

Program.....Faculty..... on date...../...../..... from..... am/pm. to am/pm. The committee agreed that the student

- Passed the thesis examination with the quality being X (Excellent) S (Satisfactory: Very good) S (Satisfactory: Good) S (Satisfactory: Fair)
- Failed the thesis examination (U: Unsatisfactory)

In case of passing examination, the committee agreed that the revised version of thesis according to the attached comment shall be submitted to the Graduate School withindays after examination. Deadline for submission is on date...../...../.....

In the case of thesis being revised and completed more than 21 days after examination, a revised thesis must be submitted to the Graduate School within 6 months after the examination date. If unable to submit the revised thesis by that time, the student shall fail the thesis examination and be retired according to the Regulations of Prince of Songkla University on Graduate Studies.

Please be informed.

Signature Chairman of Thesis Examination Committee
(.....)

Signature Committee
(.....)

Signature Committee
(.....)

Signature Committee
(.....)

Signature Committee
(.....)

<p>For the Chairman of the Program Committee Sign..... (.....)/...../.....</p>	<p>For the Faculty Sign..... (Dr. Pornpimon Chuaduangpui) Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Educational Administration/...../.....</p>
<p>For the Head of the Division Sign..... (.....)/...../.....</p>	<p>For the Graduate School Sign..... (.....) Dean of the Graduate School/...../.....</p>

Remark: Result on thesis examination is equivalent to average cumulative grade as below:
X (Excellent) = 4.00 S (Very good) = 3.50 S (Good) = 3.25 S (Fair) = 3.00

Details of Comments from Examination Committee

Thesis title (Original):.....
.....

Suggestions on Revision

1. Thesis title (Revised):.....
.....

2. Academic comments:

2.1 Conceptual framework/rationale for the study
.....
.....

2.2 Abstract/Introduction
.....
.....

2.3 Objective
.....
.....

2.4 Instrument, Procedure, Methodologies
.....
.....

2.5 Results
.....
.....

2.6 Conclusion and Suggestion
.....
.....

1.7 Others
.....
.....

3. Format

3.1 Language and writing
.....
.....

3.2 Contents/Table
.....
.....

3.3 References
.....
.....

3.4 Others
.....
.....

Sign.....Student
(.....)

SignChairman of Thesis Examination Committee
(.....)

Evaluation Form for Master Thesis Examination

Examination Committee and students are responsible for being aware of this rubric in advance of thesis examination. This form will be completed by the Examination Committee. Rubrics of items to be evaluated are displayed on the next page.

Student's Name:

items to be evaluated	expected value (master)	Please indicate <u>score</u> from 1-5 f <u>from 1 to 5</u> based on rubrics (next page) ¹	weight	score x weight
1. quality of content (50%)				
1.1 significance and originality	3		x7	
1.2 soundness of methodology	3		x3	
2. overall quality of <u>writing</u> (15%)	3		x 3	
3. presentation (10%)				
3.1) personality, language, and communication	3		x 1	
3.2) quality of presentation media and presentation time	4		x 1	
4. responses to the questions (25%)				
4.1) response to simple questions	4		x 1	
4.2) response to complex questions	3		x 2	
4.3) understanding his/her own thesis and confidence in response to questions	4		x 2	

1: Allow decimal points in scores such as 3.5

Total

score.....

- Excellent (≥80)**
- Very Good (70-79.99)**
- Good (60-69.99)**
- Fair (50-59.99)**
- Fail (≤49.99)**

Signature Head of Committee
(.....)

Date.....

Evaluation Form for PhD Thesis Examination

Examination Committee and students are responsible for being aware of this rubric in advance of thesis examination. This form will be completed by the Examination Committee. Rubrics of items to be evaluated are displayed on the next page.

Student's Name:.....

items to be evaluated	expected value (PhD)	Please indicate <u>score</u> from 1-5 ^f <u>from 1 to 5</u> based on rubrics (next page) ¹	weight	score x weight
1. quality of content (50%)				
1.1 significance and originality	4		x7	
1.2 soundness of methodology	4		x3	
2. overall quality of <u>writing</u> (15%)	4		x 3	
3. presentation (10%)				
3.1) personality, language, and communication	4		x 1	
3.2) quality of presentation media and presentation time	4		x 1	
4. responses to the questions (25%)				
4.1) response to simple questions	4		x 1	
4.2) response to complex questions	4		x 2	
4.3) understanding his/her own thesis and confidence in response to questions	4		x 2	

1: Allow decimal points in scores such as 3.5

- Total score.....**
- Excellent (≥90)**
 - Very Good (80-89.99)**
 - Good (70-79.99)**
 - Fair (60-69.99)**
 - Fail (≤59.99)**

Signature Head of Committee
(.....)
Date.....

Rubric for Evaluating Both Master and PhD.Theses

Please rate various aspects of thesis examination using the specified rubrics. If description under rubrics is not fitted or relevant to your situation, the Committee may modify it as deemed appropriate, or select the score with description closest to your situation.

domain	subdomain	score	rubrics
1. quality of content (50%)	significance and originality (35%)	1	no originality with substantial similarity to theses, studies, or works that have already been proposed.
		2	minor degree of originality with minimal variation from theses, studies, or works that have already been proposed.
		3	acceptable degree of originality with rather difference from theses, studies, or works that have already been proposed. (expected value for master level)
		4	high degree of originality with significant difference from theses, studies, or works that have already been proposed. (expected value for PhD level)
		5	has <u>one of the following characteristics</u> : <input type="checkbox"/> The study leads to the formation of <u>new theory or ideas</u> , or refutation of old theory/ideas or significant revision/modification of existing theory/ideas. <input type="checkbox"/> The study develops <u>new and better research methodology/tools</u> , or refutes old methodology/tools or significantly revises/modifies existing methodology or tools. <input type="checkbox"/> The study discovers <u>new body of knowledge, process for production, management, or service provision and innovation</u> beneficial to academic field, industries or society, or significantly revises/modifies existing knowledge, process or innovation. Note: In assessing significance and originality, the Committee could take into account 1) the potential of the study for publishing in the journals with high impact factor and 2) its applicability to resolve the problems of industries or society.
	soundness of methodology (15%)	1	bad choices of methodology/tools in the study
		2	methodology/tools need major improvements in order to ensure validity and reliability of the study
		3	some aspects of methodology/tools need minor improvements in order to ensure validity and reliability of the study (expected value for master level)
		4	methodology/tools <u>ensures validity and reliability</u> of the study (expected value for PhD level)
		5	methodology/tools <u>ensures high degree of validity and reliability</u> of the study
2. overall quality of writing (15%)	Overall quality of writing	1	<input type="checkbox"/> inadequate explanation on rationale, results, and discussion of the study <input type="checkbox"/> majority of figures/tables are hard to follow <input type="checkbox"/> ethical consideration is not mentioned <input type="checkbox"/> no citations when needed, incorrect references and citations, incomplete reference list, incorrect format

		2	<input type="checkbox"/> some explanations are written on rationale, results, and discussion of the study, but incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> some figures/tables are hard to follow <input type="checkbox"/> ethical issues are considered but not well addressed <input type="checkbox"/> citations are provided when needed, incorrect references and citations, incomplete reference list, incorrect format
		3	<input type="checkbox"/> adequate detail on rationale, results, and discussion of the study and clearly written <input type="checkbox"/> majority of figures/tables are clear & easy to follow <input type="checkbox"/> ethical issues are considered and well addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> citations are provided when needed, accurate references and citations, incomplete reference list, incorrect format (expected value for master level)
		4	<input type="checkbox"/> adequate detail on rationale, results, and discussion of the study and effectively written <input type="checkbox"/> most figures/tables are clear & easy to follow <input type="checkbox"/> ethical issues are considered and well addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> citations are provided when needed, accurate references and citations, complete reference list, incorrect format (expected value for PhD level)
		5	<input type="checkbox"/> adequate detail on rationale, results, and discussion of the study and exceptionally written <input type="checkbox"/> almost all figures/tables are clear <input type="checkbox"/> ethical issues are considered and well addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> citations are provided when needed, accurate references and citations, complete reference list, correct format
3. presentation (10%)	3.1) personality, language, and communication (5%)	1	<input type="checkbox"/> eye contact avoided <input type="checkbox"/> present with note reading <input type="checkbox"/> poor English (if present in English) <input type="checkbox"/> gestures during presentation need improvement in many aspects
		2	<input type="checkbox"/> some but inadequate eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> present with incorrect English (if present in English) <input type="checkbox"/> some gestures during presentation need improvement
		3	<input type="checkbox"/> adequate eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> present with understandable English (if present in English) <input type="checkbox"/> appropriate gestures during presentation (expected value for master level)
		4	<input type="checkbox"/> adequate eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> present with good English (if present in English) <input type="checkbox"/> effective gestures during presentation (expected value for PhD level)
		5	<input type="checkbox"/> adequate eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> present with very good command of English (if present in English) <input type="checkbox"/> professional gestures during presentation

	3.2) quality of presentation media and presentation time (5%)	1	<input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate graphics are used in media <input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate text size in most of the media <input type="checkbox"/> no references are cited when needed <input type="checkbox"/> finish presentation more than 15 min before or after the time agreed upon
		2	<input type="checkbox"/> graphics are not related to presentation <input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate text size in many media <input type="checkbox"/> no references are cited when needed <input type="checkbox"/> finish presentation 11-15 min before or after the time agreed upon
		3	<input type="checkbox"/> graphics support text and presentation <input type="checkbox"/> inappropriate text size in some media <input type="checkbox"/> no references are cited when needed <input type="checkbox"/> finish presentation 7-10 min before or after the time agreed upon
		4	<input type="checkbox"/> graphics explain text and presentation <input type="checkbox"/> appropriate text size in nearly all media <input type="checkbox"/> references are completely cited when needed <input type="checkbox"/> finish presentation 3-6 min before or after the time agreed upon (expected value for master and PhD level)
		5	<input type="checkbox"/> graphics explain text and presentation <input type="checkbox"/> appropriate text size in all media <input type="checkbox"/> references are completely cited when needed <input type="checkbox"/> professional and well-organized media <input type="checkbox"/> finish presentation less than 3 min before or after the time agreed upon
4. responses to the questions (25%)	4.1) response to simple questions (5%)	1	not able to provide appropriate answers to any questions
		2	able to provide accurate answers to a few questions
		3	able to provide appropriate answers to some questions
		4	able to provide appropriate answers to most questions (expected value for master and PhD level)
		5	able to provide appropriate answers to nearly all questions
	4.2) response to complex questions (10%)	1	not able to provide appropriate answers to any questions
		2	able to provide appropriate answers to a few questions with some guidance
		3	able to independently provide appropriate answers to a few questions (expected value for master level)
		4	able to independently provide appropriate answers to some questions (expected value for PhD level)
		5	able to independently provide appropriate answers to most questions

	4.3) understanding his/her own thesis and confidence in response to questions (10%)	1	not understand of his/her own work no confidence in answering/discussion
		2	demonstrate fair understanding of his/her own work, fair confidence in answering/discussion
		3	demonstrate adequate understanding of his/her own work, and adequate confidence in answering/ discussion
		4	demonstrate good understanding of his/her own work, and a high degree of confidence in answering/discussion (expected value for master and PhD level)
		5	demonstrate very good understanding of his/her own work, and a very high confidence in answering/discussion

