



แบบแจ้งผลการสอบวิทยานิพนธ์

วันที่.....เดือน.....พ.ศ.....

เรื่อง แจ้งผลการสอบวิทยานิพนธ์

เรียน คณบดีบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย

ตามที่คณะกรรมการสอบวิทยานิพนธ์ได้ดำเนินการสอบวิทยานิพนธ์ของนาย/นาง/นางสาว.....
รหัสนักศึกษา.....หลักสูตร.....สาขาวิชา.....
ภาควิชา.....คณะ.....เมื่อวันที่.....เดือน.....พ.ศ.....
เวลา.....น. ถึง.....น. ผลการสอบปรากฏว่า

- ผ่าน โดยมีผลสอบอยู่ในระดับ
- ดีเด่น (X: excellent)
- ดีมาก (S: satisfactory--very good)
- ดี (S: satisfactory--good)
- พอใช้ (S: satisfactory--fair)
- ไม่ผ่าน (U: unsatisfactory)

ในกรณีของการสอบผ่าน คณะกรรมการสอบวิทยานิพนธ์เห็นว่าควรใช้เวลา.....วันสำหรับการแก้ไข และครบกำหนดวันส่งวิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับสมบูรณ์ในวันที่.....เดือน..... พ.ศ..... ในกรณีที่มีการแก้ไขเกิน 21 วัน ให้จัดทำวิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับสมบูรณ์ให้แล้วเสร็จภายใน 6 เดือนนับจากวันสอบวิทยานิพนธ์ หากไม่สามารถส่งภายใน 6 เดือน นับจากวันสอบวิทยานิพนธ์ ถือว่าสอบไม่ผ่านและพ้นสภาพการเป็นนักศึกษา ตามข้อบังคับฯ ว่าด้วยการศึกษาชั้นบัณฑิตศึกษา

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดทราบ

ลงนาม.....ประธานกรรมการ
(.....)

ลงนาม.....กรรมการ
(.....)

ลงนาม.....กรรมการ
(.....)

ลงนาม.....กรรมการ
(.....)

ลงนาม.....กรรมการ
(.....)

<p>1. สำหรับหลักสูตร ลงนาม..... (.....) ประธานคณะกรรมการบริหารหลักสูตร/...../.....</p>	<p>3. สำหรับคณะ ลงนาม..... (ดร.พรพิมล.....เชื้อดวงมูย) รองคณบดีฝ่ายวิชาการและบริหารการศึกษา/...../.....</p>
<p>1. สำหรับสาขาวิชา ลงนาม..... (.....) หัวหน้าสาขาวิชา...../...../.....</p>	<p>4. สำหรับบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย ลงนาม..... (.....) คณบดีบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย/...../.....</p>

หมายเหตุ : กรณีที่จำเป็นต้องเทียบผลสอบวิทยานิพนธ์เป็นเกรดสะสมเฉลี่ย ให้ใช้หลักเกณฑ์ดังนี้ :

ดีเด่น = 4.0 ดีมาก = 3.50 ดี = 3.25 พอใช้ = 3.0

รายละเอียดแนบแบบแจ้งผลการสอบวิทยานิพนธ์

ชื่อวิทยานิพนธ์ (เดิม)

.....
.....

ประเด็นการแก้ไข

1. ชื่อวิทยานิพนธ์ (แก้ไข)

.....
.....

2. เนื้อหาทางวิชาการ

2.1 กรอบแนวคิด/หลักการและเหตุผล

.....
.....

2.2 บทคัดย่อ/บทนำ

.....
.....

2.3 วัตถุประสงค์

.....
.....

2.4 วัสดุอุปกรณ์และวิธีดำเนินการวิจัย

.....
.....

2.5 ผลการวิจัย

.....
.....

2.6 สรุปและข้อเสนอแนะ

.....
.....

2.7 อื่นๆ

.....
.....

3. รูปแบบการเขียน

3.1 ภาษาที่ใช้

.....
.....

3.2 สารบัญ/ตาราง

.....
.....

3.3 การอ้างอิง

.....
.....

3.4 อื่นๆ

.....
.....

ลงชื่อ..... นักศึกษา
(.....)

ลงชื่อ..... ประธานคณะกรรมการสอบ
(.....)

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 to 5 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> <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
		1	not able to provide appropriate answers to any questions

4. responses to the questions (25%)	4.1) response to simple questions (5%)	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

