**GS Dent 5**

# 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 of Dentistry

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 within ……………..days 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

 (…..…….………………..) (…..…….……….…..…..)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **For the Faculty**

 Sign………………………..………  (……………………………………)  Dean or Associate Dean  ……../……./………  | 1. **For the Graduate School**

Sign…………………………..………  (………………………………) Dean of the Graduate School  ……../……./……… |

**Remark:** Resulton 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

*Updated 20 Nov 2022*

**GS 5/1**

**Details of Comments from Examination Committee**

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

……………………………………………………….……………………………………………………

**Suggestions on Revision**

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

……………………………………………………….……………………………………………………

1. Academic comments:
	1. Conceptual framework/rationale for the study ..........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
	2. Abstract/Introduction

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. Objective

........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. Instrument, Procedure, Methodologies

.........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. Results

.......................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

2.6 Conclusion and Suggestion

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. Others

……………………………………………….………………………………………………………….……………………………………………………………………….…………………………………

1. Format
	1. Language and writing

........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. Contents/Table

..…………….……………………………………………………………………………………..………

.....................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. References

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

* 1. Others

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

 Sign………………………………….......Student

 (…..……………..…………………….…..)

 Sign …………………..…..………….….Chairman 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 score from 1-5 ffrom | weight | score xweight |
| **from 1 to 5** based on rubrics (next page)1 |
| **1. quality of content (50%)** |  |  |  |  |
|  1.1 significance and originality  | 3 |  | x7 |  |
|  1.2 soundness of methodology | 3 |  | x3 |  |
| **2. overall quality of writing (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 score from 1-5 ffrom | weight | score xweight |
| **from 1 to 5** based on rubrics (next page)1 |
| **1. quality of content (50%)** |  |  |  |  |
|  1.1 significance and originality  | 4 |  | x7 |  |
|  1.2 soundness of methodology | 4 |  | x3 |  |
| **2. overall quality of writing (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. Thesis**

 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 one of the following characteristics:  The study leads to the formation of **new theory or ideas,** or refutation of old theory/ideas or significant revision/modification of existing theory/ideas. The study develops **new and better research methodology/tools**, or refutes old methodology/tools or significantly revises/modifies existing methodology or tools. The study discovers **new body of knowledge, process for production, management, or service provision and innovation** 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 ofmethodology(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 **ensures validity and reliability** of the study **(expected value for PhD level)** |
| 5 | methodology/tools **ensures high degree of validity and reliability** of the study |
| **2. overall quality of writing (15%)** | Overall quality of writing | 1 |  inadequate explanation on rationale, results, and discussion of the study  majority of figures/tables are hard to follow ethical consideration is not mentioned no citations when needed, incorrect references and citations, incomplete reference list, incorrect format  |
| 2 |  some explanations are written on rationale, results, and discussion of the study, **but incomplete**  some figures/tables are hard to follow ethical issues are considered but not well addressed citations are provided when needed, incorrect references and citations, incomplete reference list, incorrect format  |
| 3 |  adequate detail on rationale, results, and discussion of the study and **clearly written**  majority of figures/tables are clear & easy to follow ethical issues are considered and well addressed. citations are provided when needed, accurate references and citations, incomplete reference list, incorrect format **(expected value for master level)** |
| 4 |  adequate detail on rationale, results, and discussion of the study and **effectively written** most figures/tables are clear & easy to follow  ethical issues are considered and well addressed. citations are provided when needed, accurate references and citations, complete reference list, incorrect format**(expected value for PhD level)** |
| 5 |  adequate detail on rationale, results, and discussion of the study and **exceptionally written** almost all figures/tables are clear ethical issues are considered and well addressed.  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 |  eye contact avoided present with note reading poor English (if present in English) gestures during presentation need improvement in many aspects |
| 2 |  some but inadequate eye contact present with incorrect English (if present in English) some gestures during presentation need improvement |
| 3 |  adequate eye contact present with understandable English (if present in English) appropriate gestures during presentation**(expected value for master level)** |
| 4 |  adequate eye contact present with good English (if present in English) effective gestures during presentation**(expected value for PhD level)** |
| 5 |  adequate eye contact present with very good command of English (if present in English) professional gestures during presentation |
|  | 3.2) quality of presentation media and presentation time (5%) | 1 |  inappropriate graphics are used in media inappropriate text size in most of the media no references are cited when needed finish presentation more than 15 min before or after the time agreed upon |
| 2 |  graphics are not related to presentation inappropriate text size in many media no references are cited when needed finish presentation 11-15 min before or after the time agreed upon |
| 3 |  graphics support text and presentation inappropriate text size in some media no references are cited when needed finish presentation 7-10 min before or after the time agreed upon |
| 4 |  graphics explain text and presentation appropriate text size in nearly all media references are completely cited when needed finish presentation 3-6 min before or after the time agreed upon**(expected value for master and PhD level)** |
| 5 |  graphics explain text and presentation appropriate text size in all media references are completely cited when needed  professional and well-organized media 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 workno 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 |