

No.

Date.

Time.



OFFICE OF THE POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, MAE FAH LUANG UNIVERSITY

Report form of Defense Examination

Rubric for Evaluating Dissertation/Thesis

PART 1

Date _____

Name: _____ Student ID: _____

Program: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Dermatology Major: Dermatology Plan: 1.1

School of Anti-Aging and Regenerative Date: _____ Time: _____ Place: _____

Medicine

Type: Dissertation Thesis

OLD TITLE

Thai: _____

English: _____

NEW TITLE (CAPITAL LETTERS ONLY)

Thai: _____

English: _____

Examination Committee	Signature
1 Chairman : _____	_____
2 Committee : _____	_____
3 Committee : _____	_____
4 Committee : _____	_____
5 Committee : _____	_____
6 Committee : _____	_____
7 Committee : _____	_____

THIS PART IS TO BE FILLED IN BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXAM COMMITTEE ONLY

1. Overall Assessment of the Dissertation / Thesis

- FAIL PASS
- GOOD EXCELLENT

Reasons:

- Revised (please specify 2.-3.) No Revised

2. Revision period

Submission date of the revised work _____ / _____ / _____

Remark: For Dissertation and Thesis : Maximum 90 days -incl. holidays.

3. The revised Dissertation / Thesis will be read and approved by

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____

Please note that the revised Dissertation / Thesis must be re-submitted and approved to the assigned person(s) within the required date, otherwise re-examination will be applied.

(_____)

Chairman Examination Committee

Date _____

PART 2: For Program Committee

Comment / Consideration

- Approved as proposed
- Disapproved because _____

(_____)

Chairman of Program Committee

Date ____ / ____ / ____

PART 3: For School Postgraduate Committee

Comment / Consideration

- Approved as proposed
- Disapproved because _____

(_____)
Chairman of School Postgraduate Committee (Dean)
Date ____/____/____

PART 4: For Head of Office of the Postgraduate Studies

- Acknowledged and Record into MIS system.

(_____)

Date ____/____/____

Committee : WRITTEN THESIS / DISSERTATION Candidate :				
ATTRIBUTE	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Introduction / Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Weak introduction of topic, thesis & subtopic thesis is weak and lacks of arguable position	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate introduction that states topic, thesis and some of the subtopics	<input type="checkbox"/> Proficient introduction that states background information, provocative question, topic, thesis, and all subtopics in proper order	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional introduction that grabs interest of reader and states background information, provocative question, topic thesis, and all subtopics in proper order
Quality of Literatures Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited information on topic with lack of research, details or historically accurate evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Some aspects of researched with some accurate evidence from limited sources	<input type="checkbox"/> Well researched in detail with accurate & critical evidence from a variety of sources	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally researched with extreme detail, historically accurate with critical evidence from a wide variety of sources
Organization / Development of Ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks clear and logical presentation and development of ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat clear and logical presentation and development of ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear and logical presentation and development of ideas that support thesis	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptionally clear, logical, mature, thorough presentation and development of ideas that support thesis
Documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Very inconsistent or incorrect use of citations in both text and Works Cited section	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes inconsistent on incorrect use of citations in both text and Works Cited	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistent and correct format in both text and Works Cited section	<input type="checkbox"/> Proper detailed format always used consistently and correctly both text and Work Cited
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited evidence of discovery	<input type="checkbox"/> Some evidence of discovery	<input type="checkbox"/> A number of evidence of discovery	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional evidence of discovery
	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research	<input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research	<input type="checkbox"/> Good extends previous research	<input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research
	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Proficient theoretical or applied significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, with minimal errors in grammar <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very concise, clear, with consistently proper grammar and spelling <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent

Committee :				
WRITTEN THESIS / DISSERTATION STUDY Candidate :				
ATTRIBUTE	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Quality of Figures Table Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of consistency	<input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable display	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional display	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly professional display
	<input type="checkbox"/> Legends are unprofessional	<input type="checkbox"/> Legends are proper	<input type="checkbox"/> Legends are well organized	<input type="checkbox"/> Legends are very well organized
Documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Very inconsistent or incorrect use of citations in both text and Works Cited section	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes inconsistent or incorrect use of citations in both text and Works Cited section	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistent and correct format in both text and Works Cited section	<input type="checkbox"/> Proper detailed format always used consistently and correctly in both text and Works Cited
Publications/ Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet the university's requirement	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory number of works published in good quality journals	<input type="checkbox"/> A number of works published in high quality journals	<input type="checkbox"/> A great number of works are published in excellent quality journals
THESIS/DISSERTATION ORAL DEFENSE RUBRIC. Candidate :				
ATTRIBUTE	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT
Overall quality of presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable-slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well thought our slides	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized, very professional
	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication Skill is satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> All questions addressed in knowledgeable and respectable manner
	<input type="checkbox"/> Slides difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is clear not many questions are well addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> Almost all questions address in professional manner	<input type="checkbox"/> Slides are outstanding
Overall broadness of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals adequate critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge/well developed crotoca; thinking skills
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete or require prompting <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of degree program of graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area but with some incomplete response	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented but with minor incomplete response	<input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area
Overall assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> FAIL	<input type="checkbox"/> PASS	<input type="checkbox"/> GOOD	<input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT

