

Evaluation Form for Dissertation Defense Examination
Department of Anatomy Faculty of Medicine Khon Kaen University

Date.....

Name-Surname:Student ID:

Title of Dissertation proposal:

Rubric scoring		Ability levels				Total scores (Ability levels x weighted value)
		Very good (4 points)	Good (3 points)	Fair (2 points)	Poor (1 points)	
Part 1: Quality of dissertation defense writing						
1.	Chapter 1Introduction Importance of research problem (absolute 10 points) (weighted value = 2.5)	☐ Linkage of importance and research problems <u>covered all logically</u>	☐ <u>Almost all</u> mentions of importance or research problems, and <u>are almost all interrelated</u>	☐ <u>Some</u> mentions of importance or research problems, and <u>are a little interrelated</u>	☐ No mention of significance or research problems, lack of coherence	 x 2.5 =
2.	Clarity of the objectives (absolute 5 points) (weighted value = 1.25)	☐ Consistent objectives and comprehensive with the research questions	☐ Consistent objectives with the research questions (> 50%)	☐ Consistent objectives with the research questions (< 50%)	☐ No consistent objectives with the research questions	 x 1.25 =

3.	Chapter 2 Literature reviews (absolute 20 points) (weighted value = 5)	☐ Accurate content, complete, get to the point, relevant to <u>all</u> research problems, and cited references to quality of international literatures (SCOPUS > 50%)	☐ <u>Most</u> of contents with basic knowledge and anatomical figures, and has references linked to research	☐ Contents with basic knowledge and anatomical figures, and has references linked <u>to some research</u>	☐ <u>No</u> contents with basic knowledge and anatomical figures, and <u>no references</u> linked to research	 x 5 =
4.	Chapter 3 Methodology (absolute 20 points) (weighted value = 5)	☐ Systematically designed experiments with research ethics, provided rationale for each experiment, and the statistic use was consistent with <u>all objectives</u>	☐ Designed experiments with research ethics, <u>mostly provided</u> rationale for each experiment, and <u>Some statistic use was</u> consistent with <u>all objectives</u>	☐ Designed experiments with research ethics, statistic use, <u>explanation some</u> methodology	☐ <u>No</u> experimental design and ethics and <u>lack explanation</u> methodology and statistic use	 x 5 =
5.	Chapter 4 Results (absolute 30 points) (weighted value = 7.5)	☐ Data analysis and result presentation are correct and complete, related with the objectives.	☐ Data analysis and <u>most</u> result presentation are correct and complete, related with the objectives	☐ <u>Mistake in some data</u> analysis and result presentation are still related with the objectives	☐ <u>Mistake in all data</u> analysis and result presentation <u>are not</u> related with the objectives	 x 7.5 =

6.	Chapter 5 Discussion and conclusion (absolute 30 points) (weighted value = 7.5)	☐ Finding <u>reliable</u> references to discuss results <u>appropriately and comprehensively</u> with conclusion, and give details about benefits of the research via explain future research study	☐ Finding <u>reliable</u> references to discuss result <u>but not all points were covered</u> , summaries the results, and give details about benefits of the research via explain future study	☐ Finding <u>reliable</u> references to discuss result <u>but not all points were covered</u> , <u>no conclusion</u> , give details about benefits of the research via explain future study research study	☐ Finding <u>unreliable</u> references to discuss result <u>and not all points were covered</u> , <u>no</u> conclusion and details about benefits of the research via explain future study research study	 x 7.5 =
7.	Reliability and format for writing references (absolute 10 points) (weighted value = 2.5)	☐ Use the references format as specified by KKU <u>completely</u> and use up-to-date references (less than 10 years)	☐ <u>Mostly use</u> the references format as specified by KKU and use out-of-date references (less than 10 years)	☐ Use some references format as specified by KKU and use <u>out-of-date references (more than 10 years)</u>	☐ <u>No references</u> format as specified by KKU (Vancouver Style หรือ The American Psychological Association [APA]) and use <u>out-of-date references (more than 10 years)</u>	 x 2.5 =

8.	Quality of dissertation defense writing (absolute 20 points) (weighted value = 5)	☐ Grammatically correct writing in English and correct spelling (more than 50%)	☐ <u>Mostly</u> grammatically correct writing in English and correct spelling (40-50%)	☐ Grammatically correct writing in English and correct <u>in some spelling</u> (20-30%)	☐ Grammatically incorrect writing in English and Typo (more than 80%)	 x 5 =
Part 2: Oral presentation						
1.	Presentation ability (absolute 10 points) (weighted value = 2.5)	☐ Speak fluently and without hesitation, appropriate emphasis on timing, and eye contact with the audience	☐ Speak <u>mostly fluently, inappropriate</u> emphasis on timing, delayed speaking sometimes and less eye contact	☐ Speak fluently sometimes, <u>inappropriate</u> emphasis on timing, delayed speaking sometimes and less eye contact	☐ Can't speak fluently, <u>inappropriate</u> emphasis on timing, delayed speaking sometimes and no eye contact or read scripts all the time	 x 2.5 =
2.	English proficiency and quality of the media used in the presentation (absolute 10 points) (weighted value = 2.5)	☐ Use English grammatically fluently. The media is clear in terms of color, size and front type, including the use of various effects in the presentation to attract the audience to be more interested in what is being explained.	☐ <u>Most</u> of grammar pronounces correctly, <u>most of</u> the media used in the presentation are clear with appropriate font types, colors, and sizes	☐ <u>Some</u> grammar pronounces correctly, <u>Some</u> media used in the presentation are clear with appropriate font types, colors, and sizes	☐ Grammar pronounces <u>incorrectly</u> , media used in the presentation <u>are not clear</u> with <u>inappropriate</u> font types, colors, and sizes	 x 2.5 =

3.	Ability to answering questions with cited evidence to support answers, and answer questions with understanding research (absolute 10 points) (weighted value = 2.5)	☐ Answer <u>all questions</u> completely, get to the point, and cite evidence to support answers scientifically and correctly	☐ Answer <u>most questions</u> , and cite evidence to support answers in almost questions	☐ Answer <u>most questions</u> , and cite evidence to support answers in <u>some questions</u>	☐ <u>Cannot answer</u> most questions, and <u>cannot cite</u> evidence to support answers	 x 2.5 =
Part 3: Paper publication						
1.	Manuscript submission (absolute 30 points) (weighted value = 7.5)	Letter of acceptance from the Journal ☐ Submitted manuscript ☐ Accepted paper	-	-	No manuscript or paper	 x 7.5 =
		(Total 205 points from 3 parts)			Total.....	
		For calculation (205 points = 100%) % = (Total point x100)/205			Get.....% = (..... x 100)/ 205	

Evaluation criteria

(%)	Level
0 – 64.99 %	☐ Fail
65 – 74.99 %	☐ Pass
75 – 89.99 %	☐ Good
90 – 100 %	☐ Excellent

Passing standard

☐ Pass (65 - 100%)

☐ Without condition by sending completed dissertation with Turnitin result (less than 20%) and submitting its within 30 days after examination

☐ With condition by editing dissertation suggested by committee and sending completed dissertation with Turnitin result (less than 20%) within 30 days after examination

☐ Fail <65%: student must reprocess of dissertation defense examination

Signature of committee

.....
(.....)