



Announcement of
The Faculty of Environment and Resource Studies, Mahidol University
A Guideline for PhD Dissertation Progress Evaluation (GR.42) for
Doctor of Philosophy Program in Environment and Resource Studies
(International Program)

According to the quality of graduate education standard 2015 and supporting ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA), the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Environment and Resource Studies (International Program) has made a Guideline for PhD Dissertation Progress Evaluation (GR.42) that will be firstly used in the semester 1/2017 as following content.

1. The PhD Program committees set up two sets of academic presentations which require PhD students to attend as follows (see detail in an attachment 1).

1.1. Short progress report will be held twice in one semester.

1.2. Academic Forum will be held once in one semester.

2. For each academic presentation, students will be evaluated in a total of 100 points as follows.

2.1. Evaluation of Dissertation Progress is aimed to monitor student dissertation progress: Students will be evaluated from two short progress reports from major advisors and committee (see forms in an attachment 2 and 3 for major advisors and the Program committees, respectively).

2.2. Evaluation of Academic Forum is aimed to evaluated academic knowledge and skills including presentation skill: Student will be evaluated by major advisor, the Program committees and attending students (see a form in an attachment 4).

2.3. Each semester, total point will be delivered from averages points of evaluations from 2.1 and 2.2 and will be used as PhD Dissertation Progress Evaluation (GR.42) (70% weighed by a major advisor and 30% weighed by the Program committees). The total point will be graded as follows: ≥ 76 = Satisfactory (S), 75-60 = in Progress (P) and < 60 = Unsatisfactory (U)

3. The Program will provide evaluation forms to a major advisor who could not attend the academic presentations to evaluate a student and return to the Program.

4. If a student could not attend the Forum and submit a short progress report, students would be required to submit a formal letter to declare the reasons for the absence approved by advisors. In case students are absent without any rational reasons twice a semester, the Program committees would not approve to extend the study if a student meets the deadline.

This announcement takes effect since the date of this announcement.

Announced 6 July, 2017



(Associate Professor Dr. Kampanad Bhaktikul)

Dean

Faculty of Environment and Resource Studies

Mahidol University

Guideline for PhD Student Presentations

The PhD Program committees are pleased to set up two sets of academic presentations for PhD students as follows:

1. Academic Forum

Academic Forum will be held once in one semester for two days of presentation.

1.1 For the first year student, and student who has not taken proposal defense yet, the objective of this forum is to consolidate students' literature review skills. The presenter has to present at least 2 papers which are related to his/her research. The presenter has to submit an abstract of summarized reviews.

1.2 For other student who has his/her own research topic (passed the proposal defense), student is required to present research progress. The presentation will cover an overview, updated results, a thesis completion plan and obstacles and solution (if any).

1.3 For student who has/prepares a manuscript for publication, student is required to present his/her PhD researches the same way as for an academic conference presentation.

Each student has 15 minutes for the presentation and 10 minutes for Q&A. Student's presentation will be evaluated by an advisor, students and program committees following an evaluation form (attachment).

2. Short progress report

Short progress report will be held twice in one semester.

Each student is required to present his/her PhD research progress for 5 minutes, giving a **brief summary** of updated progress, a thesis completion plan, obstacles and solution (if any). Student Progress will be evaluated by an advisor and program committees following an evaluation form (attachment).

- Remarks:
1. If student could not attend the Forum and short progress report, students would be required to submit formal letter to declare the reasons of the absence approved by advisor.
 2. If students are absence without any rational reasons twice a semester, the Program committees would not approve to extend the study if student meet the deadline.



**Evaluation form of dissertation progress (for advisors only)
Twice in one Semester**

Student NameSemester.....Academic Year.....

Category	Excellent (5)	Very good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
The student's responsibility and effort on the assigned task					
The appropriateness and adaptability of the research plan and methodologies					
The student's knowledge of the research discipline relative to the dissertation					
The student's independence of thought, creativity, and ability to design and accomplish the dissertation					
Written communication skills					
Oral communication skills					
Total					

Advisor signature

(.....)

Date.....



**Evaluation form of dissertation progress
Twice in one Semester**

Student Name **Semester.....** **Academic Year.....**

Category	Excellent (5)	Very good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Responsibility					
Research/Analytical ability					
Written communication skills					
Oral communication skills					
Total					

Program committee signature

(.....)

Date.....

PHD ACADEMIC FORUM EVALUATION FORM

Name of presenter _____ PhD: _____ Y1 _____ Y2 _____ Y3 or more _____

	Excellent (5)	Very good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
COMMUNICATION SKILLS					
1. Were the slides easy to read & interpret?					
2. Did graphics support text and add to the presentation?					
3. Did the student <u>clearly explain</u> the research design or methods used?					
4. Was the presentation <u>pace</u> appropriate within time provide?					
KNOWLEDGE AND ANALYTICAL SKILL					
5. Did the student demonstrate a thorough understanding of the subject matter?					
6. Did the student critically evaluate the literature?					
7. Were the conclusions justified by the data presented?					
8. Did the student answer questions accurately and concisely?					
OVERALL EVALUATION					

Other comments _____

Evaluator: _____ Student _____ Program committee _____ Supervisor _____

Date: _____