POSTGRADUATE MANAGEMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL AND TQF STANDARD

ASSOC. PROF. DR. PHIMPHAKA HARDING

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAME IN CHEMISTRY

School of Science
Walailak University

Overview

The postgraduate program in Chemistry was revised program to follow the Thailand Qualification Framework (TQF) in 2012. In 2015, the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) implemented the lecturers' and program managers' qualification.

Aims & Objectives

- Improve program quality to international and TQF standard.
- Create a system for professional development of inexperienced lecturers or advisors.
- Increase international outlook and employability for postgraduate students.

New innovation in the program (2012-Present)

Scientific Writing I	Thesis proposal	Proposal exam
Scientific Writing II	Draft Manuscripts	Publications
Seminar/Thesis	Presentation Skills	Awards

Awards

- **6** International The Best Oral Presentation
- **3** National The Best Oral Presentation
- **2** The Best Thesis
- **1** Walailak Outstanding Alumni

Graduation time:
2-2.5 Years for MSc
3-4 Years for PhD

Publications:
1-2 ISI/thesis for MSc
3-6 ISI/thesis for PhD

Rubric for all evaluations: Example progress seminar evaluations

	5- Excellent	4 – Very good	3 – Good	2 - Poor	1 – Very poor
Subject Matter					
1) Understanding: did the student show an understanding of the material appropriate to a postgraduate chemistry student?	The student understood all the material.	The student understood most of the material, but the understanding of some points was superficial.	The student has reasonable understanding, but there were some errors.	The student showed understanding of many issues, but errors were frequent.	The student committed many errors, and demonstrated little understanding of the material.
2) Context and Purpose: did the student understand the purpose of the work and place it in its appropriate scientific context?	The student understood the aim of his/her research project and was able provide a broader context.	The student understood the aim of the work but was unable put it into a broader context.	The student partially understood the aim and context of the research project.	The student partially understood only the aim of the research project.	The student presented no aims or contextual information.
3) Depth: was the subject treated in detail and not superficially?	The student covered all the necessary topics in depth.	The student covered most topics, and all essential ones, in depth.	The student covered some topics in depth, but not all of the essential ones.	The student covered few topics in depth.	The student covered all topics only at a superficial level.
Presentation					
4) Organization	The presentation followed a logical sequence, and flowed smoothly from one section to the next.	The order of the presentation was logical, but the transitions were not all smooth.	The order of presentation was mostly good, but was awkward in one or two places.	The organization was awkward or jarring in several places.	The topics in the presentation were presented poorly, with no logical sequencing evident.
5) Delivery	The delivery was smooth, confident, well paced, and at the right volume.	There was some awkwardness in pacing or volume.	The delivery was poor enough to be noticeable but not poor enough to impair understanding.	Poor delivery impaired the clarity of the presentation.	The delivery prevented clear understanding of the presentation.
6) Use of Visual Aids	Visual aids were clearly laid out, appropriate in number, and easily legible. Figures and tables from outside sources were appropriately cited.	Most slides were good but some lacked clarity.	Slides were difficult to read and consistently had too much or too little information, but did not substantially impair understanding of the material.	Slides were sufficiently poor to make the material difficult to understand.	Slides showed little or no effort, poor organization, are unattractive, are inappropriate in number, and did not have the appropriate amount of information. Citations were lacking for figures and tables from outside sources.
7)Clarity	Everything was expressed very clearly.	All but the most difficult concepts were clearly explained.	Several points were not clearly explained.	Much of the presentation was difficult to understand.	The presentation was extremely difficult to understand.

IMPACT

- **15 Chemistry staff involved with postgraduate program through progress seminar.**
- **3 inexperience advisors successfully supervised 3 MSc students in 2 years.**
- **New courses and rubrics helped both students and advisors to work towards their goals together.**