

## Master Thesis/ Doctoral Dissertation Defense Committee's Report

## First: General Information

Student Name (In Arabic & English)		Student ID الرقم الجامعي	
College		Department	
Specialization		Degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Master <input type="checkbox"/> PhD
Thesis/ Dissertation Title (In Arabic & English)	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		
Date of Thesis/ Dissertation Defense	Day: ..... Date: / / 144 - / / 20 From: _____ am/pm To: _____ am/pm		
Has the thesis/dissertation ever been discussed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, the date of the first discussion: _____			

Members of the defense and evaluation committee according to the decision of the College Council in its session (\_\_\_\_\_)

on \_\_\_\_\_

No.	Name	Academic Rank	Role
1.	_____		Supervisor and Rapporteur
2.	_____		Member
3.	_____		Member
4.	_____		Member

KING OF SAUDI ARABIA

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

KING KHALID UNIVERSITY

DEANSHIP OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES



المملكة العربية السعودية

وزارة التعليم

جامعة الملك خالد

عمادة البحث والدراسات العليا

رقم الوثيقة / ن-5-1-وك

5.			Member
----	--	--	--------

Second: Thesis/ Dissertation Information				
1. The level to which the thesis/dissertation addresses the scientific background of the research topic:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Fully addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> Not addressed		
2. The importance of the research topic:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly significant	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately significant	<input type="checkbox"/> Not significant		
3. Originality and innovation:				
a. Originality	<input type="checkbox"/> High	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
b. Innovation	<input type="checkbox"/> High	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
4. Methods employed in the research:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Theoretical	<input type="checkbox"/> Experimental	<input type="checkbox"/> Field Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Modeling/Simulation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
5. Quality of scientific documentation (sources and references):				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
6. Depth of analysis:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Profound and convincing	<input type="checkbox"/> Profound and partially convincing	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial and unconvincing		
7. Level of research objectivity:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Systematic and objective	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsystematic and subjective	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately objective		
8. Writing quality:				
A. Writing style				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
b. Organization and coherence				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
9. Presentation quality during discussion:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor
10. Relevance conclusions and of recommendations to research results:				
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderately relevant	<input type="checkbox"/> Slightly relevant	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

## Third: Validity of the thesis/Dissertation for publication:

<input type="checkbox"/> Valid for full publication as is	<input type="checkbox"/> Valid for full publication after modifications	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially valid for publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially valid for publication after modifications	<input type="checkbox"/> Not valid for publication
---	---	--	--	--

## Fourth: Recommendation for Acceptance of the Thesis/ Dissertation and Degree Granting:

Accept the thesis/ dissertation and recommend granting the degree.

Accept the thesis/ dissertation with modifications, without further re-discussion<sup>(1)</sup>.

Address the weaknesses in the thesis/ dissertation, and the committee will re-discuss within the time frame assigned by the College Council, based on the Department Council's recommendation .<sup>(2)</sup>

Reject of the thesis/ dissertation.

(1) If this recommendation is adopted, one member of the discussion and evaluation committee is authorized to recommend granting the degree after verifying that the modifications are completed within three months of the discussion, with an extension of up to six months if approved by the College Council.

(2) If this recommendation is approved, the re-discussion must occur within one year from the date of the initial discussion.

## Fifth: Other comments (add any further comments that justify the recommendation)

---



---

Signatures <sup>(1)</sup>

No.	Name	Signature	Role
1.			Supervisor and Rapporteur
2.			Member
3.			Member
4.			Member
5.			Member

<sup>1)</sup> The committee's recommendation will be announced following the completion of the discussion, unless there is disagreement among members regarding the thesis/dissertation's merits. In such cases, the announcement of the result will be postponed until a consensus is reached. The College Council shall decide on the result of the discussion if its members disagree regarding the recommendation that the thesis/dissertation deserves, based on the recommendation of the Department Council.